

## Management & Leadership

POLICY

LEADERSHIP

MANAGEMENT

GOVERNANCE

*for South African Schools*

### In this Issue

### SM&L

*is published 10 times per year by Ednews. It is editorially and financially independent and it is not affiliated to any organisation. It seeks to provide the leaders of South African schools with current and relevant information on issues of policy, leadership, management and governance.*

# Literacy

## The high cost of failure

Research commissioned by the KPMG Foundation reveals the staggering cost to the nation of children who leave school without adequate levels of literacy and numeracy.

Education and particularly the quality of output of our basic education system have been identified as the key priorities of the Zuma administration. We have dealt with this administration's promises and plans to fix the many problems that beset it fairly extensively in the last few editions including fairly comprehensive coverage of how the DoE plans to implement the recommendations of the Ministerial Task Team established to review the implementation of the NCS. Given the very significant amount of money invested in education, we felt it would be interesting to investigate the cost and consequences poor levels of literacy and numeracy on a nation's economy.

Our investigation led us to research that was commissioned by the KPMG Foundation, a charitable trust in the United Kingdom, into the cost to the nation of children who leave school without adequate levels of literacy and numeracy. The cost is staggering, not only in terms of money, but also in terms of the human consequences of that failure.

The total cost to the state ("public purse") of the failure of an individual to learn to read was estimated to be between £44 797 and £53 098 which in Rand terms is between R551 000 and R653 105

The findings from this investigation showed that children who struggle with literacy are linked to:

- A need for additional support and/or for placement in special educational needs programmes
- Truancy
- Exclusion from school
- Reduced employment prospects in later life
- Increased health risks
- Greatly increased risk of involvement in crime ("the criminal justice system")

According to the research, these increased risks were over and above the risks associated with social disadvantage and lack of qualifications which are often linked to poor literacy development.

It is possible to attach costs to each of these risks and these costs up to the age of 37 years were then totalled for an individual who failed to learn to read in his/her primary school years. The age of 37 was chosen because it was not possible to find reliable data on the consequences of poor literacy levels beyond that age. The total cost to the state ("public purse") of the failure of an individual to learn to read was estimated to be between £44 797 and £53 098 which in Rand terms is between R551 000 and R653 105 (using an exchange rate of R12.30 to £1). The annual cost of this failure was calculated at between £1.73 and £2.05 billion (R21.3 and R25.2 billion). This is a staggering sum of money.

The investigation probed the matter further in an attempt to determine what the cost savings would be if money were to be invested in literacy support programmes such as those backed by the KPMG Foundation. Their *Every Child a Reader* initiative has developed a Reading Recovery early intervention programme which has been found to be effective with about 79% of pupils placed in the programme managing to overcome their literary difficulties. The cost of this programme is £2 380.00 (R29 274.00) per pupil per year. Approximately 38 700 pupils a year in Britain leave school with very low literacy levels. Based on these figures, it is estimated that every pound invested in the programme would provide a return of between £14.81 and £17.56 by the time the children reached the age of 37. This represents a savings for the country of between £1.37 and £1.62 billion (R16.85 and R19.93 billion).

It is estimated that every pound invested in the Reading Recovery programme will provide a return of between £14.81 and £17.56 by the time a child reached the age of 37.

The authors suggest that one of the problems of implementing such a programme is that the cost needs to be borne by primary schools which do not benefit from the savings that are made, as the advantages of the improved literacy levels of these children mostly accrue as they move into adulthood. They suggest therefore that primary schools should be provided with top-up funding specifically earmarked for intervention

programmes directed at improving the literacy levels of those children who require additional support. This is an interesting proposal and one which is worth considering.

Some of the specific findings of a review of the research into the effects of poor literacy levels provided are listed below. They make disturbing reading but illustrate clearly the debilitating effect of poor literacy skills.

- The largest group requiring special needs support was the group of children with literacy difficulties.

### **“Every Child a Reader” initiative – what it involved**

The “Every Child a Reader” initiative is a programme designed in the UK to tackle the problem of children who fall behind their peers in their literacy development and to demonstrate that with the right resources, children who fall behind in their literacy development can be helped. Funding for the first three years of the pilot programme was provided through the collaborative efforts of the government, charitable trusts and business. The University of London Institute of Education monitored the programme and also evaluated its effectiveness.

The programme aimed to achieve its objectives by placing highly-trained specialist Reading Recovery teachers in schools to provide individual support for the pupils who fall behind their peers and also to support and guide class teachers in their language teaching. The training of these teachers was funded by the government but the cost of their placement in schools was funded with money provided by charitable trusts and business. Interestingly, nearly half of the teachers involved were in their first year of training. The results were excellent: details can be found in the report “Every Child a Reader: the results of the third year<sup>1</sup>”. They are well summarised in the answers to questions posed to the monitoring and evaluation group by the KPMG Foundation and which are reported in the publication. The questions and answers as are listed in the adjacent box.

#### **References**

<sup>1</sup>Every Child a Reader: the results of the third year. A unique collaboration between Charitable Trusts, Business Sector, Government. Available as a free download from [http://www.everychildachancetrust.org/ecar/pubs/third\\_year.pdf](http://www.everychildachancetrust.org/ecar/pubs/third_year.pdf)

### **“Every Child a Reader” initiative – did it work?**

Summarised answers to questions posed to the monitoring and evaluation group by the KPMG Foundation

#### **The questions and responses**

1 Does the programme succeed in its aim of getting children back to at least average literacy levels for their age?

*“Children who received Reading Recovery on average gained 20 months reading age. Aged around six and a half, they had now successfully caught up with their average peers.”*

2 Can we be sure that these children would not have learned to read and write just as well without Reading Recovery?

*“There is ample evidence in this Year 1 study and Year 2 follow up that without Reading Recovery children with low literacy understanding do not catch up to age appropriate levels”.*

3 Do the effects last?

*“This follow up study has shown that their progress was sustained at average levels a year or more after having accessed Reading Recovery intervention.”*

4 Does the programme have a wider impact in standards within schools, beyond those children directly taught?

*“This longitudinal study shows that a trained Reading Recovery teacher can provide accurate identification and detailed diagnosis of early literacy learning; can raise the achievements of the lowest groups of children; and impact on whole class progress.”*

5 Does it work in challenging circumstances – in schools where it is hardest to raise standards?

*“Even those children in deprived social and economic, inner-city environments who had made no start into literacy after a year or more in school, can catch up if the right help comes early enough. With access to Reading Recovery this is demonstrably an attainable goal.”*

- There is a significant link between poor literacy levels and anti-social behaviour.
- Pupils with poor literacy skills are more likely to be excluded (expelled) from school than their peers.
- One study found that in the sample of permanently excluded pupils that they studied, 63% had a criminal conviction by age 24 with a tendency to violent crime, and that the suicide rate for the groups was 19 times the national rate for their age.
- Those entering secondary school with poor reading levels were 4 times more likely to be persistent truants than their better-reading peers.
- 73% of pupils with high levels of social disadvantage who were poor readers wanted to leave school at age 16 compared to 48% of the same group who were good readers.
- One study found that 75% of men at age 37 reported good health but for those who were poor readers the percentage reporting good health dropped to 50%. The same study found that men and women with poor literacy levels were 2 to 3 times more likely to smoke heavily, drink alcohol more than once a week, and be obese on a body mass index calculation, than those with good literacy skills.
- Women with poor literacy skills were 5 times more likely to be classified as depressed than those with good literacy skills.
- 25% of juveniles in custody have a reading age of that below an average 7-year-old.

While these figures apply to the United Kingdom, there is certainly a message in them for those involved in education in this country. Our public education system in its present state seems to be unable to provide the majority of children with the basic literacy and numeracy skills that they need to participate fully in the social and economic life of this country. The poor literacy and numeracy development of the children in our schools has been confirmed by the results of the systemic testing undertaken by the DoE in Grades 3 and 6. The report on the second phase of the systemic evaluation cycle for Grade 3 found that just 36% of the Grade 3s

tests for literacy and 35% of those tested for numeracy were performing at the appropriate level for their grade. The only encouraging thing to come out of this report was that these figures represented an improvement of 5% and 6% respectively over the results scored in the first round of testing. It is not surprising therefore that our prisons are full to overflowing and our hospitals are unable to cope with the burden of people suffering from poor health, the majority of whom are permanently at risk of malnutrition and the twin scourges of HIV/ Aids and TB.

The strong evidence from these studies linking poor literacy (and numeracy) development at schools with a range of social ills and the consequent very significant economic costs emphasises the need for the government to tackle underperformance at the majority of primary schools with a great deal more vigour than it has done in the past. Principals, teachers and governors also need to be made aware of the enormous social and economic cost of this underperformance. It is perhaps time to ask whether the 1 800 hours of teaching that every teacher employed by the state is expected to account for each year is enough. While we acknowledge that there are many teachers that work far longer hours than they are required to do, there are many more who do less and who baulk at the suggestion that they remain at school any longer than the minimum of 7 hours that is mandated each day. One wonders if they really understand or care about the long-term consequences of their lack of commitment and the dire impact that it has on the future of those whom they are paid to teach.

KPMG in the UK is a leading provider of professional services including audit, tax and advisory

<http://www.everychildachancetrust.org/index.cfm>

Established in 2001, The KPMG Foundation focuses on education and social projects for the disadvantaged and under-privileged, with particular emphasis on unlocking the potential of children and young people, up to 30 years of age, who for primarily social reasons have not fulfilled their educational potential.

# Leadership

## Leadership practices for improved pupil performance

Research undertaken on behalf of the Wallace Foundation identifies those policies and practices at school, district and state level which have the most impact on improving pupil performance

The Wallace Foundation<sup>1</sup> recently published a research report<sup>2</sup> prepared by its own staff which summarises findings from research into those practices and policies which have been found to be critical to successful reform efforts in the USA at local, district and state level. These reform efforts have been focussed on improving pupil performance as part of “Race to the Top” a reform initiative of the Federal Government. The Wallace Foundation is a Not-for-profit organisation that focuses on sharing expertise and providing support in areas of educational leadership, arts education and out of school time learning. In their research they looked particularly at those policies and interventions that addressed the following topics:

- Coordinating state, city and district policies
- Turning around the lowest performing schools – the role of district leaders
- Turning around the lowest performing schools – the role of the principal
- Preparing and developing effective school leaders
- Expanding opportunities for out-of-school learning.

We have listed below some of the key elements of these findings which we have reinterpreted to make them meaningful to our particular structures and circumstances and which we believe are relevant to the context of the current efforts to reform and revitalise schooling in this country.

### **Coordinating State and District Policies (in our case Provincial and District policies)**

**Better policy coordination between districts and state (provincial in our case) education departments has important payoffs.**

The research showed that in districts where there was better policy coordination between state and district

offices, principals felt that they had greater authority in dealing with the appointment of teachers, in compiling their school programme, and in establishing pupil achievement goals. They were also able to devote more time to improving classroom instruction. By contrast principals felt more frustrated about the time they spent on improving instruction and felt they have less authority over the evaluation and “removal” of teachers and administrators, if their schools were situated in districts where there was less effective state-district policy coordination

### **Efforts to expand learning opportunities outside of the school day and year are only successful where there is commitment from top leadership**

Initiatives to improve pupil performance by providing them with learning opportunities outside of the school day and year are fairly common in the larger cities in the USA. Many of these opportunities are offered during the long summer holidays (typically 8 – 10 weeks)

which are a feature of the American school year. Research has shown that the negative impact of these holidays is far more pronounced on pupils from more socio-economically disadvantaged homes/communities than on those who are better off. These research findings have spurred political leaders to promote these kinds of out of school programmes.

### **The role of district leaders in turning around the lowest performing schools**

District level strategies which have been shown to be effective in turning around under-performing schools include the following:

**Direct more resources to those schools and students with the greatest need. The kinds of additional resources which have been found to be helpful include:**

- The provision of additional funding and/or staff

“There are virtually no documented instances of troubled schools being turned around without the intervention by a powerful leader...” and “... the impact of good leadership is greatest in schools where it is most needed.”

to these schools in a way that supports their specific needs.

- Investing in building the capacity of the weakest teachers to improve their knowledge, skills and commitment.
- Increasing the allocation of instructional/teaching time by making changes to the school timetable or to the workload of teachers. This could include lengthening the school day so that pupils are exposed to more contact time each day than pupils at fully functional schools. This additional time can also be used for supervised homework periods and/or intensive revision of work that pupils have not mastered.

### **Creating incentives and conditions that make it possible for schools with the greatest need to attract high-quality principals and teachers.**

Any proposal in this country which involves paying principals or teachers according to the educational or socio-economic context of a school is likely to court controversy and be challenged by the unions. It is interesting to see, therefore, that it has been used as an effective strategy to attract better principals and teachers to underperforming schools. Interestingly, there are policies in place which make it possible to attach additional remuneration to posts which are difficult to fill because of they require applicants with special qualifications and/or skills which are in short supply or because suitable applicants are unwilling to apply because of the location or special context of the school (For more on this see the box in the adjacent column). These provisions, however, seem to be seldom used. In the United States and the UK the salaries and other conditions of service attached to the principal's post at underperforming school often inflated in an effort to attract better principals. An interesting consequence of this approach has been the emergence of principals who become known for their ability to turn around underperforming schools and who are then head-hunted by districts and SGBs because of their expertise in this regard.

The Wallace Foundation report notes that the inability of districts and schools to attract "high-quality" principals is not because there is a shortage of candidates; it is because good candidates are unwilling to accept pay and working conditions which compare poorly with other districts. Even if the pay were the same, the challenges and demands of turning around a failing school and dealing with the problematic socio-economic circumstances which are usually associated with these schools is not what most experienced and successful principals aspire to.

## **Incentives for Educators**

The provision that makes it possible to pay incentives for to teachers was declared in the policy document *Incentives for Educators* published in Government Notice No. 25 in *Government Gazette* No. 30678 of December 2007. The purpose of the policy is to "attract and retain educators in areas of scarcity" according to a statement by the DoBE in reply to a parliamentary question put to the Minister by Mr PF Smit of the IFP. According to the reply, the policy makes provision for the payment of incentives to attract applicants to post that are difficult to fill in the following circumstances:

- Posts in schools situated in remote geographical areas
- Posts in subject/learning areas/phases which are difficult to fill because of the scarcity of suitably qualified applicants. Mathematics, Science, ICT and some languages are identified in the policy but the policy also makes provision for provincial education departments to identify scarce subjects in terms of their own specific needs
- Posts in schools that are situated in difficult urban areas – these are schools that are defined as "hard-to-teach" schools
- Post which have proved difficult to fill based on evidence provided by the principal and/or SGB.

In terms of the policy the teacher appointed to these posts may only receive the additional ("incentivised") payment if he/she is fully qualified (REQV 13). The decision about which posts to incentivise and the types of incentives that will be paid, rest with individual PEDs.

Unfortunately we have not been able to ascertain which PEDs, if any, are using the provisions of this policy but we guess that it is probably seldom used, partly because this kind of additional payment is normally opposed by unions and partly because of the costs that may be involved if it were to be used extensively. Given the parlous state of education in most of our schools, however, one has to wonder why PEDs have not at least experimented with the kinds of approach that have been used successfully in the UK and USA. In those countries experienced principals with good records of success are frequently head-hunted and paid incentives to take on the headships of under-performing schools and to turn them around. It is certainly worth trying.

### **Provide timely relevant data - and training in its use – to enable principals to accurately diagnose and address learning needs.**

The Americans make extensive use of standardised testing in almost everything that they do and education is no exception. Their pupils are tested regularly using batteries of standardised tests and teachers and principals are expected to use this data to analyse pupil performance and to use it to put in place appropriate remedial interventions for those pupils who fall behind. In South Africa almost the opposite has been true since the introduction of Curriculum 2005 and for the majority of pupils the only externally set and marked systemic test of their competence has been the SC and NSC examination which comes at the end of their school career. This is certainly one of the reasons for the consistently poor performance of pupils in these examinations. The absence of externally set and moderate tests and/or examinations and an inadequate system of monitoring teaching and learning meant that teachers could pretty much do as they pleased and it would seem that many of them did. This contention is supported by evidence from the more recently introduced systemic evaluation of literacy and numeracy in Grades 3 and 6. Currently, however, with the exception of the Western Cape, only a representative sample of pupils is tested in each province. This means that the kind of information needed to hold teachers and principals accountable for pupil performance does not exist in the system at present. This is set to change with systemic testing for all Grade 3, 6 and 9 pupils scheduled for introduction in 2011. This we believe will go a long way to increasing the levels of accountability in our schools and classrooms.

### **Use principal assessment to focus more attention on improving instruction**

The authors of the Wallace Foundation report suggest that the assessment instruments used to assess the principals of most state schools provide few details about the impact that the principal has on the quality of instruction in the school. They identify this as a weakness of the system and suggest the need for a model which can provide data which will make it possible for districts to accurately track the performance of principals. This data can then be used to identify the shortcomings of principals and then to address these through in-service training and/or mentoring. A new system – VAL-ED<sup>3</sup>, has recently been developed which can be used to assess those leadership behaviours which are most closely associated with improved teaching and learning, as well as the ability to “share authority”. This second point is of interest because it suggests that the ability of a principal to share authority

is a critical element of successful school leadership. There is more about the VAL-ED system in on page 10.

### **Enable principals to devote more time to improving instruction**

One of the items of research<sup>4</sup> which the authors of the study used in compiling their report found that principals were spending about one third or less of their school day on instructional leadership and that the remainder of their day tended to be devoted to dealing with administrative and disciplinary related tasks. One solution to this problem, which is being tested in 33 districts in 9 states, is to appoint a School Administrative Manager (SAM) to relieve principals of some of their administrative load. The researchers found that this intervention made it possible for principals to spend about 1 hour more each day on instructional matters. It noted, however, that principals also needed to be provided with coaching to help them to redirect their focus from administrative matters, their “familiar routine”, to instruction-related matters.

### **Redirect the focus of district office staff from administrative management issues, to providing principals with the support that they need as instructional leaders.**

It would appear that in the USA, like in South Africa, district office staff is more interested in ensuring the principals perform their administrative tasks than on ensuring that the instructional needs of the pupils are met. Questions about these only arise when the district officials are confronted with the school's poor performance in externally set systemic tests. In the USA a number of districts have responded to the need to improve pupil performance by concentrating their efforts on providing principals with ongoing administrative support in order so that they can devote more their time and effort to instructional leadership.

### **The role of the principal in turning around the lowest performing schools**

The authors of the report use the following quote from Kenneth Leithwood to illustrate the important role that principals play in any school improvement initiative.

“There are virtually no documented instances of troubled schools being turned around without the intervention by a powerful leader...” and “... the impact of good leadership is greatest in schools where it is most needed.”<sup>5</sup>

The research findings show that the competence of the principal is the most critical element of any school



improvement strategy. The findings from research include the following:

**Investment in good principals is a particularly cost-effective way to improve teaching and learning. This is because they have the authority and competence to ensure that good teaching permeates the school.**

**A good principal is the single most important determinant of whether a school can attract and keep good teachers.**

The research shows that the decisions teachers make about whether or not to remain at a school depends largely on the level of administrative support that they feel the school provides. This is dependent on the competence of the principal.

**Turning around failing schools “must be the shared work of many” but it is the task of the principal to “lead this work”. Good principals accomplish this by:**

- Ensuring that the school functions in a way that ensures that the school’s resources and structures support teaching and learning and that there is a common understanding amongst staff about what is required of them.
- Creating well-functioning instructional teams and distributing authority so that everyone is able to support the schools vision in their decisions and actions.
- Building relationships with members of the wider school community so as to ensure that they are supportive of the school’s efforts and are willing to contribute to its success.

### **Preparing and Developing Effective School Leaders**

According to the research findings, the ability of districts and states (PEDs) to attract and retain the good school leaders depends on the following:

**The provision of better and more selective training for principals. The goal of this training should be aimed at ensuring that principals are equipped with the skills that they need to improve teaching and learning and to turn around failing schools. They list the following “proven effective practices”**

- Selective recruitment to identify expert teachers with leadership potential

- A challenging, coherent curriculum that focuses on instructional leadership, the ability to change the culture of a school, and to improve the skills and effectiveness of teachers.
- Active student-centred instruction that integrates theory and practice. Learning should be problem-based.
- Well-designed and supervised administrative internships which provide real opportunities for aspiring principals to experience leadership first-hand.

The authors give as an example the work of the New York City Leadership Academy<sup>6</sup> which uses the above approach. Graduates from this Academy who were placed in low-performing schools achieved higher rates of improved pupil performance than other new principals working in similar schools.

### **Provide more and better monitoring of new principals once they have been appointed**

New principals need to be provided with mentoring and support that goes beyond simply providing them with a “buddy” system. Mentoring needs to focus on pupil learning as a key measure of performance. The funding allocated by states (PEDs) and districts to training and mentoring programmes for new principal needs to be sufficient to make them effective. This includes funding to train mentors so that they have the skills and knowledge they need to support principals.

### **References**

<sup>1</sup> The Wallace Foundation ([www.wallacefoundation.org](http://www.wallacefoundation.org)). The Foundation is not-for-profit NGS which seeks to support and share effective ideas and practices that will strengthen education leadership, arts participation and out-of-school learning.

<sup>2</sup> Research Finding to Support Effective Educational Policymaking: Evidence and Action Steps for State, District and Local Policymakers, (Wallace Foundation, September 2009). Can be downloaded from ([www.wallacefoundation.org](http://www.wallacefoundation.org))

<sup>3</sup> VAL-ED: Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education

<sup>4</sup> Based on a still to be published report by Policy Studies Associated, which is evaluating the School Administration Manager projects and which is being supported by the Wallace Foundation.

<sup>5</sup> Kenneth Leithwood, How leadership Influences Student Learning, University of Minnesota and Toronto, 2004, 3

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.nycleadershipacademy.org/>

# Professional development

## Assessing Principal Effectiveness

The VAL-ED instrument, developed by the researchers at the Vanderbilt University and the University of Pennsylvania in the USA provides detailed assessment of a principal's perceived performance in those areas which impact on pupil achievement.

There are many different approaches to the assessment of principals including those which form part of our own IQMS and WSE processes. Most use a variety of instruments, including such things as questionnaires and face to face interviews to gather information to use as part of the assessment process. Recently, a new instrument has been developed by researchers at Vanderbilt University and the University of Pennsylvania in the USA. The instrument that they have developed is called the Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education which has been abbreviated to VAL-ED. According to the team that developed the instrument, it is effective because it is able to provide a "detailed assessment of a principal's perceived performance". The assessment measures a principal's performance in 6 Core Components and 6 Key Processes. The components and processes evaluated are those that have been shown by research to impact on student achievement.

### 6 Core Components

The Core Components are school characteristics that support teaching and learning. The 6 that have been identified – with their descriptors are:

- High standards of student learning: Goals are established for individual's teams and the school for academic learning.
- Rigorous curriculum: The academic content in all core subjects, and provided to all students, is ambitious. (Note: American public schools have a far greater say over what is taught in their schools than schools do in this country.)
- Quality instruction: Teachers use instructional practices that are effective and maximise student learning.
- Culture of learning and professional behaviour: Communities of professional practice are integrated in the school and serve student learning.
- Connections to external communities: Parents, families and external organisations are linked to the school and support academic and social learning.
- Performance accountability: Leadership holds itself and others responsible for student

performance and meeting high standards. Professional staff and students see themselves as individually and collectively accountable.

### 6 Key Processes

The 6 Key Processes refer to the processes that the principal uses to achieve the goals defined by the core components. The processes and their descriptors are:

- Planning: Articulate shared direction and coherent policies, practices, and procedures for realising high standards of student performance.
- Implementing: Engage people, ideas and resources to put into practice the activities necessary to realise high standards of student performance.
- Supporting: Creating enabling conditions; secure and use the financial, political, technological, and human resources necessary to promote academic and social learning.
- Advocating: Promotes the diverse needs of students within and beyond the school.
- Communicating: Develop, utilise, and maintain systems of exchange among members of the school and with its external communities.
- Monitoring: Systematically collect and analyse data to make judgements that guide decisions and actions for continuous improvement.

### Collecting the data

Data on the principal's performance is collected using a questionnaire which list 72 statements. Each statement is a description of a leadership behaviour which the principal can exercise and which is linked to the 6 Core Components or 6 Key Processes. The principal is then scored on a 5-point scale in terms of his/her performance level in the behaviour described. The ratings on the 5-point scale are 1 = ineffective, 2 = minimally effective, 3 = satisfactorily effective, 4 = highly effective, 5 = outstandingly effective. The instrument is completed by the principal, the principal's supervisor (from the district office), and all of the teachers at the school. The teachers' responses are anonymous.

The system is designed to be web-based with the principal, teachers and supervisor completing the form on-line but it is also possible to respond using a paper and pencil process to collect the data. Once all the forms have been completed the data is collated and analysed to produce a detailed profile of the principal's strengths and weaknesses across the 6 Core Components and 6 Key Processes. This is provided in the form of a matrix showing the core components along one axis and the key processes along the other. The example below has been downloaded from the VAL-ED website. Examples of some of the statements from the 72 item questionnaire are given elsewhere on this page. They have been transcribed from the form for the sake of legibility. An image of a section of the questionnaire is also provided to show what it looks like.



## Principal Survey Form A

Principal ID:

Describe your school: Rural Suburban

Principal:	
School:	
District:	
Date:	

Percentage of students with free/reduced lunch:

How many years have you been the principal at this school?

		Sources of Evidence						Effective	
		Check Key Sources of Evidence						Mark One or Two	
		Reports from Others	Personal Observations	School Documents	School Projects or Activities	Other Sources	No Evidence	Ineffective	Minimally Effective
<b>High Standards for Student Learning</b>									
- There are individual, team, and school goals for rigorous student academic and social learning.									
<b>How effective am I at ensuring the school...</b>									
Planning	1. plans rigorous growth targets in learning for all students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	2. plans targets of faculty performance that emphasize improvement in student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Implementing	3. creates buy-in among faculty for actions required to promote high standards of learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	4. creates expectations that faculty maintain high standards for student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supporting	5. encourages students to successfully achieve rigorous goals for student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	6. supports teachers in meeting school goals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Advocating	7. advocates for high standards for student learning when writing and implementing Individualized Education Plans (IEPs).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	8. challenges low expectations for special needs students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communicating	9. communicates rigorous goals for student learning to faculty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	10. communicates with families and the community about goals for rigorous student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Monitoring	11. monitors student learning against high standards of achievement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	12. monitors disaggregated test results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Copyright 2008 by Vanderbilt University and distributed exclusively by Discovery Education Associates

Core Components	Key Processes					
	Planning	Implementing	Supporting	Advocating	Communicating	Monitoring
High Standards for Student Learning	B	B	P	BB	P	B
Rigorous Curriculum	B	BB	P	P	BB	B
Quality Instruction	B	P	P	B	P	P
Culture of Learning & Professional Behavior	P	B	B	P	B	BB
Connections to External Communities	BB	BB	BB	BB	BB	BB
Performance Accountability	B	BB	P	BB	B	B



































## Subscribe

To subscribe to ***School Management & Leadership*** send your contact details by post, fax or e-mail to:

The Managing Editor  
School Management & Leadership  
P.O. Box 2612  
CLAREINCH  
7740

or fax to: 086 689 5971

or e-mail to: [subscribe@ednews.co.za](mailto:subscribe@ednews.co.za)

or telephone: 021 683 2899

Annual subscription is R330.00 for 10 copies published approximately monthly from February to November and subscribers will also be able to access the full features of our website at [www.ednews.co.za](http://www.ednews.co.za).

Payment can be by cheque, made payable to Ednews, or by direct payment to ABSA, Claremont: branch code: 421 109, account number 919 043 4497.