Growing the knowledge

How the PASP was designed as a learning program

Before commencing to outline the ways in which schools, in partnership with their academic mentors, were advised regarding the collection, analysis and interpretation of evidence, three terms require some further explanation: knowledge creating organisations, evidence based practice and purposeful professional learning.

It has already been asserted that the processes of evaluation to be used by the PASP were founded on a belief that schools can be knowledge creating organisations. Following David Hargreaves (1999) it is perceived that a knowledge creating school is one in which the following factors and conditions, among other things, prevail:

- A culture of, and an enthusiasm for continual improvement;
- A strong awareness of the external environment;
- High sensitivity to the preferences of key stakeholders;
- Coherent but flexible planning;
- Recognition of the expert knowledge held by teachers;
- Professional knowledge creation as a whole school process; and
- A readiness to innovate, treating mistakes as opportunities for learning (pp.126 – 127).

The belief, implicit in the evaluation (which seeks to accumulate the knowledge created by schools into broader knowledge of the PASP) was that the schools engaged in the Program would or should embody to smaller or larger degrees all of these features. In some cases they would require coaching and assistance from both their academic partners and the PASP team, but we wished to affirm our respect for the narratives of practice that were ultimately, to be developed by the schools. For as Jackson (2003) notes in relation to the UK innovation Networked Learning Communities:

… we cannot improve our schools until we collectively know and understand our schools; that the route to knowing is collaborative enquiry; and the regenerative processes of knowledge creation, knowledge conceptualisation, knowledge transfer and knowledge utilisation are at the heart of organisational and professional learning and networking activity. (p.3)

It was important that the portrayals to be developed by the schools would be evidence based. We were concerned to establish that the term 'evidence based
practice’ was one that was shared and understood. Groundwater-Smith & Mockler (2002) argued that evidence based practice is neither a neutral nor an innocent term. They argued that the purposes for gathering evidence can be conceived of in three ways: the first of these is to use the evidence in adversarial settings where it is utilised to prove a case, wishing to prove that one method is unarguably better than another; the second is to use evidence as a forensic scientist might, that is to understand a particular phenomenon or event; the third is to seek to reconceptualise and reinterpret practice on the basis of new knowledge in the way that an historian would. In thinking about evidence based practice in PASP schools, the interest was most strongly focussed on the second of these. Schools would be gathering evidence that would enable them to more deeply and fully comprehend what was happening within them and to base their practices upon those reflections.

Turning to the term ‘professional learning’ it is important to put it into a context of adult transformational learning. The expectation of the knowledge building, evidence based process is that it would be founded upon an understanding that it is adults, within a community of practice (Wenger, 1998), who would be prepared to engage with each other. They would do so in ways that emphasise contextual understanding, critical reflection on assumptions and validating meaning by assessing reasons based in evidence. As Mezirow (2000) emphasises:

> Our understandings and beliefs are more dependable when they produce interpretation and opinions that are more justifiable or true than would be those predicated upon others understandings or beliefs. (p.4)

Education has always been a complex business, but for those engaged in innovation and reform in challenging contexts, as is the case with the PASP schools, it is even more demanding and requires responsiveness and adaptation on many fronts. It requires professional learning of the highest order. As Espejo et al (1996) remind us, “we are inventing the organisations we work for and, also, inventing in these organisations” (p.332). They emphasise that the structural conditions for workplace learning depend upon sound communication, effective interaction and valid information. Professional learning takes place when people share their mental models, understand the ‘blinkers’ that can create learning difficulties, and have a strong orientation to problem posing and problem solving.

Finally, in this introduction to “Growing the Knowledge” we wish to emphasise that the professional learning is not only the learning of the schools, but also of the NSW Department of Education and Training and the NSW Teachers’ Federation, as well as the academic partners and the evaluators. Growing the knowledge had to take account of all of these stakeholders.

### 4.1 Preparing to gather evidence

In order that schools and their academic partners were well prepared in approaches to gathering evidence about the implementation of their PASP projects, two major meetings were planned and enacted; a half day reception for academic partners and a full day evaluation Forum for schools.
Critical to the school based evaluation of the PASP initiatives has been the role of the academic partners. It was seen as essential that prior to the commencement of the school year, 2003, the academic partners would have a shared understanding of the goals and purposes of the schools’ self evaluations as outlined in the meta-evaluation proposal:

The school evaluations were aimed to give a comprehensive account of the work of the school. Their simple intention was to document the process and apparent effects of the innovations being tried in the school and to record what schools have learned about the nature and effects of the particular strategies they have tried. More specifically the self evaluations are intended to (a) record the process and effects of the innovations as a kind of ‘corporate memory’ for the school community itself, (b) to permit schools to share their learning with other schools (in the first instance other schools participating in the Program) and (c) to allow schools to share their learnings with the NSW Department of Education and Training and other interested groups and thus to assist in the formation of future policy programs and procedures more likely to respond to the particular needs and circumstances of schools like these (Meta Evaluation Proposal, p. 2).

Consequently an afternoon ‘reception’ was conducted at DET, Bridge Street, 20th February. The reception was attended by academics from Charles Sturt University, Macquarie University, Newcastle University, Southern Cross University, the University of Queensland, the University of Sydney, the University of Technology Sydney, the University of Western Sydney, and the University of Wollongong.

They were welcomed by the Assistant Director-General Secondary Education, who indicated that the Program would continue beyond 2003 on the condition that the evaluation demonstrated positive outcomes and the Deputy Director General Schools, who indicated the distinctiveness of the Program and foreshadowed the introduction of the Priority Schools Help Program for 2004 which would concentrate upon a small group of troubled schools, thus demonstrating the commitment to equity programs.

The Superintendent responsible for the Program outlined the rationale for the PASP and the need for a well informed evaluation of it. Attention was drawn to:

- the objectives for participating schools;
- the funding support that had been provided to them;
- what the funds might be spent on;
- the key tenets of the Program;
- the state PASP team;
- the districts containing PASP schools and the schools themselves; and
- the processes that had been followed to date.

The meta-evaluators undertook the remainder of the briefing that included the design of the meta-evaluation with particular emphasis upon the school self-evaluations and that these evaluations would be used by schools to identify ‘the developmental edge’ in their thinking and actions. They also provided advice on
the role of the academic partners, expectations and concerns. Roles could include: assisting with writing, supplying key inquiry resources, advising on ideas and strategies being used in the various sites and engaging participants such that they could clearly see that they were contributing to the corporate memory of the schools. The processes were seen as such that they would enable a move towards a more responsive bureaucracy that respected local diversity. While the reception recognised the wealth of experience that the academic partners carried with them in their histories of working with schools it was also made clear that the overall design and structure of their evaluation responsibilities and of the meta-evaluation had been established.

Academic partners were familiarised with the key ‘technology’ that would scaffold the school self evaluations, this being the school learning portfolio whose content could be synthesised into the following broad categories: the school and its context; the project and its tasks; and the learnings and promises for future development (more detailed information regarding the school learning portfolios follows under Section 4.2).

The reception closed with some words from the NSW Teachers’ Federation seconded officer, who emphasised the union’s endorsement and engagement with the Program in the form of a partnership. He saw the project as an opportunity for public education to engage in serious community building and to enact an agenda for social change.

Over fifty academic partners attended the reception. Those who were not able to be present joined a teleconference on 14th March.

Discussion at both the reception and teleconference indicated a general sense of anticipation that the Program would be an exciting and innovative one. However several issues were flagged as being important ones to consider, these included:

- **Ethics** – Many university human research ethics committees are slow to approve academic projects, this might prove to be a stumbling block. It was agreed, however, that the DET’s own guidelines covered this matter in that these were not cross-site research projects and providing such matters as informed consent were covered to the satisfaction of the school principal this should be sufficient. Any publications arising from the academics engaging in self-study (i.e. their own reflection on the roles that they had played) would also need to be submitted to the DET who had provided the context for such a study.

- **Expectations** – Academics were concerned about the amount of writing and documentation that they would be expected to undertake. It was agreed that this would be determined by the contractual arrangements that they have with the school, thus further emphasising the notion of ‘local solutions’. The school Forum to be held in March would help clarify for schools the scope and nature of the documentation.
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• Time Frame – Attention was drawn to the short time frame of the Program. It was argued that this should be seen as ‘a work in progress’. However, there should still be demonstrable outcomes that could be documented and discussed in the portfolio.

Further discussion dealt with matters such as: capacity building in the schools, the need for active listening, the anticipated positive impact on teacher morale, the prior experiences of schools in engaging in practitioner enquiry and juggling time and resources.

The second critical occasion designed to support the development of a knowledge base for the PASP was the Evaluation Forum held on 28th March, 2003. Principals of the seventy four PASP schools were invited to attend with one other member from the school. Schools were able to negotiate the inclusion of their academic partner on the proviso that the cost would not be met by the central administration but from the allocation made to the school to cover evaluation costs. It is important to underline the policy of the Program to minimise expenditure at the centre, thus allowing the maximum distribution of resources to the schools.

The purpose of the Forum was to ensure that all schools were familiar with the guiding principles for the evaluation. Thus the goals of the Forum were that participants should have an increased understanding of: those principles, the elements of the PASP school learning portfolio, methods for collecting evidence, action research and the planning of other PASP schools.

196 people attended the Forum, including 57 principals, 20 academic partners, 10 Chief Education Officers, School Improvement, 3 Superintendents and the 5 members of the PASP team.

The Forum was opened by the Assistant Director-General who reminded participants of the genesis of broad band equity programs under the Whitlam Government. He suggested that the PASP had developed a similar energy and commitment and that this had much to do with the recognition, deeply embedded in the Program’s objectives that local solutions must be found for local problems. He saw that flexibility to respond to evidence, alertness in generating alternative explanations and alternative solutions were all important elements.

The PASP Superintendent mapped the territory of the PASP in much the same way as outlined above in relation to the academic partners’ reception. Professor Stephen Kemmis, one of the meta-evaluators, undertook a broad sweep of changing constructions of disadvantage and the development of action research over the past half century in a number of different countries and addressing a range of different social challenges. He pointed out that action inquiry in the PASP context requires multiple perspectives and understandings. In the occasional newsletter published, following the Forum it was reported:

… Travelling in the lift with a colleague from Coffs Harbour, she turned to me (Susan Groundwater-Smith, meta-evaluator) and said ‘it’s a long time since we have given so much attention to these big issues; I’m enjoying the challenge’ or words to that effect. In our short discussion she signalled that in our anxiety to ameliorate the
conditions for students in difficult circumstances we sometimes fail to examine those circumstances themselves, how they have arisen and how they are reproduced. (Newsletter #1, p.1)

For most of the remainder of the day, time was devoted to advising schools specifically of approaches to gathering evidence (see below 4.2) and the development of the school learning portfolio. It was indicated that while schools would want to celebrate what had been achieved for students, teachers, leaders and the community, the emphasis would be upon what had been learned. Evaluation was not to be seen as merely a form of fiscal accountability, that the money had been spent appropriately (important as that is), but also that the Program was concerned with professional accountability – being accountable for major decisions to do with curriculum, pedagogy, classroom management and the like, in ways that are transparent and justifiable.

One of the academic partners, Les Vozzo, who in his own work had kept a professional learning portfolio, used that experience to illustrate in practical ways how a portfolio could be developed and maintained. He demonstrated how his philosophy of practice had evolved and manifested itself in the ways that he thought about teaching science. He drew links between the ways in which he had examined his own professional learning with those that the school might use.

Little time was left at the end of the day for school interest groups to meet. But it was seen that this was not the major purpose of the Forum which was mainly related to placing the Program’s evaluation into a larger context. All the same, it was clear that participants were a little frustrated that they had not had sufficient time to meet their colleagues and discover what they were doing and why.

Participants were requested to complete a short evaluation sheet at the conclusion to the Forum. They were required to rank on a Likert scale from 1-5 their agreement with a statement that each of the outcomes of the Forum had been achieved. 77% of the participants agreed that the Forum had increased their understanding of the guiding principles for the evaluation. 82% of participants agreed that they had an increased understanding of the elements of the PASP school learning portfolio. 90% of participants indicated that they had an increased understanding of the methods for collecting evidence. 67% agreed that their understanding of action research had been increased. While these results indicated a general to high level of satisfaction with the Forum, the area that indicated the greatest shortcoming was the opportunity to have an increased understanding of the work of other schools. Only 55% of the participants believed that this outcome had been achieved.

Statements such as “Fantastic opportunity for networking. Have organised some school visits” and “Valuable opportunity to network during the day. Would like to have access to what other schools are doing” were offset by several who generally indicated that more time should have been devoted to this session in order to achieve this outcome.
4.2 Approaches to gathering evidence

Central to the concept of the PASP being a knowledge based Program is the notion of action inquiry. Teachers would be assisted in gathering evidence using a variety of methods and would be enabled to reflect upon what they had discovered and make informed decisions regarding their next actions.

For many school based practitioners the very term ‘research’ connotes a particular model of measurement, with standardised pre- and post- testing and a systematic comparison of results between experimental and control groups. It was something of a revelation to them to discover that there were many ways of collecting evidence that would be commensurable with classroom practice. For example, in conducting a focus group, using students as researchers (see Chapter 7), the very act of designing the questions, engaging with the peer group, debriefing and advising staff of results involves a number of key learning outcomes, for students, from a range of key learning areas. It is clear from the participants’ high level of satisfaction with respect to hearing about new and interesting strategies in the Forum that the wider range of methods was seen to be useful to them. The following strategies were shared with schools:

- Focus group inquiry and its merit as a source of evidence in a variety of contexts;
- Images and metaphors as powerful research tools;
- The monologue – interviewing oneself;
- Using scenarios to stimulate response;
- Documentary photographs and drawings;
- The silent conversation; and
- Using questionnaires and surveys.\(^3\)

At both the academic partners’ reception and the evaluation Forum detailed advice was given regarding the processes of building a school learning portfolio. Based upon the New South Wales Department of School Education’s document *Schools on the Move* (1998) the emphasis has been upon the school as a learning organisation, within which teachers and students learn, and beyond which the community also learns.

The following summary captures the purposes and structure of the portfolio:

The purpose of the portfolio is to:

- Record the processes and effects of the strategies that have been adopted as a kind of ‘corporate memory’ for the school community as a community of practice;
- Permit schools to share their learning with other schools; and

---
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- Allow schools to share their learning with the NSW DET and other interested groups to assist in the formation of future policy, programs and procedures.

The key questions that the schools will address are:
- What did we learn as a result of adopting these strategies?
- What effect have our actions had upon student learning?

The key questions for the meta-evaluation are:
- What have schools learned?
- What changes have occurred, both in terms of operational factors and enhanced understanding of student needs?
- What are the indicators of successful projects (short term, medium term, long term)?
- What have been the costs and benefits of the Program at the local and State levels?
- What level of District, State and academic assistance is required to facilitate projects of this kind?

The school learning portfolio has been defined as: evidence based documentation of organisational and collegial learning regarding a workplace’s transformation.

The portfolio contains:
1. A statement of purpose.
2. A discussion of the school context.
3. The philosophy of the school.
4. The goals of the school.
5. The specific PASP strategies.
6. Evidence of professional learning – what is being learned about professional learning, what is being learned about pedagogy, what is being learned about student learning, what is being learned about the school within its community and system?
7. Reflection upon professional learning.
8. A judgement of worth – how worthwhile has the work been and what have been the costs and benefits (Portfolio Summary Handout Prepared by Meta-evaluators for Evaluation Forum).

Preparing for the gathering and documenting of evidence has been a significant task for the meta-evaluators and the PASP team. Unlike many bureaucratic evaluations the meta-evaluators have been fully engaged with, and instrumental in, designing the Program’s processes from a relatively early stage. It could be said that the meta-evaluators have acted as the academic partners to the PASP team in much the same way as their colleagues have supported the individual schools.

4.3 Progressive focussing

Early in the year, it was clear that schools would appreciate a focussed mid-way review by the State PASP team who had been providing on-going support and had remained in constant touch with the schools, both on a needs basis and to provide
networking opportunities. Following the March Forum, it was signalled that structured visits would be undertaken during June and would be seen as a part of the ongoing evaluation. In discussions about how the June visits were to be conducted, schools recommended early notification of visits with clear guidelines as to what would be required by the PASP team. For their part, they would like the visit to focus on clarification and constructive feedback on the portfolio and the school’s progress in terms of data/evidence collection.

During May, planning commenced for the June visits. It was agreed that each school would be visited by two members of the PASP team, each of whom could provide a membership check of the visits’ outcomes. The meta-evaluators would participate in a number of visits (twelve in all) traversing a variety of school districts. Schools were advised that the aims of the school visits were to provide:

- mentoring for the school learning portfolio;
- an opportunity for schools to report on and demonstrate work in progress;
- feedback on the school’s learning to date; and
- an occasion to celebrate achievements.

Visits of three hours would be planned by the schools to cover three distinct sessions:

- PASP in Progress – a structured discussion between the PASP team, the principal and one or two key others. The discussion would be based on a framework covering five areas of learning regarding the context, inputs and infrastructure, strategies, learning processes, and impacts. As well, there would be reflection upon the school’s action plan and the learning portfolio as a work in progress.
- PASP in Action – A school led demonstration of the PASP in action which could include a classroom visit, conversations with and demonstrations from key personnel.
- PASP Team Response – Feedback from the state PASP team, to the principal and one or two key others which would address the five areas of the framework.

A brief handwritten report was prepared during these three sessions, and in the final session it was discussed with the principal and others from the school participating in this session. These notes were later transcribed and returned to the school as feedback.

It was clear from the visits that the PASP was well underway. Of course, it would have been premature to have expected to see that targets were being met at this point. Nonetheless, it was clear that a number of learnings were emerging about the design and management of local projects.
All schools recognised and applauded the flexibility inherent in the PASP design. They appreciated that they were able to develop solutions that appeared appropriate to their needs. In thinking about change they were now more inclined to understand their schools as an ecosystem, where making changes in one area would have impact and influence upon another. It was clear that PASP projects, as interventions, were not isolated strategies, but fitted within the schools’ policies and practices.

At this mid-point, student welfare and behaviour management were seen to be major issues. In several cases it was argued that the school is a haven for students. A number of schools were attempting to address concerns in relation to behaviour management by enhancing substantive student engagement. Much of what happens in such challenging schools as those identified by the PASP is to do with crisis management. Welfare issues have a capacity to paralyse leadership and reduce opportunities to develop wider and more proactive policies. Several Principals observed that they now had more time for parents and students where they could deliver positive messages about learning and achievement.

Schools were clearly feeling that they were being revitalised by the Program. Many reported that there were more opportunities for professional discourse and reflection. As a teacher in one school that was visited reported, “the staff have had the same malaise as the students, constant dealing with consistent entrenched problems … this (PASP) has been the best professional development I have had in years.”

Another outcome that was being noted was the increase in distributed leadership within the PASP schools. Providing additional staffing opportunities for these schools had meant that larger numbers were assuming leadership roles. Schools had developed more sophisticated layers of management as people took on new responsibilities.

The development of the school learning portfolio depended to some extent on the engagement of the academic partner. In some schools this had been quite minimal, with the academic only responding when called upon. In other cases the academic partner had been proactive in working closely with the school as was originally anticipated. (This matter will be more fully discussed in Chapter 6). At this point it was clear that there were some ‘silences’ in the portfolios, mainly in relation to any analysis of school culture or the school’s social history.

All the same, the general response of schools to the June visits was that they were ‘on track’ and feeling significantly revitalised by a Program that gave them a great sense of agency. In her feedback to the PASP team, one meta-evaluator quoted Winter (2003) who observed that:

The defining characteristic of action research is that it involves practitioners and service users in attempts to create new understanding through negotiating and implementing improvements in the quality of social practices. This has important consequences. First, the ethic of action research is not that of scientific detachment, but of responsive engagement. The practical worth of the inquiry process is not simply the matter of subsequently ‘implementing the findings’; rather every phase of
the work is itself intended to enhance professional values (justice, rationality, care, autonomy etc.) pp. 142 – 143.

The June visits to schools were a clear manifestation of the work of PASP team in providing pressure and support to schools. It was seen by the schools that “someone is constantly asking critical questions”. The team’s hands-on management style was recognised and affirmed by the schools who were increasingly aware that they were involved in a change program. There was a real sense of connectedness and collaboration both within the schools and between the schools and the PASP team.

Following the June visits and the knowledge that they produced, schools began planning for the November Forum at which they would report on what they had learned to an audience composed largely of peers, but also including some senior Departmental officers. It became evident that some kind of provision would need to be made to allow schools to have an overview of the work of all participants in the PASP. Clearly, this would not be possible in terms of all 74 schools presenting details of their work to all other schools in a session of their own. It was decided to request schools to design a poster that would be informative and focused and could be displayed for all to see4.

Schools were advised that posters should provide an overview of the school plan highlighting the research focus, the strategies used, the evidence collected and the learnings. Posters were an important part of the process of focusing schools on what was central and essential in terms of their projects. This focus, in turn, assisted them in preparing their presentations to the November Forum.

November presentations were to be designed to capture, in a brief twenty minutes, the most significant aspect of the school’s PASP project. The purpose of the presentation was to provide the schools with the opportunity to focus on this one significant strategy and explore it in depth. Each school team (of three) would have the chance to present once and hear a number of presentations by other schools.

The critical elements of the presentation were seen to be:

- What is the key strategy?
- Why did you choose it?
- How did you manage it? E.g. what organisational structures did you put in place? How have you used your staff differently?
- What worked?
- How did you know that it worked?
- What did you learn?

4 It is important to note here that at this juncture the Department of Education and Training was undergoing a major restructure. Members of the PASP team were being seconded to provide advice in other arenas. A primary school principal was brought in to continue to supply advice to schools (just prior to the Forum, a second primary school principal was also attached to the program).
• What impact has this learning had on pedagogy and student welfare in the school?

Brief school profiles had been earlier developed and were included in the Forum papers as an aide de memoire for schools and to enhance networking between them.

November 14th saw the culminating Forum of the trial of the PASP. Schools had been advised that the funding would continue into 2004 and were already making plans for the next stage of the Program. Schools were grouped into seven ‘learning circles’. Groupings were based upon the primary/secondary divide, not because there was an intention to reinforce the divide, but because the challenges did vary according to the ages and stages of the learners. For example, early childhood education presented concerns that differed from the education of adolescents. Each learning circle contained schools from a range of districts and geographic areas and had a chairperson who attended to time management. As well there was an academic partner who acted as a rapporteur who would capture the essential learnings of the group.

The Forum was seen as a learning conference. The title “Growing the Knowledge: Professional Learning is More than Sharing” gave voice to its focus and direction. Participants were provided with a learning journal intended to capture new ideas, surprises and reflection on action that might arise from the new knowledge that had been acquired.

As the learning circles progressed, participants were requested to record affirmations, innovations and surprises, implications, and key learnings. Over two hundred comments were documented. While it is not possible, here, to capture these in detail, the most often cited responses are briefly discussed.

Affirmations were generally concerned with the opportunity given to teachers to exercise professional judgement regarding what was needed in order to enhance their students’ learning. Schools have been given opportunities to experiment in processes that engaged their students in more productive and enjoyable learning. This in turn, reduced some of the behaviour problems faced in schools in challenging circumstances. “Smart risk taking” was seen as essential to trying out new ideas. The PASP had created an environment where this was possible. “It was great to see schools/teachers willing to share not only successes, but problems that they had encountered along the journey”.

While many innovations were site specific, people could see the germ of an idea that they could then take to their own context and re-engineer to meet local conditions. For example, the idea of inviting every classroom teacher to learning support teacher meetings to talk about students at risk was seen as “a great idea”; or, the notion of a “guaranteed curriculum” (further discussed in Chapter 5) was welcomed as an unexpected strategy. The varied use of teachers outside the norms of established staffing was particularly noted as was the general diversity of solutions. One group recorded the link between “the deep professional learning of teachers” and the consequent improvement in learning for students.
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Many implications statements were related to capacity building and sustainability. How were schools to manage beyond the PASP? “Great programs are in place because of additional staff but what happens when (or if) this funding is ceased?” The flexibility of the Program was applauded, but it was believed that some thought will need to be given to existing staffing policies, particularly with respect to establishing a stable and competent staff for students in schools with deep needs.

Key learnings emphasised the benefits of collegiality and the development of the school as a whole community. Schools were concerned that resources are properly targeted and not “spread too thinly”. There was a strong belief that the PASP had as its ultimate and primary focus the needs of the students and that with “courage, passion, integrity and self-belief” schools would be able to develop solutions that best met those needs.

As the year drew to a close schools were finalising their learning portfolios and portfolio reports. After the earlier visits in June, and following further conversations with the schools, it had become clear that schools would need to synthesise their learnings and the evidentiary base that underpinned them. The following model for the portfolio report was distributed on the understanding that it was a scaffold rather than a fixed template.

Section 1: School background and context (2 pages)

Section 2: What the School has done – Strategies and their impact (8 pages)
• Professional learning
• Pedagogy
• Staffing solutions
• Organisation for learning
• Student well being
• Student support
• Interagency and community partnership

Section 3: School learning processes (5 pages)
• Action inquiry projects – collecting, analysing and interpreting evidence
• Staff professional development processes
• Building a portfolio
• Reporting e.g. June visits/Forums etc.
• Working with an academic partner
• District support and other consultants

Section 4: Issues (5 pages)
• Unexpected changes
• Crisis

Section 5: Overall learnings (3 pages)
• Are local solutions helping meet local needs?
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• Are we challenging orthodoxies?

Section 6: Where to from here? (2 pages)

• Future planning

To conclude: this chapter has concentrated upon the many strategies employed by the PASP to grow professional knowledge in and beyond the participating schools. The chapter that follows will give detail of the emergent professional practices that have been designed to enhance student learning and well being in some very difficult and challenging circumstances.
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