DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 417 233 UD 032 171

AUTHOR Townsend, Tony
TITLE Quality, Equity and Effectiveness: Critical Issues for Tomorrow's Schools.
PUB DATE 1997-07-00
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Australian Council for Educational Administration (Canberra, Australia, July 9-12, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Decentralization; Economic Factors; *Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Educational Quality; Educational Technology; *Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Futures (of Society); Prediction; *School Based Management; Social Change; State Programs; *Technological Advancement
IDENTIFIERS *Australia (Victoria)

ABSTRACT

In recent years there have been substantial changes in the way in which education is structured, financed, and managed in Australia. The move towards more self-management in schools, is now operating in the Australian school systems. Similar changes have been occurring in other countries, spurred on, by the governments' desire to save money. In the face of these changes, school administrators in Victoria (Australia), as in most other educational systems, face three main questions: (1) what does it mean to have a quality education?; (2) how can it be ensured that all students have access to a quality education?; and (3) how can educators ensure that all students experience success? All of these questions were raised in light of educational decentralization. Another major uncertainty educators face is the impact of technological change. Clearly, students from a school with no computing facilities are at a disadvantage, which is bound to increase. The increasing impact of technology means that a major issue for administrators over the next few years is to focus on the school as currently structured and to make some predictions about where it might be going. These predictions are to be made on the basis of evidence and not emotion. The speed of change in education is now approaching the speed of change in everything else, and school administrators have not yet been given the skills they need to deal with the rapid changes on the educational front. (Contains 1 table and 38 references.) (SLD)

Quality, Equity and Effectiveness: Critical Issues for Tomorrow's Schools

A paper presented at *Beyond the Boundaries*
the Annual Conference of the Australian Council for Educational Administration,
Canberra July 9-12, 1997

Associate Professor Tony Townsend
Director, South Pacific Centre for School and Community Development
Faculty of Education
Monash University
Australia
Telephone: (03) 9904 4230
Facsimile: (03) 9904 4237
email: tony.townsend@education.monash.edu.au

Introduction

The international trend towards devolution of decisions and responsibilities for managing schools to the school level, with the end point being self-managing, or self-governing public schools has been perhaps the most powerful influence changing the understanding of leadership in education over the past decade. Instances can be seen in Canada, where the Edmonton School District pioneered many of the features of school restructuring we see today, in the United Kingdom with Grant Maintained (GM) and Locally Managed (LM) Schools, in the United States with the charter school movement and in New Zealand, which adapted the Canadian model as a means for developing a national system of self-managing schools called *Schools of Tomorrow.*

In recent years there has also been substantial change in the way in which education is structured, financed and managed in Australia. The move towards more self-managing schools, complete with school councils, school charters, school global budgets, quality assurance, school reviews, and the like, are now a feature of most, if not all, Australian school systems. One only has to look at the changes occurring in New South Wales (Cuttance, 1997) and Victoria (DSE, Victoria, 1993) and those that are emerging in Queensland (DOE, Queensland, 1996) to see the emphasis being placed on accountability, marketing and management, particularly as they impact on school communities.

This change has been seen by some as being a destabilising force within school systems, perhaps because it could be argued that some schools have struggled to come to grips with new requirements, new procedures and new accountability measures. However, other schools have flourished under self-management. Townsend (1997a: 13) characterised this in the following way:

> We might suggest that the current situation is akin to surfers catching a big wave. Some will be looking at the shore and wondering how quickly they can get there. Others will be looking back to where the sea seemed to be calmer and wondering if they could ever go back. Yet others will be looking straight down and wondering when the crash will hit them.

Educational administrators in Australia in the past decade have been confronted with changes of similar proportions to those facing administrators in other countries. Since the 1860s and 1870s, when education was made free, compulsory and secular in the various state school systems, there has been an expectation that the government would provide the vast majority of the funds required to run schools, including teacher salaries, administrative costs, maintenance and building costs, books and other supplies for the children and also make most of the decisions. Most local communities were involved in

fundraising of some sort, through raffles, social activities or voluntary contributions from parents to support additional school activities or to buy equipment. The level of fund raising was minimal in most cases and was seen as supplying equipment additional to the school's needs. Until the late 1970s, decisions, about curriculum, teaching methods, about policy, were invariably made at the centre and passed down for the principal to implement. The role of the principal was quite straightforward.

However, the last twenty years have seen momentous changes to the way in which education is structured and run. Starting with the Karmel Report (1973), described by Caldwell (1993:3) as 'arguably one of the most influential documents in school education in the last twenty-five years', each of the states has undergone various levels of restructuring and the role of the principal, teachers and parents have changed in terms of their input to educational policies and practices. Students have changed too, not only because of demographic changes brought about by a much more multicultural clientele, but also because social and community concerns such as drugs, alcohol, violence, family breakdowns and the stagnant economy, none of which the school has caused but all of which the school is expected to deal with.

The next decade: Issues for school administrators

Perhaps the most important agenda for the next few years, as it possibly always is for educators, can be identified by three questions:

- What does it mean to have a quality education?
- How do we ensure that all students have access to such an education?
- How do we ensure that all students experience success?

This framework of quality, equity and effectiveness provides the central theme for the rest of this paper. Two concerns identified by Victorian principals as critical to the restructuring process are the issue of funding and the issue of control. The level of intervention by government and the department into what can and cannot be decided locally has led some commentators to question whether or not the Victorian system can be called self-managing. There still seems to be a gap between the government's claim that *Schools of the Future* implemented the government's 'commitment to the view that quality outcomes of schooling can only be assured when decision-making takes place at the local level' (DSE, Victoria, 1993:1) and the reality of what is happening in schools. These issues, which help to place the debate in context, will be addressed as well.

Restructuring education: Can governments let go of their power?

Guthrie (1986: 306) argued, 'unless policies are identified that unleash productive local initiatives, the reform movement seems likely to lose its momentum.' Some of the school-based decision-making literature (eg., Henderson, 1987; Henderson and Marburger, 1986; Henderson and Lezotte, 1988) suggests that if decisions relating to school personnel and situations are made at the school level then there would be a better chance of having the right decisions made than there would be if the decisions were made away from the school at a district, regional or state level. Rosenholtz (1989), in her analysis of schools that were improving and schools that were not, concluded that the success of any strategy for enhancing student performance depends largely on the empowerment of the people at the school site.

However, Griswold, Cotton and Hansen (1986) concluded that initial stages of change involved anxiety and confusion, and that ongoing support was important to help cope with change-induced anxiety. Devolution may improve educational policy making, but without skilled staff, committed parents and a dedicated school leader, and appropriate levels of resources and training, there is no guarantee that devolution will bring about improved decisions, or any decisions at all, if the central authority places mandates on the school. This suggests that we may need to give schools and school systems time to establish the appropriate elements before we make definitive judgements.

However, some of the previous attempts at restructuring have had quite a few years of development. The Edmonton system, often cited as the 'best-practice' example of self-management, has suffered from financial downturns in the past decade, something that was not a problem when it was first established. This made the development process more difficult in recent years. Some commentators are now arguing that school self-management was a myth. Booi (1992: 3) argued:

> ...the myth involves much more than the budget process; it reaches into virtually every aspect of school culture, as it is designed to do. We are told constantly that the schools have been 'freed' to make all the big decisions. Of course, with this alleged freedom comes responsibility for the 'outcomes' - particularly the difficult ones. If staff are declared surplus, it is the school's 'decision'. If there is not enough money for professional development, that is 'the school's choice'. If schools' results on achievement tests are low, the culprits are near at hand. In reality, power, control and resources are kept at the centre; responsibility, blame and guilt are decentralised to the schools.

In Britain, it has been argued that 'governments have actually increased their claims to knowledge and authority over the education system whilst promoting a theoretical and superficial movement towards consumer authority' (Harris, 1993).

The Cooperative Research Project (Thomas *et al.*, 1994, 1995a, 1995b, 1996), a study jointly conducted by the Victorian Department of Education, Principals' Associations and

the University of Melbourne provides a unique view of restructuring a school system in Australia. It identifies the opinions of principals about a range of issues that emerged as the Victorian system moved to self-managing schools. In fact, there were many areas of the program that principals were positive about. Principals expressed moderate to high levels of confidence that the *Schools of the Future* program would enable school communities to determine the destiny of the school (mean = 3.4 out of 5.0), would make the school accountable to the community (3.8) and actively foster the attributes of good schools (3.9). They also expected that there would be a more relevant and responsive curriculum (3.1), improved long term planning (3.5) and shared decision making (3.2). Caldwell (1997: 10) reports that 86% of principals who had experienced both the centralised and decentralised models of management preferred the self-managing school.

However, it also found high levels of principal concern over potential problems related to decision making, including the transition to new accountability measures (mean = 3.6 out of 5.0), level of bureaucratic control (3.8), maintaining the quality of education during a period of rapid transition (3.9) and expectation of further changes (4.0). One principal remarked, 'Most central controlled system experienced in twenty-nine years with the DSE' (DSE, 1996: 44). Principals had found that there were substantially increased expectations of them, but far more bureaucratic controls as well. Caldwell (1997: 10) reported:

> Problems of workload and frustration at constraints on flexibility were significant and consistent with those identified in earlier surveys. mean workload was 59 hours per week, the same as in 1995, but 69% indicated that the workload was higher than expected, also a consistent finding in recent years.
>
> Mean job satisfaction was down, to a mean of 4.3 on a 7-point scale, compared to 5.3 on the base-line survey and 4.6 in the 1995 survey.

This suggests that the level of control exerted by the Department was enough to cause frustration, but not enough for principals to want to return to the past. Principals wanted more flexibility, in staffing, in resource availability and in planning, than the Department was prepared to give. The contractual arrangements between the Department and the principal made the principal more of a line manager than an educational leader, and the frustration that this caused boiled over into a contractual dispute in 1997, one that has yet to be fully resolved.

Decentralisation and a quality education

Chapman and Aspin (1997: 61) argued:

> What no-one will disagree about is that schools of tomorrow must, as well as being efficient and effective, be of high excellence: they must, in comparison

> with the schools of yesterday and today, show that they are institutions planned, organised and directed to offer educational experiences, activities and outcomes that are marked by a concern that those experiences, activities and outcomes shall all be of the highest quality. It is the problem of saying what that quality might be, and how it might be brought about in our educational institutions, that educators have now begun to grapple.

They identify a series of what they call core values of quality schooling promoting the development of individuals that are both autonomous and capable of entering mutual relationships. In other words a quality education enables an individual to be both 'self-motivated and self-starting' but also has 'patterns and networks of mutual relationships with other individuals and with the whole community' (Chapman and Aspin, 1997: 65).

Such suggestions entail the development of a broad range of skills and attitudes, rather than simply focusing on basic academic skills. There have been some attempts to identify appropriate, and locally acceptable, goals for Australian students, rather than simply having governments provide a rigid framework for what occurs in schools. The Effective Schools Project, a major national study into school effectiveness in Australia concluded:

> School effectiveness is about a great deal more than maximising academic achievement. Learning, and the love of learning; personal development and self-esteem; life skills; problem solving and learning how to learn; the development of independent thinkers and well-rounded, confident individuals; all rank as highly or more highly in the outcomes of effective schooling as success in a narrow range of academic disciplines.
>
> (McGaw *et al.*, 1992:174)

Townsend (1994) found that school communities in government schools in Melbourne felt that academic, vocational, citizenship, personal development and community goals all needed to be considered. They wanted to go beyond what might be called the 'regular' curriculum to include things that they saw as being important for *their* children rather than children in general. The devolution of some curriculum authority to the school would enable this to occur. He proposed a core-plus curriculum:

> ...where the core might be the state mandated obligations of the school, similar to those that would relate to success in literacy and numeracy, but the plus would be determined by the school community.
>
> (Townsend, 1994: 105)

In the future we may have to define a quality education more on the basis of what it will enable our children to do, rather than what it helps them to know. The move towards lifelong education, expressed by the Victorian Association of State Secondary Principals (VASSP, 1996), suggests that it is no longer possible for schools to teach students everything they need to know, so it may be necessary to provide the skills of accessing knowledge (which will include literacy, computer literacy and numeracy) rather than

specific content knowledge. But whatever the content area might be, the underlying aim is to achieve excellence.

> Those who achieve excellence will be few at best. All too many lack the qualities of mind or spirit which would allow them to conceive excellence as a goal, or to achieve it...But many more can achieve it than now do. And the society is bettered by not only those that achieve it but by those who are trying.
>
> (Gardner, 1961:133)

Decentralisation and equal access

Perhaps the major issue confronting governments is, having decided what a quality education is, how we can ensure that all citizens have access to it. It was interesting that at the 1996 AERA in New York one could sit in on a discussion between John Chubb and Myron Lieberman on the privatisation issue. For these people the privatisation debate has gone way beyond 'Should we?' and they were providing various perspectives on 'How?' In Australia, it could be argued that the privatisation of public education is being approached by stealth. Both state and federal funding have been reduced for public school systems, thus promoting the situation where parents are paying more and more to send their child either to a non-government school or to a 'free' government school.

Recent decisions by the newly elected Commonwealth government push the privatisation issue further than any previous government. They have reduced the per capita funding for education, particularly in government schools and, at the end of 1996, introduced a change that will have a dramatic effect on funding public education. It established what was called the Enrolment Benchmark Adjustment (EBA). A benchmark of 29.4% was set as the national percentage of students enrolled in non-government schools, although each state varied from this figure slightly. Under the scheme, a total of $1712.50 would be deducted from expenditure on government schools for every new student that enrols in a non-government school. The Australian Schools Lobby (1996: 3) reports ' The Federal government justifies the cut of $1712.50 per student with the argument that state governments "save" twice that amount each time a student moves from a government to a non-government school.'

The following table indicates the effect that this would have had on Commonwealth funding of government schools in Victoria had the scheme applied for 1995-96. Since the percentage of students in non-government schools increased by 0.23%, this becomes the base figure for the calculations. The $1712.50 is deducted for 0.23% of the 782,712 students in the state (ie. 1800 students). Thus the state of Victoria would have received

1800 X $1712.50 or $3,082,500 less from the Commonwealth under the EBA scheme despite having 2720 additional students had the scheme been in existence in 1996.

Table 1: Victorian students in government and non-government schools

	No. of students in govt schools	No. of students in non-govt schools	totals	% in non-govt schools
1995	519,804	256,143	775,947	33.01
1996	522,524	260,188	782,712	33.24

This money does not go to private schools, it is removed from the system altogether. At a time when state governments are severely cutting education budgets themselves, this decision makes enrolment in government schools even less attractive than it was before.

This cost cutting also place additional stresses on schools and particularly principals, as more and more activities previously controlled or undertaken centrally are now expected to be conducted at the school level. For instance, in Victoria, staffing, maintenance and cleaning, professional development, financial management and accountability, all of which were previously undertaken by the centre to a greater or lesser extent, are now being conducted at the school. These tasks are being picked up by (fewer) people at the school working harder and, sometimes by giving people responsibility for areas in which they are not trained.

If we take a step back and look at the state of affairs dispassionately, we must have some sympathies with governments at this time in our history. More and more people are demanding higher levels of service, over a range of areas, health, education, public safety, transport, but at the same time are demanding they pay less and less taxes. There has to be a critical intersection at which the level of service provision and the level of public funding meet. I think we reached this about ten years ago. Since then governments all around the world have struggled to meet the demands put on them by various interest groups in the community. Increasing national debts and an increasing gap between the rich and the poor have been two outcomes of reaching this crossroad.

It may be cynical to suggest that the sole reason for devolution is to save governments money, but there seems to be a fair degree of evidence to suggest that it is at least high on their priority list. All of the other claims made by government, that devolution will enable communities to have a far greater say in the direction the school will go, that the quality of education for children will rise, that schools will improve their levels of accountability to the local community, do not yet seem to be supported by the international data.

In Victoria, where the *Schools of the Future* program has pushed devolution further than in any other state in Australia, the roles of the local community have been to select the principal and develop the school charter, a three year contract between the school and the educational authority. In reality, this seems to be a similar sets of tasks to those undertaken by parents in a non-government school. The discussion of the use of a voucher (or Educard, as described by the VASSP, 1996), where the funding for each student accompanies that student to whatever school is chosen, is fraught with danger, unless the government fully funds every student to the school they choose. Otherwise schools will be able to charge extra fees (as happens now in non-government schools) and student choice will be limited by their parents' income. Recent information related to contracts between students and schools (Heinrichs, 1997) suggests that students might be excluded from government schools on the basis of their academic performance. This suggests being part of a market approach to education has driven schools to lengths of competitiveness that might be unhealthy for the system as a whole.

The notion of a voucher allocated to all citizens as a means of funding education continues as an issue just below the surface of education debate. A consistent reader of daily papers (Boyle, 1997) will see the issue surface from time to time. Even the VASSP (1996: 24) identifies a voucher (called an Educard) as the means by which education and the marketplace meet. The issue of educational disadvantage is addressed:

> All individuals are given a certain minimum number of educational rights and credits to realise these rights. These credits provide access to services right through to the end of formal tertiary education. Some of these services are means tested so as to ensure the government's educational investment is targeted most specifically towards those in greatest need.

What isn't addressed is the necessary change of attitude required by both government and the community as a whole for this level of funding to be achieved.

The notion of resources following students is not a new idea. Voucher system have been attempted in the United States as early as the 1970s, where the US Office of Economic Opportunity first undertook feasibility studies in Gary, Indiana, San Francisco and Seattle and then funded a voucher system in Alum Rock School District in San Jose, California in 1972. Recent research into vouchers at Stanford University, found that 'parents who use vouchers are highly satisfied with the schools they have chosen and believe the shift from public to private has been beneficial' (Henry: 1996:1). One of the difficulties with a voucher system is the possibility that they may help to increase the gap between the students of those parents able to make appropriate choices (and have them funded) and those students whose parents, because of their own previous educational disadvantage, make the wrong choice, or who fail to choose at all.

However Townsend (1996a: 29) argued:

> the need for a voucher approach to education in Australia can be rejected for other reasons:
>
> * the debate about vouchers is not new and there is no evidence that a voucher system will work any better than other newer forms of resource allocation;
> * to narrow the issue of resource allocation for schools in Australia down to the issue of vouchers is unproductive, since the debate in Australia has gone beyond vouchers;
> * various Australian models, such as the Weighted Student Index of the Schools of the Future, are a sophisticated form of vouchers (that consider many forms of student disadvantage) that take us beyond the level of controversy that the simplistic view of voucher-education created.

There is evidence emerging that the level of financial support for schools is dropping, perhaps dramatically, over time. Perhaps the best example of the impact of cutting resources on education might be in Victoria. Whereas, on average across Australia, government expenditure on schools increased by around 2.5% (from $4265 to $4784 per pupil) from 1992-3 to 1994-5, Victoria suffered a decline of about 12% (from $5070 to $4434 per pupil). Up to 50% (with an average of around 30%) of the non-teaching staff budget required to run school programs is being raised locally (Townsend, 1996b).

Since additional government support for students identified as economically disadvantaged makes up less than 10% of the average cost of funding a student, moving more of the responsibility for funding the educational program to the school level creates more problems for some schools than for others. The school funding crisis has resulted in pressure to pay school fees being placed on parents and children who are operating at family incomes below or near the poverty line. The Brotherhood of St Laurence recently undertook a series of interviews with 20 families who are within this category. Stories of intimidation of both children and parents emerge, which indicate a system under stress:

> My daughter does swimming. It's about $85 for swimming and I felt it unnecessary because my daughter can swim quite well. There's no problem, and so I chose not to send her swimming. She failed P.E. because she did not attend.
>
> In the class they stood her up in the front of the students and said 'this one here has not paid' and it was only one year that we didn't pay.
>
> (Brotherhood of Saint Laurence, 1996: 6-8)

The evidence suggests that some schools have demonstrated increasing capability when it comes to raising funds under the *Schools of the Future* program. This might be an

indication that the system is working. However, the balance of evidence suggests that the vast majority of schools are struggling to raise sufficient funds to compensate for the decrease in government funding. Local fundraising is no longer for 'extras', but is now being used on curriculum and other programs central to the schools' operations.

Two outcomes are possible. Either some schools will become much poorer than others, struggle to attract quality staff and will only be able to offer a limited range of options to children, thus condemning those children to less employment and further education options in the future, or they will go out of existence altogether, as people vote with their feet and go elsewhere. If government subsidies only provide minimal staffing for minimal programs, then local fundraising must pay for the rest. Rich schools will become more attractive, offer a range of programs, be able to attract better staff thus encouraging further students, making them even richer and more attractive, and so on. There could well be two classes of government schools, the rich and the poor. This would be in effect a privatisation of the system where children would get the level of education their parents can afford.

A further difficulty for administrators in the future may be the need for them to either raise funds to keep the school afloat or to speak out against the cuts that have made it necessary. A difficulty for principals is that the contracts they sign contain incentive pay clauses which would be jeopardised by the latter action. Many principals may well now be feeling that the short term gains that were made when they were negotiating their contracts a couple of years ago have locked them into a situation they now see as 'lose-lose'. Administrators in the future have to identify where their allegiances lie. If it is to the local community, it could jeopardise their career. If it is to the government, it could jeopardise the careers of all of their students. Not an easy choice to make.

Decentralisation and an effective education

Peterson, McCarthey and Elmore (1996: 120) argued: 'At the center of debate on school reform is the idea that, by changing ways in which schools are organized, educators can change how teachers teach and increase the opportunities for student learning.' Yet, at this stage, there is only limited evidence, anywhere in the world, confirming that restructuring, in itself, makes any difference to the academic performance of students. Caldwell (1996), tried to explain the connection between school self-management and school effectiveness:

> ...when we do look at schools that have improved, or if we do look at schools that are so-called effective schools, we've seen that in all cases, people have taken the initiative to make decisions for themselves, to solve their own problems, to set their own priorities, They've usually been schools that have been able to select their own staff in

some way. So the characteristics of improving schools one can find in a system of self-managing schools. But the key thing... that then by giving all schools the capacity of self-management to expect an improvement in student learning, we haven't had any evidence that's consistent, that that, by itself, is sufficient to lead to school improvement.

Such evidence that is supportive suggests that there has to be a strong sense of community for it to happen. Newman and Wehlage (1995: 3) argue:

> The most successful schools were those that used restructuring tools to help them function as professional communities. That is, they found a way to channel staff and student efforts toward a clear, commonly shared purpose for student learning, they created opportunities for teachers to collaborate and help one another achieve the purpose; and teachers in these schools took collective - not just individual - responsibility for student learning. Schools with strong professional communities were better able to offer authentic pedagogy and were more effective in promoting student achievement.

The Peterson, McCarthey and Elmore (1996) study, which analysed in detail the restructuring efforts of three American schools, led them to conclude:

> Our study reaffirms how extraordinarily complex and demanding the work of teaching is. It also reveals how teachers' practice is situated within the day-to-day demands and needs of particular children in a particular class dealing with particular curricular issues. These particularities make it apparent that neither reformers' restructuring attempts nor their sweeping directives to 'teach for understanding' go nearly far enough for the teacher who is confronted with figuring out what these directives mean for teaching writing in an actual classroom to a real group of second-grade children of diverse backgrounds, abilities, and understandings.
>
> (Peterson, McCarthey and Elmore, 1996: 150-151)

They confirmed, as does Townsend (1994) the critical role of teachers in developing a quality program and the effective delivery of that program. A series of hypotheses were developed:

- Teaching and learning occur mainly as a function of the teachers' beliefs, understandings and behaviors in the context of specific problems in the classroom.
- Changing practice is primarily a problem of learning, not a problem of organization. Teachers who see themselves as learners work continuously to develop new understandings and improve their practices.
- School structures can provide opportunities for the learning of new teaching practices and new strategies for student learning, but structures, by themselves, do not cause the learning to occur.
- Successful relations occur among school structure, teaching practice, and student learning in schools where, because of recruitment and socialization, teachers share a common point of view about their purpose and principles of good practice. School structure follows from good practice, not vice-versa.

(Peterson, McCarthey and Elmore, 1996: 147-149)

What both the Peterson *et al.* (1996) and the Newman and Wehlage (1995) studies confirm, is that successful restructuring efforts will only occur if teachers are fully behind them.

There is evidence to suggest that the restructuring activity may in fact detract from performance as teachers spend less of their time on teaching activities and more of their time on administration and other things. The increased workload for classroom teachers, in the areas of school decision-making, charter development and external accountability may diminish emphasis on 'structured teaching' and 'effective learning time' which have been shown by Scheerens (1992) to be the school level factors most closely linked to increasing student outcomes. Classroom characteristics such as 'opportunity to learn', 'pressure to achieve', and 'high expectations', rely to a large extent on the commitment of the teacher, rather than the management system in operation. Teachers suffering from the negative impacts of increased workloads and stress are less likely to be able to deliver those facets of school operations that bring about improved student outcomes. Whitty (1994:13) concluded 'that in the particular circumstances of contemporary Britain some of the positive educational benefits claimed [for school self-management]...have yet to be forthcoming and that, far from breaking the links between educational and social inequality, they seem to intensify them'.

The major concern, from an administrator's viewpoint, is how to juggle these new responsibilities and still find time to be the educational leader of the school simultaneously. One of the things that has been found, and this is typical of restructuring in other countries as well, is that the workload for administrators (and teachers too) has risen greatly, and if the evidence of some of the older systems of self-management (New Zealand and the UK) is any indication, these higher levels of involvement don't seem to drop back once the system has been established. Caldwell (1997), Townsend (1996b) and the Cooperative Research Project (Thomas, 1996) all identify the levels of concern brought about by increasing workloads of those in schools.

Not only are workloads an issue, but the relationships between principals and staff seem to deteriorate as other pressures emerge. Halpin *et al* (1993) suggest the process of running a self-managing school can result in an increase in the distance between the teachers and the headteacher. The impact of resources, both raising and allocating them, is one of these pressures. Sinclair *et al* (1993) report that in England and Wales 'headteachers are no longer partners in the process of educating pupils - they become allocators of resources within the school, managers who are driven to ensure that the activities of employees are appropriate to the needs of the business, and givers of rewards to those whose

contribution to the business is most highly regarded.' Davies (1992: 4), an English headteacher, writes:

> I cannot believe that hundreds of headteachers, whose professional and job satisfaction has come through working with teachers and children so they can walk along the road towards empowerment and liberty, can so quickly swap all of this for the keyboard, spreadsheet and bank balance...We seem to have entered a new era of managerialism without ever being clear what it is that we are managing.

One of the main tasks of the system in the next decade will be to provide principals with the skills and commitment to build a leadership team. It is not possible for one person to take on all the responsibilities now demanded, but some administrators have not yet learned how to delegate. It would seem that without this development there could be high incidences of illness and early retirements as administrators burn out. In almost all studies conducted in the United Kingdom (Campbell & Neill, 1994; Rafferty, 1994a) and New Zealand (Wylie, 1994; Bridges, 1992; Livingstone, 1994) and Australia (Thomas, 1996; Townsend, 1996b), the implementation of the self-managing concept has increased the workloads of people at the school. This has been accompanied by reports of 'no overall improvement in standards but teachers have been driven to burnout' and evidence of 'a steep rise in the numbers of heads and deputies retiring' (Rafferty, 1994b).

The impact of technological change

It was interesting at the 1996 AERA to hear Andy Hargreaves indicate that he (along with Seymour Sarason and Joe Murphy) was one of the few people remaining who still write all their work by hand. It seemed rather strange to me that three of the most critical thinkers in the area of educational change had refused to embrace perhaps the major factor related to that change, technology. I guess it is because one of the problems with technological change is that its timeline is no longer compatible with that of education. Once, because technological change took place over decades rather than days, education was able to incorporate it into the teaching framework. The change from blackboards with chalk to whiteboards with erasable writers did not take place overnight, and it didn't really matter because the framework of teaching largely stayed the same. In addition to this, teachers and teaching methods were notoriously traditional in outlook. New-fangled things like overhead projectors were purchased because they were new and interesting, but were then left to gather dust in cupboards because it was just as easy to write on the board. The argument that a surgeon of the 1890s would be lost in a modern hospital but a teacher of the 1890s would fit right in to a modern classroom has been used before, but perhaps until the last few years, the analogy was fairly accurate. However, the advent and subsequent development of computer technology has changed all of that.

Technological change today is geared to commerce. If a business does not immediately adopt any new technology that emerges it may fall behind its competitors, so the speed of introducing new equipment, new techniques and new ways of looking at the world continues to accelerate. The number of people connected to the internet has doubled or trebled each year since it became available to the public. However schools and teachers, generally speaking, have not kept pace. The first reason is financial, since all schools do not have the funds to provide access to computers and time on the Internet. Governments in various parts of Australia have intentions to have at least one computer for every four school students by the year 2000. However, they are much less informative about where the money will come from. The Victorian government recently announced a scheme of support that provided one government dollar for every three raised by the school. The South Australian government has budgeted for about a third of the likely cost. It is obvious that parents are expected to raise the rest.

We have now reached a point where students from a particular school that has no computing facilities will be absolutely disadvantaged against students from a school that has, when it comes to seeking future employment. We have reached a stage where all students, no matter what their future aspirations might be, must have some levels of skill with computing. We now have to develop a strategy that will enable it to happen.

Another difficulty for schools and school funding is the amount of professional development required just to keep up with the technological changes occurring. In the past decade, there have been limited numbers of computers in schools and even fewer teachers who knew what to do with them. Now there is great pressure to use computers as an educational tool, which means that every teacher must have an understanding of how to use them as a central component of learning, so they are not simply used as a 'filler' by classroom teachers. Given the changes in software in particular, it could be estimated that at least the equivalent cost of the computer, in time terms if nothing else, would be required to train the person who uses it, and this cost is one that is ongoing.

If administrators decide that this money is to come out of already tight budgets, it may well be that some things have to go. One response seems to be a narrowing of the curriculum being supported. This will mean that subjects like art, music, physical education and so on, which are already under stress, may have to give way so that 'basic skills' can be reinforced. Instead of buying art equipment, sports equipment and musical instruments, many schools are pushing their resources into the technology areas, leaving parents who want their child to have these 'peripheral' learnings to pay for it themselves. If all aspects of the curriculum are considered to be important in the school, then it might be that some teachers may have to be retrenched for the funds to be raised. This is a big change in the way in which education has been run in Australia and many parents neither

want, nor can afford, the changes. It could be argued that we now have a situation where subjects being given priority in schools are those mandated, tested or can attract additional funding to the school (Townsend, 1996b). In the long term this narrowing of the curriculum offered by the school may diminish society as a whole.

A critical role of the administrator of the future will be to balance the need to ensure that students are competitive, in the sense that students in their school have had access to the same level of skill development that students in other schools have had, with the need to promote a program that enables students a range of options when they leave school. A role that is becoming increasingly important for administrators is accessing sufficient resources, from all different types of sources, to enable both needs to be addressed.

Where does the future lie?

Finally, I wish to make some comments on the current paradigm of the school as a place where young people learn to live in the real world. The metaphor proposed by Carr best describes the need for change:

> Many schools are like little islands set apart from the mainland of life by a deep moat of convention and tradition. Across the moat there is a drawbridge, which is lowered at certain periods during the day in order that the part-time inhabitants may cross over to the island in the morning and go back to the mainland at night. Why do these young people go out to the island? They go there in order to learn how to live on the mainland.
>
> (Carr, 1942:34)

If we didn't have schools today and we wanted to develop a place that would satisfy the educational needs of a modern, developed, technological society, what would it look like? Not surprisingly, all of the issues discussed above seem to be linked, because to talk about a single issue such as privatisation automatically refers one to the issue of funding. To consider the proper implementation of new technologies leads us to ask 'What will the future be like?'

It was interesting that in only one of the sessions that I attended at the 1996 AERA did anyone (Judith Chapman) contemplate the notion that the structure of the school in the future might be completely different to what it is today. It concerned me to think that most of the forward thinkers in the world felt that school would still be much the same, probably because I feel that it has to be different if it is to survive. There are a couple of reasons for saying this. The first reason is that the march of technology is unstoppable and if educators don't deal with it, technology will deal with them. It is appropriate to

remember that the Apple computer was first developed exactly 20 years ago this year. Its total accessible memory was 16 kilobytes. By the time a program was loaded into the computer it could retain approximately 2 pages of text. By 1983, the computer had developed sufficiently for Jack Minzey and I to write in *Core Plus Education: A Model for Schools of the Future*:

> Imagine for a moment the possibilities. An interactive television system has access to computer facilities that store in their memory banks educational information. Instead of reading about volcanoes or hearing about them from the teacher, a child can program his computer and see a volcano at work. Through the interactive system, he can ask the computer any question he wishes about volcanoes. Imaginative programs could maintain the child's interest and provide a one-to-one learning experience for up to thirty or more children. Lessons may be for two or three hours a day broken down into short sessions that account for the child's age, intelligence and attention span. Social interaction can take place at a designated time during the day under the supervision of parents or paid leisure workers. If we look at the supervision situation at schools during recesses, then there would probably only be the need for one supervisor for every two hundred children. A terminal placed in the child's house also does not work set hours. A program may be called at 6:00 a.m. or 7:00 p.m. and consequently could align itself far more easily to the motivational aspects of learning. It is thus possible to replace some of the teaching responsibilities of a teacher with a machine that is capable of providing information faster, and perhaps more accurately, than a teacher can and to replace the supervisory functions of a teacher with a specially trained supervisor who is capable of handling more children at once than a teacher is paid to do.
>
> (Minzey & Townsend, 1983: 10)

Now, my CD-ROM can provide me with all of the information we suggested above at any time of the night or day. The computer that I am now writing on (certainly not top of the range) has a gigabyte of memory on its hard disk (65,000 times the memory of the apple of just 20 years ago), can access 25 megabytes of memory at any one time and is able to access instantly millions of computer sites all around the world through internet. Where will we be in another twenty years and how are we preparing ourselves, and our children for when we get there? It appears that technology has its own version of Zeno's Paradox (the Greek philosopher that suggested if you kept taking half of a pile of sand you would never actually have no sand left). Technological change has increased rapidly, as was pointed out by Alvin Toffler in *Future Shock*, and it continues to speed up. We think that it must slow down sometime soon, but it never does. We might be getting closer and closer to the limits of human ingenuity but we are not there yet, and possibly will never be.

Given the concerns discussed above, the major issue for school administrators over the next few years is to focus on school as it is currently structured and to make some predictions about where it might be heading, but to do it on the basis of evidence, not emotion. The evidence suggests that technology will continue to change, that government funding will continue to be a problem, that the social and employment needs of students

will also continue to change. We may need to consider different ways of staffing the school, with low teacher-pupil ratios for the early grades to ensure all students have adequate skills to promote self-learning, and perhaps larger groups at later levels to incorporate computer based learning supplemented by group discussions and social interactions.

The recent restructuring of education in many parts of the world with moves towards more local decision-making at the school site could well be considered to be the first major shift in the way in which education has been administered since it became compulsory in most Westernised societies in the 1860s and 1870s (about four generations ago). Of course we only need to look at the course of history to see what massive and rapid developments education might be facing in the future. It took flight and communication about four generations for the leap from human ingenuity to power, from the first balloon flight and the wire telegraph of the 1790s to Kittyhawk and the wireless telegraph service of the early 1900s. The subsequent three generations to the present have seen massive moves forward in both areas. We have moved from man's first powered flight to the threshold of interplanetary travel and have moved from the tappings of the telegraph wire service to instantaneous communication anywhere in the world in many different forms, telephone, television, electronic data and finance. We could argue that the concerns expressed by Coleman (USA), Plowden (UK) and Karmel (Australia) led to the current restructuring efforts, the first major change in education since the 1870s. It is likely that similar rapidity of change to those indicated above might now be expected in education. To conclude the surfer on a wave analogy I started earlier: 'The only thing we can say for sure is that whatever happens with the current wave, another one will be along soon' (Townsend, 1997a: 13).

We need to deal with the possibility, that somewhere in the future, that we will have virtual classrooms, with students plugging their helmet and gloves into their computer at home to become virtually surrounded by their classmates and the teacher. Or we could have students walking out their front door onto the Steppes of Africa or the ice of Antarctica. Such developments are no more or less feasible than the internet would have been to the scientists of the 1940s who would walk for five minutes to get from one end of their computer to the other.

Some other changes that might be predicted, particularly if we see a future where schools are something like they are now, could include extending the range of the school's activities. Staples (1989) argued that schools of the present were 20/20 schools, catering for just 20% of the population and being open for about 20% of the year. He argued for 100/100 schools which would see schools, in the first instance extending the school hours from the current less than 20% of the year to something over 50% and developing a school clientele from the current 20% of the population to the whole population. The

document *Education 2010*, commissioned by the Victorian Association of State Secondary Principals, talks about Learning Centres, Knowledge Navigators and Mentors. The interesting part of this vision is that pre-school children now will complete their education in such an institution.

It does not seem cost effective to have a publicly owned building, with a range of facilities that might be used by all members of the community, shut for the majority of each day and on more than a third of the days in a year. Promoting a range of inexpensive, relevant programs to community members outside of school hours seems one way in which the school might increase its base of community support, provide a much more cost-effective use of public plant and funding and perhaps raise some additional funds that might extend the range of school programs. If society is going to continue to change, even at its current rate, the need for re-training, of youth and of those much older, and the need for local support services (health, welfare, safety) will continue to escalate. Rather than having these services spread all over town, schools could be redesigned to incorporate them so they would be readily available to all families.

Some research that I am currently working on (Townsend, 1997b) suggests that schools are reaching out to their communities already. More than 80% of government secondary schools have a range of programs to extend their students' horizons, including through work experience, school-industry links, excursions and visiting speakers and more than 60% have dual recognition programs and various forms of parent and community involvement activities. Many provide parent education, personal development and recreation programs for the community. Even primary schools provide work experience and other types of involvement programs. Almost 50% of schools have community interaction as a school goal. Most principals (52%) agree that community involvement has increased over the last five years and 73% would like to see it increase even further. However, time and resources are seen as the major barriers to improving this involvement even further.

School administrators have to face up to a massive change in the way in which things are going to occur. In many cases people are reactive to decisions being made by others and coping as best they can with change as, and when, it occurs. The real difficulty for Australian educational administrators, and I suspect administrators in other parts of the world as well, is to become pro-active, to take a peek into the future and to say this is where we need to be in twenty years time and this is how we can best get there. The difficulty they have is that the speed of change in education is now approaching the speed of change in everything else, and we haven't yet provided our administrators with all the skills they need to deal with it.

References

Australian Schools Lobby (1996) *Current Issues in School Policy, (1)*, 1.

Booi, L. (1992) The emperor's new clothes and the myth of decentralization, *The Bell, Book and Candor*, 12(2), pp. 1-4.

Boyle, R. (1997) 'A letter to the Editor', *The Age*, 20th May, 1997, A10.

Bridges, S. (1992) *Working in Tomorrow's Schools: Effects on Primary Teachers* (Canterbury, New Zealand: University of Canterbury).

Brotherhood of Saint Laurence (1996) What is happening to 'free' public education? Low income families experiences of primary and secondary education. *Changing Pressures Bulletin, No 3*, (Melbourne: Brotherhood of St Laurence) [photocopy]

Caldwell, B. (1993) *Decentralising the Management of Australia's Schools* (Melbourne: National Industry Education Foundation).

Caldwell, B. (1996) 'The Victorian State School System', part of a radio interview with Jane Figgis on *Education Report,* Radio National, 27 March.

Caldwell, B. (1997) 'The *Schools of the Future* program in Victoria: The Principal Perspective.' A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, Chicago, IL, March.

Campbell, J. & Neill, S. (1994) *Curriculum at Key Stage 1: Teacher commitment and policy failure* (London: Longman).

Carr, W.G. (1942) *Community Life in a Democracy*, (Washington, D.C.: National Congress of Parents and Teachers).

Chapman, J. & Aspin, D. (1997) 'Autonomy and Mutuality: quality education and self-managing schools' in Townsend, T. (ed) *Restructuring and Quality: Issues for Tomorrow's Schools* (London and New York: Routledge), 61-80.

Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfield, F. & York, R. (1966) *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Govt Printing Office).

Cuttance, P. (1997) 'Quality assurance for schools: case study - New South Wales' in Townsend, T. (ed) *Restructuring and Quality: Issues for Tomorrow's Schools* (London and New York: Routledge), 100-114.

Davies, M. (1992) The little boy said...the Emperor still isn't wearing any clothes, *The Curriculum Journal*, 3 (1), pp. 3-9.

DOE, Queensland (1996) *Partners for Excellence: The Strategic Plan 1997-2001 for the Department of Education*, (Brisbane: Department of Education, Queensland).

DSE, Victoria (1993) *School Charters Information Package for Consultation and Promotion.* (Melbourne: Directorate of School Education).

Gardner, J.W. (1961) *Excellence,* (New York: Harper &Row).

Griswold, P., Cotton, K. & Hansen, J. (1986) *Effective Compensatory Education Source Book, Vol 1: A Review of Effective Educational Practices* (Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Education Laboratory).

Guthrie, J. (1986) School-Based Management: The Next Needed Education Reform, *Phi Delta Kappan,* 68 (4), pp. 305-309.

Halpin, D., Power, S. & Fitz, J. (1993) Opting out of state control? Headteachers and the paradoxes of grant-maintained status, *International Studies in the Sociology of Education*, 3(1), pp. 3-23.

Harris, K. (1993) Power to the people? Local management of schools, *Education Links*, 45, pp. 4-8.

Heinrichs, P (1997) 'School of the Future dogged by the past' in *The Age* 17, May, 1997, p A21.

Henderson, A. T. (1987) *The Evidence Continues to Grow: Parent Involvement Improves School Achievement. An Annotated Bibliography* (Columbia, Maryland: National Committee for Citizens in Education).

Henderson, A. T. & Marburger, C. L. (1986) *Beyond the Bake Sale: An Educator's Guide to Working with Parents* (Columbia, Maryland: National Committee for Citizens in Education).

Henderson, A. T. & Lezotte, L. (1988) School-Based Improvement and Effective Schools: A Perfect Match, *Community Education Today*, 15(3), pp. 4-5.

Henry, T (1996) 'Are school tax vouchers worthwhile?' *USA Today* April 11, 1.

Karmel, P. (1973) *Schools in Australia: Report of the Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission*, (Canberra, A.C.T.: Australian Government Publishing Servic)e.

Livingstone, I. (1994) *The workloads of primary school teachers - A Wellington region survey*. (Wellington: Chartwell Consultants)

McGaw, B., Piper, K., Banks, D. & Evans, B. (1992) *Making Schools More Effective*, (Hawthorn: Australia, ACER).

Minzey, J. D. & Townsend, T. (1983) *Core Plus Education: A Role for School of the Future* (Ypsilanti, Michigan: Eastern Michigan University).

Newman, F. & Wehlage, G.(1995) *Successful school restucturing: A report to the public and educators by the Center on Organisational Restructuring of Schools*, (Madison, Wisc.: Wisconsin Center for Educational Research).

Peterson, P., McCarthey, S. & Elmore, R. 'Learning from restructuring.' *American Educational Research Journal, (33)* 1, 119-153

Plowden Report, (1967) *Children and Their Primary Schools*, (London: HMSO).

Rafferty, F. (1994a) Alarm at growth of 60-hour week, *Times Educational Supplement*, 5 August, p. 1.

Rafferty, F. (1994b) Many more heads leave jobs, *Times Educational Supplement*, 2 September, p. 9.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989) *Teachers Workplace: The Social Organization of Schools* (New York: Longman).

Scheerens, J. (1992) *Effective Schooling: Research, theory and practice* (London: Cassell).

Sinclair, J. Ironside, M. and Seifert, R. (1993) Classroom struggle? Market oriented education reforms and the impact on teachers' professional autonomy, labour intensification and resistance. A paper presented to the International Labour Process Conference, Keele University, Staffordshire, April.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

UD032171

Title: Quality, Equity and Effectiveness: Critical Issues for Tomorrow's Schools

Author(s): TONY TOWNSEND

Corporate Source: MONASH UNIVERSITY

Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2 documents

☒ Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

☐ Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: A C Townsend

Printed Name/Position/Title: ASS PROF TONY TOWNSEND

Organization/Address:
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
MONASH UNIVERSITY
PO BOX 527 FRANKSTON VICTORIA 3199
AUSTRALIA

Telephone: 61-3-99044230

FAX: 61-3-99044237

E-Mail Address: tony.townsend@education.monash.edu.au

Date: 20/2/98

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Box 40, Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to: