



English Schools in Transition: Building Collaborative Leadership

**REPORT TO THE MINISTER
OF EDUCATION**

DECEMBER 2000

Québec 

ADVISORY BOARD ON
ENGLISH EDUCATION

ENGLISH SCHOOLS IN TRANSITION:
BUILDING COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP

REPORT TO THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION

DECEMBER 2000

ADVISORY BOARD ON ENGLISH EDUCATION 1999-2000

Chair	Gretta Chambers
Members	Lynden Bechervaise Lynn Butler-Kisber Heidi Coleman Neville Gurudata Irene Konecny Mary Liistro-Hébert Dominic Martini Dennis McCullough Michael Palumbo Frank Pettinicchio Donald Reid Thomas A. Reisner Brian Rock Patrick Ryan Johanne Smith Joan K. Wasserman
Ex Officio	Elaine Freeland
Secretary	Jim Cullen
Secretarial Support Services	Mireille Laroche
Research	Lauren Small

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD: SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND CURRICULUM REFORM: A STRATEGIC POSITION (EXTRACT)	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1	
THE CONTEXT	3
CHAPTER 2	
THE SITUATION OF ENGLISH SCHOOLS	5
CHAPTER 3	
GOAL SETTING FOR ENGLISH SCHOOLS	7
CHAPTER 4	
COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP	9
• THE NEW DIVISION OF POWERS: PRINCIPALS AND CENTRE DIRECTORS, TEACHERS, GOVERNING BOARDS, SCHOOL BOARDS: NEW ROLE, THE MINISTRY	9
• CHANGING THE CULTURE OF TEACHING AND LEARNING	19
• VOICES FROM ENGLISH ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	20
CHAPTER 5	
ACCOUNTABILITY BASED ON COLLABORATIVE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP ...	23
CONCLUSION	25
APPENDICES:	
A. Profile of Personnel in English Schools	27
B. Recommendations of the Advisory Board on English Education Report 2000: English Schools in Transition: Building Collaborative Leadership	28
C. Individuals Consulted by the Advisory Board on English Education 1999-2000	30
D. Bibliography	31
E. Websites to be Consulted	33

FOREWORD

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND CURRICULUM REFORM: A STRATEGIC POSITION¹

Nicole Tardif

Université de Sherbrooke

The curriculum reform poses a dual challenge for school administrators, i.e. that of concurrently implementing a new management model and the new curriculum.

Toward a New Management Model

In the winter of 1997, the Minister of Education launched a plan of action, *A New Direction for Success*. One of the lines of action announced in this plan involved decentralizing powers. Schools and their governing boards were thus placed at the very heart of school decision-making. The Conseil supérieur de l'éducation had made a recommendation along these lines in its 1990-1991 annual report. The Conseil had suggested that the division of powers between local and central authorities be reviewed and that the regulatory framework be streamlined, especially as regards basic school regulations, budgetary rules and working conditions. This recommendation was consistent with the trends observed in several European countries. The Commission for the Estates General on Education had drawn similar conclusions by the end of its public consultation. In its final report, *The State of Education in Québec*, it lamented that the education system was highly centralized and that such centralization had negative effects on the involvement of players at all levels of the system.

A Concern for Balance in the Division of Powers

The School

The concern that there be balance in the division of powers is rooted in the clearly stated consensus that decisions should be made as

close as possible to the front lines, i.e. at the school level, and reflected in the sharing of powers and responsibilities between the governing board, the school principal and school personnel. Thus, the school principal is now responsible for implementing the curriculum reform in the school. This responsibility includes ensuring compliance with the basic school regulation and phasing in the Québec Education Program.

The School Board

The school boards have been maintained as the intermediate level of authority. It was decided that they should continue to have the power to levy taxes and that their representatives should continue to be elected by universal suffrage. The functions of school boards have also been maintained. These include planning, monitoring, evaluating, rendering accounts and supporting schools. These functions were, however, adjusted in light of the new powers granted to schools. For example, school boards must allocate resources among their schools in an equitable manner and in consideration of the needs expressed by the institutions. School boards must also make public the principles governing their allocation of financial resources.

The Government

The Government is responsible for the general orientations of the education system, public funding, resource allocation, the basic school

1. Source: *Le Point en administration scolaire* (Volume 2, no. 1, Automne 99, p. 9) is a periodical developed by the MEQ in collaboration with administrators in the elementary and secondary school system. Nicole Tardif, formerly an official in the programs department of the MEQ, is teaching at the University of Sherbrooke in the Faculty of Education.

regulations, budgetary rules, the negotiation of working conditions, programs of study, uniform examinations and the certification of studies. Overall regulation of the education system is the role of the political authority, which consists in taking a long-term view of the future, ensuring both the system's stability and its ability to reform itself, guaranteeing the coherence of the whole while setting priorities and, lastly, ensuring a genuine public debate on the economic and financial options involved. (International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, *Learning: The Treasure Within*, UNESCO: Paris, 1996, pp. 155-156. The Commission was chaired by Jacques Delors.)

Toward Collegial Management in Schools

The Conseil supérieur de l'éducation, in *La Gestion de l'éducation: nécessité d'un modèle*, suggested replacing a management model characterized by top-down control, centralized managerial powers over routine administration, the absence of critical reflection on the efficiency of actions, and the absence of outcomes-based evaluation, with a management model geared to the mission of the education system and the

strategic planning of activities based on concerted action. For school administrators, this new management model involves several major changes affecting, among other things:

- their vision of the school and their understanding of its orientations
- their management style
- the missions and mandates they assume
- the type of evaluation they carry out

It also requires that school administrators:

- play a more active, facilitating role within the school and community
- take account of the involvement and contribution of the personnel with whom they work
- provide visionary leadership
- build community within the school with a focus on the requirements inherent in the mission of the school and the attendant responsibilities
- promote and actively support innovation within the school
- manage the introduction and application of the curriculum reform

INTRODUCTION

The Advisory Board on English Education calls for collaborative leadership to secure the implementation of the new school-centred Education Act in the English sector.

The Education Act has placed considerable emphasis on collaborative leadership. The Ministère de l'Éducation is developing for Québec a new curriculum in response to the broad-based consensus that the culture of teaching and learning must change.

In this report, which contains 13 recommendations, the Board examines the situation of English schools and centres, recommending that each educational institution develop authentic links to its communities (chapters 1-3). Chapter four suggests English school boards align their goal setting with the Strategic Plan 2000-2003 of the Ministère de l'Éducation. This chapter makes ten recommendations on such matters as:

- developing school profiles
- planning and goal setting
- continuing education resources for English school administrators

- teacher and administrator education
- establishing and supporting Parent Participation Organizations
- capacity building in school board organizations

Chapter five highlights conditions that facilitate collaborative leadership in schools.

Chapter six discusses the implications of accountability in the context of collaborative educational leadership.

The report concludes with a call for collaborative and visionary leadership that begins with support for teachers and students.

The Advisory Board wants to express its appreciation to all those who took time to visit and dialogue on this important topic. The members of the Board are confident that teachers and students in our schools and centres are well served by leaders whose cooperative and visionary input we have had the opportunity to experience in drafting this report.

CHAPTER I

THE CONTEXT

Decentralization of school management and mission; Deconstruction of linear learning by discipline; Refashioning school structures to decompartmentalize and better integrate teaching and learning and to become more receptive to team-building, collaborative teaching and participatory management.

The provisions of the Education Act² and the time frame laid down for their implementation impose a rapid and radical rethinking of the management of elementary and secondary education in Québec. The boundaries³ of traditional levels of responsibility no longer pertain. The putting in place of a division of powers reflecting the new guidelines for a school-centred rather than a system-centred decision-making process calls for a profound change in the structural organization of the delivery of education to go along with the curricular reform that stresses collaborative learning, flexible time tables and cross-curricular teaching rather than the rigid demarcation of disciplines.⁴

The school is to become the locus of responsibility for what is taught and learned on its premises. The guiding force and ultimate authority for the elaboration and carrying out of each school's or each centre's educational authority rests with its Governing Board. "The Governing Board shall adopt, oversee the implementation of and evaluate the school's educational project."⁵ The functions and powers of the board are exercised in collaboration with students, parents, the principal or centre director, teachers and other school staff members and community representatives. The interaction and power sharing suggested by such a structure in order to function effectively and productively require enlightened leadership with superior skills in

consensus building. The preoccupations of the disparate constituencies now responsible for the mission of each school community may differ in accordance with their respective perspectives and interests. The learning process for all involved will vary from school to school and from centre to centre.

Perhaps the most important dimension of each school's educational project is a new approach to teaching and learning that calls for learner-centred classrooms and teacher-centred schools.⁶ The required shift from an organizational model that is uniquely based on traditional scheduling and one-dimensional logic to a learning community open to reflection, change, growth, innovation and experimentation cannot be decreed. Parents, especially those on the Governing Board, have the responsibility to monitor the implementation and the results of the school project. It must be worked out through interaction, planning and cooperation among teachers, administrators and students. It means abandoning traditionally structured agendas for a team approach to agenda building⁷ whereby a school's action plan is developed along the lines of a common pedagogical philosophy. Connecting to such a change in a school's organizational culture is a challenge that can only be met by exceptionally perceptive leadership and the personal commitment of every member of the school community.⁸

2. *Education Act*. R.S.Q., Chapter 1-13.3

3. *Crossing Boundaries: Collaboration, Coordination and the Redefinition of Resources* by S. Sarason and E. Lorentz (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998).

4. Sergiovanni (1994b) *Organizations or Communities? Changing the Metaphor, Changes the Theory*.

5. *Education Act* S.74.

6. Linda Lambert, *Framing reform for the new Millenium. Leadership Capacity in Schools and Districts*. CJEAP 2000. <www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap>.

7. S. Sarason and E. Lorentz, *op. cit.*, "Epilogue: The Public Schools and the Private Sector."

8. See bibliography resources: Manning and Saddleire as well as Katzenback and Smith.

CHAPTER 2

THE SITUATION OF THE ENGLISH SCHOOLS

Urban schools; Rural schools; Small schools; Isolation; Pedagogical expectations of English-speaking parents; Making do with fewer community resources; Importance of community schools to the socio-linguistic balance of isolated English-speaking communities; The challenge of meeting the high expectations of parents for their children's success in advanced math and science with fewer options in English schools than can be offered in the French sector.

The new Education Act puts the responsibility on each school team and each centre team for providing the appropriate education package in a variety of demographic, socio-economic and geographic situations. It used to be taken for granted that local communities were not responsible for the system. Educational administration was system-packaged. It is now to be ordered according to an education project put together by the school or centre team to meet the needs and expectations of its own clientele. The new law is a framework to guide the move to student-centred teaching and learning. It does not of itself effect the required changes to structures and perspectives or provide the leadership that can bring them about. That leadership will depend in great part on the financial, human and community resources available to individual schools and centres.⁹

Many of Québec's English schools are small and isolated.¹⁰ Resources are spread thin and the distances between schools, often considerable. Learning and leadership are affected by these factors. But the expectations of parents does not necessarily shrink to fit the reduced circumstances of isolation. In certain 'mainland' areas of the province, educators take it upon themselves to help students in difficulty by keeping them longer in school in order to finish their secondary school diploma. In the French sector there are more options, especially in vocational

education. Parents in the English sector continue to insist that their children take the science and math courses that lead to post-secondary education, even in situations where there are not sufficient numbers of students in a particular school to warrant a high-level math or science teacher and in other cases when children are only marginally or not at all qualified to take these advanced courses. The challenge is to keep as many options open as possible to the greatest number of students.

The curriculum reform emphasis on turning schools into learning communities¹¹ calls for providing support for schools with limited local resources. In outlying areas, schools are community centres. The loss of the English school would have a devastating effect on communities already dealing with a delicate socio-linguistic balance.¹² There is great local resistance to the merging of schools over large territories in order to form schools with the critical mass of students needed to justify a full curriculum offering and the teaching resources to implement it. Even in situations where the changing of school boundaries represents a less dramatic communal loss and transportation burden, it is very unsettling for parents. Parents and students identify with 'their school' and often do not think they will be as well served by some other school. This proprietary attitude cannot but be strengthened by the autonomy granted

9. Fullan (Chapter 3 "The Complexity of the Change Process")

10. See table 4.2.13 in Appendix A for a profile of personnel in English schools in Québec.

11. See Bibliography resources: Lieberman as well as Sergiovanni, (1994a) *Building Community in Schools*, Chapter 9 "Becoming a Community Learners."

12. Berger, Marie-Josée, (1999), *Education Canada* 39(3), p. 28-31 "Enjeux de la responsabilisation en milieu éducatif minoritaire franco-ontarien."

each school by the Education Act. But as that new autonomy raises the required levels of human and pedagogical resources, ways must be found to both raise the generic profile of schools on the broader horizon and provide schools that are inevitably small and isolated with the means to implement an up-to-date educational project.

The English school is a mainstay of Education for English speakers in Québec. As clearly indicated in an article in Education Canada (Fall 1999), which focuses on the special role of the minority language school. "In keeping with the mandate of French-language schools, school boards must be responsible not only for the students' academic performance, but also for the development of their language and culture. Because of the special relationship between the

school and the minority community, this mandate and the accountability for achieving it must be incorporated into the activities of each school."¹³ For Québec English communities too, because of the special relationship between English-speaking communities and their schools, the mandate and accountability for responsive and effective leadership must be built into the mission of each school.¹⁴

The Advisory Board on English Education recommends:

*THAT the MEQ and the English school boards provide support for each English school as the school builds authentic links with its communities.*¹⁵

(Recommendation 1)

13. Berger, Marie-Josée, p. 30.

14. The Advisory Board on English Education December 1999 Report to the Minister of Education, *Culture and English Schools in Play* makes recommendations directed at helping the English-speaking community transmit its language and culture (72-5017A).

15. See the annual report of the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation (1991-1992), section 3.2.3 ... en lien avec une organisation communautaire (pp. 47-48)

CHAPTER 3

GOAL SETTING FOR ENGLISH SCHOOLS

Goal setting and accountability have been reallocated by the Education Act. At the local level schools have the goal of improving the competencies of the greatest number of students. At the system level, the Ministry and the school boards are encouraged to examine common orientations and provide resources to the schools.

The principal and the centre director are accountable to the Governing Board for carrying out the mission and project for which the Governing Board bears collective responsibility. The Governing Board in its turn is accountable to the community served by the school or centre it represents. It is the principal or centre director, however, not the Governing Board, who is accountable to the School Board in the person of its Director General and, through him or her, to the Ministry for the implementation of the school's pedagogical project, the teaching and learning of the substance of the curriculum reform mandated by law and enforced by the Ministry through the School Board.

Teachers are responsible individually and collectively for the building of the teams¹⁶ in which they must henceforth exercise their profession. They are responsible for student learning and for complying with the educational project of the school,¹⁷ but they answer to the principal and, through him or her, to the School Board and the Ministry. Teachers have a responsibility towards the children and their parents, but do not answer to them in the exercise of their professional duties.

• At the school level

The reform of the curriculum underscores the importance of human and technical resources in implementing the objective of helping students master subject content and transfer knowledge to everyday life. Schools need teach-

ing and technical resources to promote integrated learning based on a cross-curricular, competency-based approach.¹⁸

In elementary school there will be three two-year cycles with programs of study for each cycle. More formative learning and authentic performance assessment place the emphasis on encouraging student progress rather than the former emphasis on grade repetition. Teachers work as a team for each level rather than in individual grade classrooms. Emphasis is placed on language instruction, on reading, writing and math. Secondary I, II and III become Cycle Four during which students will follow the core courses with more time devoted to the teaching of French, second language, as well as history and citizenship education every year, a series of science and technology courses and the introduction of an optional third language. Cycle Five groups the old Secondary IV and V levels and aims at integrating core learning in language arts and mathematics, history and citizenship education, understanding the contemporary world and science. Students also have the option of choosing academic or vocational training or a combination of both. In practice the facilities of schools and centres are not organized to provide these options. Twenty-five per cent of all course time is to be used by students to catch up or devote themselves to enrichment activities developed locally by the school. Textbooks will be complemented by the Internet, CD-Roms, videos and other relevant materials. The Advisory Board looks forward to the work of the Educational

16. Katzenback and Smith.

17. *Education Act*, S.22

18. MEQ. *The Québec Education Program*. Preschool Education. Elementary Education, Approved Version (2000).

Resources Foundation sponsored by the English school boards. The mandate of this foundation, which was established in early 2000, is to manage teaching material development for the English school boards of Québec, as well as the copyrights resulting from the publication of such material. Every English school board in Québec is a corporation member and the board of directors is composed of one representative from every member board of the corporation. The foundation has created an Instructional Materials Centre.

• At the system level

At the system level the MEQ and the English school boards must assure that English education sets standards for all students, teachers and managers and that resources are equitably available across the province. In order to harmonize the effort of the MEQ and the school boards, the English services unit of the MEQ has already established a range of support mechanisms, including the Implementation Design Committee and the Curriculum Coalition. Since the MEQ has developed a Strategic Plan for the years 2000-2003, it is appropriate that the English school boards examine this Strategic Plan in the context on their own planning.

The MEQ Strategic Plan has five orientations:

- improve the educational achievement of students by encouraging them to learn as much as they can and to stay in school until they graduate;
- ensure that the programs of study are relevant to the realities of today's world and a changing labour market;
- provide individuals with qualifications in keeping with their aptitudes, with a view to helping them enter and stay in the labour force;
- improve the efficiency of the education system by focusing on results, accountability and transparency;
- improve the performance of universities as regards the quality of teaching, management efficiency and responsiveness to the needs of society.¹⁹

The Advisory Board on English Education recommends:

THAT in their planning and goal setting the Quebec English School Boards Association (QESBA), the Association of Directors General of English School Boards (ADGESB) and the Association of Administrators of English Schools of Québec (AAESQ) take into consideration the five orientations of the Strategic Plan of the Ministère de l'Éducation 2000-2003.

(Recommendation 2)

19. *Strategic Plan of the Ministère de l'Éducation 2000-2003 – Summary (July 2000)*. 49-1325A available on the MEQ website <www.meq.gouv.qc.ca>

CHAPTER 4

COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP

*Collaborative leadership; the Division of powers; **principals** and **centre directors** facilitating change; developing school profiles; school self-evaluation; planning and goal setting; continuing education resources; **teachers** and their learning time; team approach; **governing boards**, promote the establishment of Parent Participation Organizations; **school boards**; mission and mandate of organizations for which boards are responsible; **the Ministry**; policy framework on educational leadership; changing culture of teaching and learning; Voices from two English elementary schools.*

• The New Division of Powers

As the burden of proof of the effectiveness with which the new curriculum is being implemented now falls to the school, the structure of decision making has also devolved to the individual school community through Governing Boards made up of principals, teachers and parents.²⁰ It is they who will decide on what resource materials will be used to facilitate learning. It is they who have the responsibility of deciding on resource materials to keep the Governing Boards fully informed about the options available. The curriculum sets out what students should know and be able to do at various points along the way, but how they get there is the responsibility of a team of professional educators with the active participation of parents. The drawing up and carrying out of the mission of each school is to be a collaborative process which requires people skills beyond professional expertise and a personal commitment to the quality of education.²¹ Not only is team work now required among teachers teaching children in the classroom, but the thrust, objectives and even the form of a school's educational plan are to be arrived at by consensus among the three constituencies closest to the particular group of students in question; however, the three groups don't necessarily have to share each other's priorities. Principals, teachers, parents and community representatives, as well

as business partners in adult and vocational education, now share responsibility for the packaging and delivery of curriculum content.²²

PRINCIPALS AND CENTRE DIRECTORS

Principals and Centre Directors have increasingly played a defining leadership role in the management of the schools for which they are responsible. Leadership is still expected of them but the context in which it must now be exercised has changed in nature. Leadership in a context of consensus calls for a different approach than leadership which depends on a hierarchical relationship. The principals of today must be pedagogical leaders with sophisticated management skills in order to get the members of their school's Governing Boards to come up with common objectives and mechanisms for the successful implementation of an education project they have jointly adopted. Principals have the responsibility of turning the school's teaching staff into a collaborative team of interactive educators with a commitment to shared best teaching practices, integrated learning and student-centred classrooms. Principals need to understand the legal and regulatory context of Québec education, which has changed considerably in recent years. They must be managers of human relations,²³ as well as have skills in financial, material and facility management. Ideally, in

20. Fullan and Hargreaves.

21. Sheetz and Benson.

22. Sergiovanni (1994a), *Building Community in Schools*, Chapter 11, "The Challenge of Leadership."

23. Gouvernement du Québec, Ministère de l'Éducation. *Accommodating Religious and Cultural Diversity in the School*, Québec (1997) (75-0035A).

the past, a good principal was expected to emerge from the ranks of master teachers. He or she is still viewed as having a foundation in sound pedagogy and a firm grasp of a philosophy of education. But the new regime requires of them a much broader experience and expertise. They now have to master procedures and be adepts of strategic planning. As school managers, they are charged by the Education Act to carry out a wide range of responsibilities in collaboration with teachers, parents and the community, for which they need decision-making and conflict-resolution skills.

It is no wonder then, that under these new circumstances laden with increasingly complex responsibilities, principals have become hard to come by, particularly at the secondary level, where the implementation of the new curriculum will be much more difficult and complicated to put in place. Experienced, devoted teachers with the pedagogical stature and commitment to be principal material are loath to give up what they love, teaching, for an administrative burden that few have been trained to assume. A new and improved salary scale responding to the lengthy job description for a principal is helping at the elementary level. Vice-principals, however, are still underpaid and overworked and these entry level positions are hard to fill.

Principals are therefore very much left on their own to become what one school board commissioner told the Advisory Board was nothing short of "miracle workers." They are called upon to motivate staff, to build teams, to choose wisely in the hiring of new teachers, to make consensus a priority, to communicate effectively with parents, to develop a knowledge of the community and the school's place in it, to interact with complex family situations, to help children by networking with social agencies, to handle old buildings while keeping in focus the primary mission of the school, all with no department heads, few vice-principals, and few consultants or student services personnel.

Yolande Nantel, who coordinates a unique unit, the Secteur du développement des compétences at the Commission scolaire de Montréal, made a presentation to the Advisory Board in which she described the following characteristics of today's school leader:

Facilitating Change²⁴

(Extract – Yolande Nantel)

1. Provide Strong Pedagogical Leadership

Strong pedagogical leadership is necessary at all administrative levels, be it the school board, the school board division or the school, especially on the front lines with the school team. Leaders must be high-profile, visible. They must show their colours, stand by their pedagogical views and principles, and support their school team by developing a common project in which the team believes and a solid structure for participatory management.

2. Promote A Common Vision and A Common Will

- Define clear orientations
- Share these orientations with the school team members
- Establish strategies and priorities with the school team members

School leaders involve their human resources in the change process and help break down barriers so that all members of the school personnel become true partners in change.

3. Accept Turbulence and Chaos and Manage Doubt

School leaders allow time for change to take place and allow themselves and their personnel to doubt and to question.

24. Extract: La gestion du changement à la CSDM tout un défi, par Yolande Nantel, coordinator of the secteur du développement des compétences, CSDM, 1999-2000. (Presentation to the Advisory Board on English Education, 20-01-2000)

4. Facilitate the Emergence of Agents of Change

School leaders initiate reflective discussion in various groups and settings, and establish effective communication networks in order to ensure that information flows smoothly throughout the school, right down to the classroom.

5. Take Risks

School leaders try new approaches and concepts to create opportunities for team building and teamwork.

Above all, they are willing to change themselves, i.e. to give up old habits and ways of doing things.

In a recent study, the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation (CSE) examined the role of the secondary-school principal.²⁵ The Advisory Board supports the recommendations of the CSE report in particular the following recommendations:

- that the MEQ review administrative standards imposed on schools to improve administrative support, streamline procedures, providing management tools and competent administrative support staff;
- that School Boards support principals in the upgrading of their skills for pedagogical leadership;
- that principals and teachers support the development of team leadership in schools;
- that school administrative teams increase ties with the community and develop strong networks in the community.

The particular concerns of individual principals may vary according to the size, location, clientele and all around circumstances of their respec-

tive schools. Of particular general importance, however, is the issue of the quality of French instruction and the management of school reform at the secondary level where collective agreements are still based on disciplines but the curriculum and school governance now call for trans-disciplinary cooperation. The availability of guidance-oriented schools and the career options approach they offer help diversify the paths open to secondary-school students. The reform puts more emphasis on the need for a greater variety of options for students in the form of technical and vocational education, which principals are now charged with bringing to the table for discussion and action. In this regard, general education and vocational education need to work together. Principals are responsible for informing students and parents of all the options. The Basic Regulations now allow for young people to take courses in general and vocational education at the same time. The complexity of this new type of double streaming will have to be worked out and will require collaboration at all levels.

Principals are also faced with the fact that greater importance is being given to indicators and statistical profiles. The Ministère de l'Éducation is now making statistical profiles available to each school, along with the relevant socio-economic information. Based on the success plan²⁶ of the school, the Ministry will provide funding for school improvement activities. Principals must therefore become familiar with how to use such data and how to interpret the information in order to build into their respective school projects the kinds of activities that will generate the desired results.

The Ministère de l'Éducation developed Self-Assessment Instruments for Enhancing Success. These instruments have been helpful to school principals seeking to develop a profile of the perceptions of students, teachers, parents and administrators.²⁷

25. CSE, *The New Context and Challenges Facing Secondary School Administrators*. (1999) Summary available from the CSE website <www.cse.qc.ca>. Summary of CSE (1999), *Diriger une école secondaire: un nouveau contexte, de nouveaux défis*.

26. Education Act S.83 (Governing Board reports to community.)

27. MEQ, *Self-Assessment for Enhancing Educational Success in Secondary School* (28-2641-06A) and *Self-Assessment for Enhancing Educational Success in Elementary School* (82-0012A). The Partnership for School Improvement has been involved in promoting and supporting sustained, systematic approaches to continuous school improvement that enhance student learning and strengthen the school's capacity for managing change. The PSI produced *School Self-Assessment. Measuring What Matters*. A Starter Kit in 1999, in cooperation with several schools and school boards, supported by the Services à la communauté anglophone of the Ministère de l'Éducation and the Office of Research on Education Policy (OREP) of McGill University.

Prospective principals must show an aptitude to communicate with parents, teachers and the community, and a familiarity with information and communications technologies. They should have experience in areas not directly related to education. But, over and above the myriad new responsibilities they are expected to assume, principals must retain the confidence of teachers in the role of master teacher *inter pares*.

The Advisory Board on English Education recommends:

THAT, with a view to facilitating school improvement, the Ministère de l'Éducation and school boards support each English school in developing a school profile.
(Recommendation 3)

The Advisory Board on English Education recommends:

THAT each English school board monitor the progress of each school and ensure that schools have access to resources for fair and constructive self-evaluation.
(Recommendation 4)

The Advisory Board on English Education recommends:

THAT the English school boards and the principals of each English school in Québec align their planning and goal setting with the orientations of the MEQ to improve school success, and report the results to their communities.
(Recommendation 5)

The Advisory Board on English Education recommends:

THAT the Partnership for School Improvement²⁸ collaborate with the CSE and the École nationale d'administration publique (ENAP) to provide English school administrators with continuing education resources, for example:

- *the timely English translation of important CSE reports related to educational administration such as:*
 - *"Le rôle des Headmasters en Angleterre et les enseignements à en tirer dans un contexte de décentralisation,"* CSE Études et Recherches, by Hélène Pinard, April 1999.
 - *"Le renouvellement du curriculum: expérience américaine, suisse et québécoise,"* CSE, January 2000.
- *an on-line resource centre for school principals, modeled on the school-leaders' listserv developed by the Canadian Association of Principals and the 'Observatoire – Vigie' of ENAP.²⁹*
(Recommendation 6)

The Advisory Board on English Education recommends:

THAT the MEQ undertake negotiations with the management board of Le Point en administration scolaire to examine the feasibility of having Le Point en administration scolaire published in English and French simultaneously.
(Recommendation 7)

TEACHERS

The traditional view of teacher as an instructor, imparting knowledge to a classroom and guiding his or her students through the learning process is being sorely challenged. The latter day trends in teaching practices have led to greater emphasis on more collaboration among teachers and an intensified interactive approach to teaching and learning. With curriculum and school governance reform, the trend is being imposed as the norm. The principal's role is to promote the collaboration in teaching that is now required by the Education Act, while respecting and encouraging the strengths and approaches of each teacher. The building of common themes and projects across disciplines will

28. The following groups form the Partnership for School Improvement: The Faculty of Education, McGill University, Services à la communauté anglophone of the Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec, the Quebec Provincial Association of Teachers, the Association of Directors General of English Schools of Quebec, the Association of Administrators of English Schools of Quebec, the Quebec Association of Independent Schools.

29. *Vigie* is published five times a year by the Observatoire de l'administration publique, École nationale d'administration publique <www.enap.quebec.ca>. Canadian Association of Principals, School leader's listserv: www.schoolfile.com/cap.htm.

require time for teachers to work together, individual incentives for them to break down the classroom isolation in which they have traditionally exercised their profession, and a framework within which they can feel secure in the pooling of their resources and expertise in a team approach to the interdisciplinary requirements of integrated learning. Teachers have become the designated architects of the delivery of the new curriculum. In consequence, they will become major contributors to defining the overall school mission, its education project, the scheduling of classroom time, the choosing of teaching materials, the integrating of subject matter, the methods of evaluation, and the connecting of what is learned in the classroom to everyday life. In order to successfully accommodate the need for interaction among teachers, time must be made available and opportunities created to facilitate a productive collaboration that enhances rather than diminishes each teacher's contribution to the overall thrust of a school's teaching and learning process.³⁰

Teachers need learning time of their own and the leeway to affect structural changes that will allow them to collectively set the goals for animating the school project. Such a culture change in the methodology of the organization and packaging of curriculum content cannot be imposed, it must be worked out between teachers themselves and led from within the school. Leaders must gain trust and divest themselves of "traditional authority" in favour of "distributive leadership" in order to effectively facilitate rather than direct a consensual approach to team teaching and interdisciplinary learning. Principals, teachers and consultants, as well as board officers, all share leadership. The matter of trust comes at a certain risk to a teacher's professional security. Shared leadership evolves out of constructive dialogue, the recognition of best practices and a common concern that teaching and learning should be geared to making school intellectually and culturally relevant to students, particularly at the secondary level. Studies show that the high school drop-out rate is adversely affected by a student's disconnection with curriculum content and delivery. Elementary school

teachers are more advanced in the exercise of team teaching, evaluation and adapting curriculum content to the interests and abilities of their pupils.

The role of the unions is crucial in regard to the use of time. Local negotiations should be open to flexible use of pedagogical days and flexible scheduling. The school must be scheduled to encourage collegiality. The school project and mission proposed by the Governing Boards will influence the ways in which school teams use time and develop a collaborative approach to teaching and learning. The elements for working out these new procedures are outlined in the Education Act and the collective agreements. There needs to be a process in place in each school to manage differences of opinion regarding the local application of time use. The process leading to the current province-wide collective agreement was marked by moments of wider input and other moments in which political priorities dominated. Local arrangements will have to reflect a balance of special interest input and shared decision making as well as timely and politically sensitive decisions on the part of principals.

The fostering of curriculum ownership and control by teachers is more difficult to achieve in secondary school, which is rigidly compartmentalized by discipline. As students move through the system from elementary school, where they will have experienced a greater variety of classroom learning contexts, this cohort of students will have a positive impact on the movement towards comprehensive and collaborative approaches to the subject matter.

Practising teachers have not been trained in the culture of shared teaching agendas. They are going to be obliged to learn as they go and will need a great deal of support along the way. In future, teacher training will have to be tailored to the requirements of a generalist approach that emphasizes active learning, cross-curricular learning, critical thinking and cooperative learning.³¹ On the other hand, recruitment of math and science teachers remains difficult. Competition

30. Moller G. and Katzenmeyer M. (Chapter 1, "The Promise of Teacher Leadership.")

31. MEQ/FCPPQ, *Something to Talk About... The Quebec Curriculum Reform* (Borchure for Parents) 2000 (72-0097A).

for specialists in these subject areas is very strong, and there are fewer teachers available for teaching the options in the top grades of high school. Most people trained in the sciences and math do not want to take another four years to train for the classroom. And yet, even the best teaching practices cannot compensate for a lack of in-depth, solid grounding in these demanding subjects. In its round of consultations, it was suggested to the Advisory Board that the model used in vocational education should be examined with a view to promoting positive practicum experiences in general education. In some cases, vocational teachers-in-training are paid for their work as they do their practicum. Such arrangements are actually in place with the agreement of parity committees. Perhaps general education teachers should be offered the opportunity to apprentice in differing contexts such as: other schools, community institutions, universities, businesses and government, in order to promote collaborative teaching and boundary crossing.

Support for teachers entering the system is also an area in need of exploration. In their recent brief to the Minister of Education, the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation published *College-Level Teacher Training: A Joint Project Involving the WHOLE College Community* (2000).

As indicated in the summary of the report, teacher training and mentoring are given serious consideration. Among other things, it suggests that new teachers be assigned a lighter workload for a period of time to allow them to acquire adequate training, thus enabling them to provide a higher quality of teaching to their students. To support and provide training for these new staff members, the Conseil suggests that experienced teachers act as their mentors or associate teachers.³²

The new programs that call for a team approach could be helpful in introducing teachers to a school context. The English school system faces its own challenges in the recruitment and retention of teachers. A program of mentoring could have a beneficial effect on easing a

teacher's transition from a learning context to one of pedagogical responsibility. Maintaining the quality of English and French is another challenge of paramount importance in the English system. Seventy-five per cent of the English elementary schools polled by McGill University Faculty of Education about preschool teachers indicated that they wanted teachers who could teach in French.

The Advisory Board on English Education recommends:

THAT the MEQ give particular attention to the use of time and the exercise of shared leadership among teachers and administrators in the English sector while aligning the MEQ orientations document for teacher education and in-service with the soon-to-be published MEQ orientations document on principal education and in-service.

(Recommendation 8)

GOVERNING BOARDS

Governing Boards are the locus of what the Education Act defines as the increase in the power of parents over the education of their children. At the beginning of the school year, the parents elect parent representatives to serve a two-year mandate. The focus of Governing Boards is on the school project and student success. One of the Governing Board's primary tasks is to identify the issues on which its members want to work together. The power is not set aside for groups. It is exercised by the board as a collection of representatives from different groups who need training to work together. The approach to training governing boards should be consistent with the Education Act so that the training is most effective when carried out with all groups present rather than through consultations with their constituencies. Teachers of the school hold a meeting to elect their representatives in the same time frame as parents and according to the procedure set out in the collective agreement or, failing that, according to the procedure determined by the principal after consultation with the teachers.³³

32. The Education Act indicates teachers should collaborate in the training of future teachers and in the mentoring of newly qualified teachers (EA. 5.22.6.1).

33. EA. 5.48, the MEQ website has information on governing boards. <www.meq.gouv.qc.ca>.

Getting parents³⁴ to participate fully in the process is the responsibility of the school team. Parents of students are a large, disparate group who can benefit from the Parent Participation Organization (PPO). “The purpose of the (PPO) is to encourage the collaboration of parents in developing, implementing and periodically evaluating the school’s educational project and their own participation in fostering the child’s academic success.” (E.A. 96.2) This is a period of transition for parent representatives. The school premises and support services are made available for meetings. There has been less emphasis on the academic role of the PPO, which is more often encouraged to raise funds for school activities. The PPO needs support and encouragement to work on the school’s educational project.

Many parents do not yet view the new purpose and powers of Governing Boards as a major increase of power for parents. The reconfiguration of parent representation has resulted in a less efficient parent voice on some Boards where the number of parent representatives has actually diminished. As schools work out the roles of the various constituencies that make up the membership of their Governing Boards, parents are adjusting to their newly configured role. Shared vision is still a challenge for traditional parent representation. Some Governing Boards operate as mini-parliaments, based on votes; others strive to arrive at a consensus. The law encourages the Governing Board to work on the school project and the plan for the school year. Professionals must be strategic in presenting their education and management plans. The law has clearly established a framework in which planning, negotiation and argument precede decision making and action. The Advisory Board has been asked to point out that Governing Boards in vocational and adult centres need further study.

The Advisory Board on English Education recommends:

THAT the English schools promote the establishment of the Parent Participation Organization (PPO) and facilitate its role in developing, implementing and evaluating the school’s educational project.

(Recommendation 9)

The Advisory Board on English Education recommends:

THAT the MEQ clarify the structure and membership of the governing boards established for adult and vocational education centres.

(Recommendation 10)

SCHOOL BOARDS: NEW ROLE

With curricular and school reform, school boards have become the facilitators rather than the directors of the educational projects in their respective territorial jurisdictions. School boards remain crucial to each school’s stability and successful transition to its reform-oriented mission.

The massive change in the quality and nature of local responsibility requires guidance as well as support. The principal has become a key figure in the life of a school. School boards are responsible for the vetting and selection of principals. The importance of this responsibility cannot be exaggerated. The difficulties associated with the recruitment of principals—uncertainty about the level of job security and the arrangements to return to teaching if the assignment does not work out; the expertise and competence for dealing with schools in the midst of governance and curriculum changes—represent an enormous challenge for school board Directors General, particularly at the high-school level where there are fewer applicants. Examples of posted calls for principals are found on school board websites.³⁵

For most practising administrators, the management skills now required, other than in the field of education, are not sufficiently taught.

34. See QESN website <www.qesn.meq.gouv.qc.ca> for information on leadership in English schools.

35. Websites of all nine school boards are found in an appendix to this report.

Boards are having to provide some of this extra-curricular learning.

The Faculty of Education at McGill University has developed a 15-credit graduate certificate which can be accessed from off-campus locations. Courses in this program are taught by experienced educators and can become the basis of a masters degree.³⁶

Several boards offer regular professional development for principals. Local practicums such as ten days of shadowing administrators are made available to interested teachers. More and more young people are showing an interest in leadership courses. Promising administrators are being appointed with only five years experience in the system and are expected, with support, to learn on the job.

The fact that training and internship opportunities for prospective candidates from the teaching corps are few and far between preoccupies school board officials, as teachers should not be dropped or lured into the job of principal without adequate preparation. Formerly, the position of vice-principal was used for training. But vice-principalships are under paid for the work involved and find few willing takers. School boards cannot wait for a large pool of experienced candidates for principal posts who meet the new job description. The implementation of the curriculum reform has to take place while principals adapt to major changes. In the interim, the strong candidates for the job must possess the pedagogical qualifications and proven organizational expertise. Prospective principals must be prepared to take risks. School boards are examining ways to make senior officers responsible for the implementation of the reform. Such resources are an important support in complementing the skills and the drive of these emerging principal-leaders.

In the regions, principals are more isolated. The emphasis on team building and pedagogical supervision can be more stressful for rural and isolated schools. Candidates are recurrently needed in far away areas. Costly travel to Montréal generates a great need for distance

education support, especially for principals. The support must be applicable to the actual situation of the particular principal who cannot leave for an extended period of time. The Littoral and Eastern Shores School Boards, for instance, have head teachers who could be good candidates for the post of principal, but their training needs require some form of distance education. School board commitment and support should make such distance education available.

The relationship between school boards and schools is in transition and principals need the full support of their school boards when they take risks. It is up to the boards, therefore, to build networks of resources, to monitor the changes and to support their principals in practical ways as they lead their school communities through the reform process. The Internet is an effective tool for building on-line resources for principals. Creation of clusters could reduce the isolation of principals. School boards should ensure that principals meet regularly with one another and encourage peer coaching.

School board commissioners and officers meet regularly for workshops focusing on planning for the support of principals and schools in their own wards. For several school boards, especially the Eastern Shores School Board, the cost of meeting is very high due to the distances that must be covered. But commissioners need to understand the progress of the reform in order to shape school board policy and allocate resources appropriately. Principals are asked to tell the school board what services they need. One board has not hired a Deputy Director General with a view to empowering the principals to assume the role of instructional services director. There are risks in decentralizing instructional services. Board officials continue to play an important role in this regard. On the other hand, there is a need to separate out the different types of management support needed at the school level. For instance, the usefulness of appointing a school manager along with the principal to look after sectors such as links to social workers, counselling, career services and building management needs to be considered. Such proposals may require negotiating arrange-

36. McGill University website. <www.mcgill.ca>

ments in line with the Education Act and collective agreements. To facilitate the decentralization process, one school board has hired a business manager to help sort out and coordinate the managerial complexities at the level of school board administration with a view to being of assistance to principals as they take on their new responsibilities.

School boards and their super structure, the Québec English School Boards Association (QESBA), are responsible for getting the structural reforms up and running. One observation heard during the ABEE's consultations with educators and administrators closely involved in mapping the transition process was that success in meeting the challenge would be gauged by the speed and effectiveness with which school board administrators "worked themselves out of a job." Many of the issues facing schools across the English schools network have wide implications and are not conducive to piecemeal solution. School boards singly or in conjunction with one another are and will always be better placed to speak and negotiate for the whole.

The development of good working relationships with the French boards is both easier and more generally productive at the board or association level where the French and English sectors face the same preoccupations and issues. Building upkeep and real estate problems are often way beyond the scope of a single school administration. The \$25 million made available by the MEQ for upgrading and repairing schools is nowhere near enough to do the job. QESBA noted that Canadian Heritage department of the federal government has supported construction of schools based on a 50-50 cost-sharing formula. Collaboration with municipalities for the provision of land and common services through school buildings goes beyond the resources of the school proper. There is also the question of the data on schools, which must be accurate, timely and informative. To be of use, it must be validated and interpreted in accordance with the various missions and differing demographic and socio-economic clienteles lumped together in the overall data. For example, data on special needs students should be treated in a way that distinguishes them in order that reliable indicators can be developed across the heterogeneous

school population. School boards must develop a coordinated approach to manage real estate and information resources, and most importantly human resources.

One of the issues that is affecting and will continue to affect the English school system is the fact that at present, only three per cent of school administrators are under 40 years of age and that 65 to 70 per cent of English school administrators are expected to retire over the next five years. Strategies for meeting this challenge are needed across the system. School boards need to improve their advocacy and representation to the government, their collaboration with universities and their wide dissemination of information, all more productively undertaken at a regional and provincial rather than a local level.

Several boards convene cross-board pedagogical days to promote networking. Mentors are assigned to each principal providing opportunities to shadow and exchange with a range of services at the board and in the community. Where there is a lack of critical mass, school boards cooperate to provide wider professional development. The school board/University partnership of the Québec Learning Consortium brings together three English school boards and Bishop's University. Consideration is being given to distance education services for principals among three other school boards.

With regard to human resources, instructional services directors working out of school boards can provide a buffer for principals. They can form sub-groups and work as a team. Evaluation is facilitated by this structure. Schools with similar structures can be grouped and occasional useful meetings between elementary- and secondary-school personnel can be organized.

School boards have a significant part to play in getting general and vocational education sectors to work together. Principals are responsible for informing students and parents of all the options. The Basic Regulations now allow for students in the youth sector to take courses in general and vocational education at the same time. The difficulty is that principals see this split registration as a loss of funding.

Collaboration with the French sector is being further considered. In many areas, English-school students have few choices. Options are missing so students complete their vocational studies in French. Some English boards are working towards getting more options in technical and vocational education.

Several boards are struggling to keep their small schools open. That effects the assignment of principals and imposes a considerable transportation burden. The Ministère de l'Éducation transportation standards are difficult to apply across the widespread English school boards. The issues of transportation and distance education need more consideration and study by school board and ministry officials. School boards in conjunction with the Ministry must address the exorbitant costs of school telephone lines used for the delivery of distance education and Internet connections, impediments that cannot be overcome by individual schools.

A school principal should know his or her constituency and be familiar with the local social and employment services and other government agencies. But the task of coordinating these myriad services goes beyond the school's sphere of influence. The principal often faces a multitude of agency contacts from many different jurisdictions. Running meetings with all these people and services is very expensive. Government agencies assume that schools and school boards can handle information from an infinite number of sources to address the social and community needs of the children. One-stop agencies do not exist for anglophone children except the school. One school board deals with 26 CLSC's. A single school does not have the resources, no matter how well organized its principal, to deal with this fragmentation or to oblige government agencies to find solutions by talking to each other. It falls to school boards to provide their schools, particularly small and isolated schools, with links to the myriad government agencies and social service centres across wide geographical territories and jurisdictions. In many regards, a school board's professional relations committee provides principals with a valuable support and linkage system.

The Advisory Board on English Education recommends:

THAT the Directors General of the English school boards specify the mission and mandate of the organizations for which they are collectively responsible (CACR, PROCEDE, CASER, etc).³⁷

(Recommendation 11)

The Advisory Board on English Education recommends:

THAT the Directors General of the English school boards in the interest of capacity building and public accountability require an annual report from each of the organizations for which they are collectively responsible (CACR, PROCEDE, CASER, etc).

(Recommendation 12)

THE MINISTRY

The English sector is well served by having its own Assistant Deputy Minister (ADM) and departments (Direction des politiques et des projets (DPP) and the Direction de la production en langue anglaise (DPLA)) of the Services à la communauté anglophone (SCA) of dedicated and experienced professionals in constant touch with every facet of Québec's English schools network. Since the appointment of an English sector ADM in 1992, English schools have been able to rely on a support system at the Ministry level that has become indispensable to school board DGs, school principals and English educators in general for collecting for analyzing, evaluating, and disseminating information and managing resources devoted to strengthening and improving overall school education in the English sector.

As of December 1998, the DPP of the SCA, under the direction of Assistant Deputy Minister Elaine Freeland, was given responsibility for the implementation of the reform in the English sector. The DPP began the process of transition by setting up two structures, an Implementation Design Committee (IDC) and a Curriculum Coalition specifically designed to provide guidelines for, on the one hand, approaching and

37. CACR (Committee of Anglophone Curriculum Responsables)
PROCEDE (Provincial Organization of Continuing Education Directors, English)
CASER (Committee of Anglophone Special Education Responsables)

carrying through the reorganization of school management and, on the other, adapting the new curriculum, in conjunction with the French sector, to the pedagogical requirements and demographic realities of Québec's English-speaking schools.

The transition strategy included the setting up of the IDC as well as addressing a variety of demographic community needs by collaborating with 16 "Lead Schools" to test best practices with the active monitoring of Québec's three English universities. McGill University and Bishop's University have been asked to develop two series of multimedia material, one on outcome-based learning and the other on the integration of learning, to be used by school teams in the reorientation of the teaching and learning process called for by the reform. Other initiatives have been the "Curriculum Countdown," a useful pamphlet providing information about the progress of the implementation of the reform in the English sector. And a joint initiative of McGill University and anglophone sector of the Federation of Parent Committees of Québec (FCPPQ) has produced a series of three pamphlets published in French and English, for the information of parents.

The availability of teaching material in English, which continues to be problematic, is being addressed by the English Educational Resources Foundation (EERF). Instigated by the school boards in collaboration with the SCA-DPP, the EERF is a non-profit organization created by the Directors General of the English school boards with Ministry representation, to develop teaching materials to be used by the English sector. Some of this material is more than likely to be aimed at second-language learning, given that so much of English education takes place in French, particularly at the primary level.

The MEQ has consulted school authorities and is preparing a policy and orientation papers to set a framework for educational leadership. The report *Les nouveaux besoins de perfectionnement des directions d'écoles* (November 15, 1997) specifically recommends that MEQ policy must address the French and English sectors: "It will be

up to the relevant authorities to determine... <whether it is appropriate>... to design professional development activities specifically geared to French- and English-speaking groups." (p. 24; free translation).³⁸

It is important that this new policy take into account the needs of management officials, especially principals in the English sector.

The Advisory Board on English Education recommends:

THAT the MEQ specifically take into account the English sector in developing a set of orientations on school leadership.
(Recommendation 13)

• CHANGING THE CULTURE OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

The structural and pedagogical changes imposed on the school system by the Education Act are radical but not revolutionary. The overall reform is in large part the sanctioning of many of the best teaching and learning practices that schools and teachers have been developing on their own for some time. Today, everyone working in the system is called upon to collaborate in the building of a structural framework in which an integrated approach to teaching and learning can be adapted for the benefit of students at different levels and with various needs in the context of each particular school population.³⁹ Therein lies the real challenge. There can be no factotums in the system. The teaching and learning process is no longer dictated by the rules of the curriculum; it cannot be simply applied across the board. It must be worked out to fit the particular clientele of a school community.

The reform is as much about how to learn (competency) as about what to learn (the subject matter incorporated in the course of study). Learning by rote from a text book devoted to a specific and isolated discipline is not sufficient in itself to assure the competency that students take into the world. The principal objectives of curricular reform are to enhance student learning

38. Henry J. & J. Cormier, *Les nouveaux besoins de perfectionnement des directions d'écoles*. Document produit pour le Comité de perfectionnement des directeurs d'établissements d'enseignement (DISCA5), Québec, November 15, 1997

39. Fullan, Chapter 4 "The School as a Learning Organisation."

and to better prepare students for learning on their own throughout their lives.

A school system based on the acquisition of skills and competencies rather than on a proficient subject-by-subject knowledge can only succeed if educators work together in the development of an integrated approach to the acquisition of competencies. Proficiency is not sacrificed for competency acquisition, but rather enhanced by it. The leadership needed to bring this new perspective into focus at the level of every school is of a different kind than the hierarchical leadership of traditional school structures. Leadership is no longer a top-down management exercise. Leadership fosters coordinated collaboration at every level of school life, from the setting of common goals to time allocation and a shared teaching load.⁴⁰

In the Advisory Board consultations across the network, the question of enlightened leadership was a recurrent preoccupying theme. A common thread ran through all the briefs, presentations, discussions and reports on the subject. Anne-Marie Léveillé-Shields,⁴¹ the Principal of Elizabeth Ballantyne Elementary School which began moving towards a collaborative teaching model some time ago, provided the ABEE with a representative view of the skills and competencies required of the educational leaders of today. The model used by Ms. Shields was based on the reform model of competencies for students adapted for use by administrators. Based on a package of required competencies, then, programs could be developed to focus on leadership practices that address the real situations facing those in charge of getting the new methods working and in gear.

• VOICES FROM ENGLISH ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Anne-Marie Léveillé-Shields gave her views on leadership to the Advisory Board. Ms. Shields proposes five competencies for improving educational leadership.

1. Find and use knowledge. Leaders should be able to:
 - articulate the culture of the organization, its norms and values;
 - develop knowledge about the reform, governing board and other issues affecting schools;
 - find information from various sources;
 - find time and means to inform and be informed;
 - have knowledge of regulations, policies, board procedures and collective agreements;
 - be informed about and develop skills in computer technologies to be used as a tool for information and knowledge.
2. Be a strategic planner
 - develop organizational shared vision;
 - support a student-centred focus;
 - plan appropriate and effective staff development;
 - organize and support dialogue for learning;
 - network with universities and other schools.
3. Be a team leader
 - develop communication skills;
 - be a group process facilitator;
 - be a conflict mediator;
 - create and model effective dialogue;

40. Fullan, Chapter 2 "Moral Purpose and Change Agency."

41. Anne-Marie Léveillé-Shields, recently retired Principal of Elizabeth Ballantyne School in the English Montréal School Board, won the Montréal Island School Council Woman of Merit Award in the Administration Category. Anne-Marie Léveillé-Shields has a Master's Degree in Counselling from State University of New York and Bachelor Degrees in Human Development and Computerized Statistics from McGill University and in Education from Concordia University. She represented the EMSB at the Ministère de l'Éducation for the Co-ordination à la condition féminine. She and Marzia Michielli, Centre Director of the Rosemont Technology Centre, are founding members of Women in Education (WE), started in February 1999. Composed of women from the English School Boards in the Montréal Metropolitan Region, it is committed to the advancement of women in leadership positions and promotes the contribution of women in the workplace. It also promotes pay equity for groups such as secretaries.

- support positive team effort;
- develop relationships which enhance learning, understanding and co-operation;
- involve all partners in programs, activities and accomplishments.

4. Implement and carry-out decisions

- be a mentor;
- develop models of supervision;
- demonstrate effectiveness in financial, administrative and organizational management.

Ms. Shields added one dimension to the reform competencies (certainly applicable to leadership).

5. Become a reflective educational leader

- model reflective behaviours—share reading, discuss in small groups issues of concern;
- support innovations;
- support leaders within the organization;
- monitor implementation;
- develop assessment tools;
- mentor;
- develop accountability strategies and practices;
- develop a reflective practice.

Dialogue with Andrew Aitken, Principal, Ste-Foy Elementary School

Andrew Aitken, principal of the Ste-Foy Elementary School in the Central Québec School Board, dialogued with the ABEE about school leadership. Mr. Aitken responded to several questions, including the following:

What was the impetus for change?

Aitken: Five years ago, the staff had a hard time making decisions and there was not enough commitment to innovation. Teachers expressed a concern about being isolated in their classrooms and wanted to get together more.

The main goal became to get teachers to be part of a team and to work together for more effectiveness.

We invited Ann Kilcher to help the staff with the process of realizing a common school vision and for establishing action plans.

Every year we built in time to work together during school hours. For example, we hired supervisors to do recess supervision, reorganized the workloads and thus provided an extra hour a week to do professional development. It cost us \$8 000. It was the teachers who decided on the incentive of paying others to do yard duty.

In the first year we established a lot of our skills as team members and it was a fairly demanding time. We learned to listen, not to put down another person's ideas or the person, and how to come to decisions. We now decide by consensus how to run things in the school. We are now well positioned to implement this new reform.

Newcomers to the school integrate easily into the culture of teamwork.

What is the principal's role?

Aitken: To create the working situation and do away with the barriers to doing what it is you want to do. The principal is the facilitator—he or she finds the time and the money and keeps the team on track towards the goal. In the first year, I ran the meetings, but it was very onerous in terms of preparation. In the second year, the responsibilities for pre-planning were divided up and in the last two years the teachers have run the meetings. I share the responsibility of leadership with the staff.

Place of the Governing Board?

Aitken: The process started before the institution of governing boards, but we did include the parents in a randomly selected focus group. The parents wrote the educational project to match the vision. The parents inform other parents about the reform, so it is the selected group that is receiving information on the reform. Currently, we are conducting a focus group with the children on the organization of teaching by cycle. It was a staff decision to move toward grouping by cycle. We did not involve the parents, which in hindsight was an error. They question the decision a lot and are not comfortable with it.

The children are comfortable with the move to cycles. They identify themselves by cycle. There are 66 students in the first cycle with three teachers. Teachers plan, teach and evaluate together. The model forces teachers to work together and breaks down the isolation.

Is this going to become THE model?

Aitken: The model works for our school, but could be more difficult to organize in a larger school.

Teachers often feel that the presence of another teacher is threatening. The looping model (one teacher with a group for more than one year) may become more prevalent.

In our model we have the flexibility to create differentiated learning situations and this gives the teachers an opportunity to use their particular expertise well. I believe that the model will also help with the early identification of learning problems, as there are three teachers monitoring each child.

CHAPTER 5

ACCOUNTABILITY BASED ON COLLABORATIVE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Effect of decentralization; administrative accountability at the local and school board level; collaborative leadership; value-added self-assessment.

The principal is accountable to the school board for the school's pedagogical results and curriculum, as well as the sound management of the school budget, previously negotiated with the school board. Once the negotiated budget envelope has been turned over to the school, no part of it remains under school board control. But the principal, as the representative of the local school government, becomes accountable to the school board government for its judicious use.

Decentralization changes the former hierarchical structures into a multi-level system of shared decision-making and responsibilities for the delivery of education. Standards, the programs of study to be followed and the evaluation of province-wide examinations are still governed by uniform rules. For meeting the overall standards, the Ministry is accountable to the government and the final arbiter, the people.

The school boards are accountable to the Ministry for meeting the standards set for elementary and secondary education, for putting in place and supporting the reform management systems needed to monitor and verify that schools are following the basic school regulations and meeting the pedagogical objectives set out in the Education Act. School boards have this overall responsibility because they are local governments whose members are elected by their respective communities to which they are accountable.

There is no decentralization of educational objectives. The curriculum sets out what students should know and be able to do at various

points along the way. The reform accents the process by which teaching and learning take place to meet the objectives. The team of professional teachers work together on the ways and means of dispensing education, providing a certain autonomy in the setting of targets, the choosing of values to accent and the forging of links with the wider community. The school is the institution with the closest ties to the community which depends on the school for the education of its children. The school is the crux of the whole operation, where the system itself succeeds or fails. The principal is therefore primarily accountable to the DG but he or she is also accountable to several other constituencies in the community focused on the education provided by his or her school, rather than on the general thrust of the education system.

The decentralization of powers and the taking of responsibility by those who assume those powers demands that mechanisms be put in place to assure the good use of the allotted resources. "Management by results" is a priority in the Québec government's philosophy of management, for education and for all other sectors of the civil service. Work will no longer be judged only on doing the job responsibly, by the rules. The quality of the results of the work is judged not by the doer but by those to whom he or she is answerable. The MEQ and the school boards must protect the school sector from the dangers and injustices of evaluating the performances of schools simply by comparing across the board results rather by a more nuanced interpretation of what constitutes a value-added for each school, based on school self-assessment. It would seem important not to impose accountability⁴² for

42. Association des directeurs généraux des commissions scolaires report *L'Adige et l'imputabilité dans le réseau scolaire* (29 mars 2000).

results, setting standards at the top, but rather to promote school self-assessment and collaborative efforts across the school network. A school's self

evaluation is where any open system of evaluation begins.⁴³

43. Purkey and Smith.

CONCLUSION

As curriculum reform progresses through the cycles of elementary school toward more complex implementation at the high-school level, teachers will be forced to carry the heaviest burden of proof. Strong but enlightened and flexible leadership exercised by school boards and principals will be a vital component in the successful completion of the required reorganization of the management of the school system, as a whole and school by school. Territorial adjustments, legal and regulatory issues, the provision of educational services, the hiring of personnel, the tracking involved in the production of success plans are all issues that call for efficient and visionary leadership. School leaders must provide the climate and resources for promoting a variety of pedagogical models, from the design of an integrated Cycle One to the mapping of the mosaic of disciplines in Cycle Five. But at the end of the day, teachers will deliver the educational services to the students in the classrooms. The reform will not work without planning. But the planning in itself can have little effect on a child's mind or an adolescent's language skills or interest in physics. The impact on teachers of the new curriculum and structural reform cannot be exaggerated. And the impact of teacher preparation and in-service training on student academic success has been amply shown in research findings.

Teachers need time, resources and pedagogical support to help them work out for themselves and among themselves how they can best contribute and adapt to the process, procedures and objectives spelled out by the reform. But they also need incentives to develop the leadership capacities that will ensure school success.⁴⁴

Teachers are not only being required to take on several new layers of responsibility, they are also required to take on the teaching of a curriculum which many of them were not academi-

cally prepared to teach. This is not a Québec or Canadian phenomenon. There is today, for instance, an international penury of math and science teachers. It is not because teachers in the past were not interested in or encouraged to learn about mathematics and science in order to be able to teach these subjects. It is more the effect of an approach to the education of teachers that emphasized pedagogical skills and relied on a good general education to provide an expertise that only needed "topping up" to produce the necessary expertise to teach the subject matter. Today's more holistic, integrated approach to learning has in no way downgraded the importance of pedagogy. Rather, it is being more and more widely recognized that to awaken and kindle the intellectual interest of students in the natural sciences, a teacher of those subjects should have a passion for and an in-depth knowledge of the disciplines. It is, however, unrealistic to expect practising teachers to go back to school for the years required to get another subject-based degree at their own expense.

We acknowledge teachers as a precious resource for our communities and for society.⁴⁵ To prepare teachers for what is being asked of them we must recognize their worth and spend the necessary resources. When the recruitment of principals became difficult, teachers who loved their profession were approached to take on the added work and responsibilities associated with being a principal. The teachers turned down the opportunity because the pecuniary rewards in no way made up for the professional rewards they would have to forgo. The problem was addressed by making it financially worthwhile for a master teacher, well qualified for the job, to put his or her experience to work, as principal, for the school as a whole rather than the individual classroom. It is perhaps time, and a propitious time, to examine the remuneration, financial support and educational upgrading of our teachers. The quality of the school system depends first and fore-

44. Moller and Katzenmeyer.

45. Fullan and Hargreaves, Chapter 4 "Interactive Professionalism and Guidelines For Action."

most on the quality of what is taught in the classroom. Society will not get the best possible education for its children if it is not prepared to provide the best possible educators to teach them. A love for the profession is certainly an incentive to practise it well, but being recognized socially and financially as an essential service cannot but draw more qualified people into the profession and keep those already engaged in it abreast of its more and more demanding requirements.

Principals and centre directors, governing boards and school boards, and the Ministère de l'Éducation can make the curriculum reform an opportunity to support teachers and students in the primary activity of education: teaching and learning. Our recommendations in this report support collaborative leadership and accountability. Visionary leadership starts with support for teachers and students.

Appendix A

PROFILE OF PERSONNEL IN ENGLISH SCHOOLS

Table 4.2.13 published in Statistiques de l'éducation.
Enseignement primaire, secondaire, collégial et universitaire.
Édition 2000

Table 4.2.13
Personnel in school boards, by sector, category of employment,
gender and language of workplace, in 1998-1999
ALL PERSONNEL

		French	English	Native Languages	Not Specified	Total	
YOUTH AND ADULT SECTORS							
Teaching staff							
General education	Men	19 988	2 380	43	3	22 414	
in the youth sector	Women	51 744	6 317	167	3	58 231	
General education	Men	1 133	158	3	6	1 300	
in the adult sector	Women	2 835	444	2	6	3 284	
Vocational education	Men	4 473	233			4 706	
	Women	2 532	276			2 808	
YOUTH SECTOR							
Administrative staff	Men	684	96	1		781	
	Women	220	57	1	1	279	
School principals	Men	1 771	221	1	1	1 994	
	Women	1 228	154			1 382	
Managerial staff	Men	382	62	3		447	
	Women	193	25	2	1	221	
Non-teaching professionals	Men	1 618	133	8	57	1 816	
	Women	2 567	271	21	121	2 980	
Support staff	Men	12 414	1 651	101	247	14 413	
	Women	32 649	5 047	157	218	38 071	
ADULT SECTOR							
Administrative staff	Men	82	13		1	96	
	Women	24	8			32	
School principals	Men	228	24			252	
	Women	128	16			144	
Managerial staff	Men	17	1			18	
	Women	15	4			19	
Non-teaching professionals	Men	216	28	3	5	252	
	Women	255	35	1	1	292	
Support staff	Men	542	67	7	9	625	
	Women	1 206	205	17	14	1 442	
TOTAL		Men	43 548	5 067	170	329	49 114
		Women	95 596	12 859	368	365	109 188
		Total	139 144	17 926	538	694	158 302

Source: Personnel des commissions scolaires (PERCOS II).

Note: All persons that had an employment relationship with a school board between July 1 and June 30 are included in these statistics.

Appendix

B

**Recommendations of the Advisory Board on
English Education Report 2000: English
Schools in Transition: Building Collaborative
Leadership**

Recommendation 1

THAT the MEQ and the English school boards provide support for each English school as the school builds authentic links with its communities.

Recommendation 2

THAT in their planning and goal setting the Quebec English School Boards Association (QESBA), the Association of Directors General of English School Boards (ADGESB) and the Association of Administrators of English Schools of Québec (AAESQ) take into consideration the five orientations of the Strategic Plan of the Ministère de l'Éducation 2000-2003.

Recommendation 3

THAT, with a view to facilitating school improvement, the Ministère de l'Éducation and school boards support each English school in developing a school profile.

Recommendation 4

THAT each English school board monitor the progress of each school and ensure that schools have access to resources for fair and constructive self-evaluation.

Recommendation 5

THAT the English school boards and the principals of each English school in Québec align their planning and goal setting with the orientations of the MEQ to improve school success, and report the results to their communities.

Recommendation 6

THAT the Partnership for School Improvement collaborate with the CSE and the École nationale d'administration publique (ENAP) to provide English school administrators with continuing education resources, for example:

- the timely English translation of important CSE reports related to educational administration such as:
 - “*Le rôle des Headmasters en Angleterre et les enseignements à en tirer dans un contexte de décentralisation*,” CSE Études et Recherches, by Hélène Pinard, April 1999.
 - “*Le renouvellement du curriculum: expérience américaine, suisse et québécoise*,” CSE, January 2000.
- an on-line resource centre for school principals, modeled on the school leaders' listserv developed by the Canadian Association of Principals and the 'Observatoire – Vigie' of ENAP.

Recommendation 7

THAT the MEQ undertake negotiations with the management board of *Le Point en administration scolaire* to examine the feasibility of having *Le Point en administration scolaire* published in English and French simultaneously.

Recommendation 8

THAT the MEQ give particular attention to the use of time and the exercise of shared leadership among teachers and administrators in the English sector while aligning the MEQ orientations document for teacher education and in-service with the soon-to-be published MEQ orientations document on principal education and in-service.

Recommendation 9

THAT the English schools promote the establishment of the Parent Participation Organization

(PPO) and facilitate its role in developing, implementing and evaluating the school's educational project.

Recommendation 10

THAT the MEQ clarify the structure and membership of the governing boards established for adult and vocational education centres.

Recommendation 11

THAT the Directors General of the English school boards specify the mission and mandate of the organizations for which they are collectively responsible (CACR, PROCEDE, CASER, etc).

Recommendation 12

THAT the Directors General of the English school boards in the interest of capacity building and public accountability require an annual report from each of the organizations for which they are collectively responsible (CACR, PROCEDE, CASER, etc).

Recommendation 13

THAT the MEQ specifically take into account the English sector in developing a set of orientations on school leadership.

Appendix C

INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED BY THE ADVISORY BOARD ON ENGLISH EDUCATION 1999-2000

Meeting guests

Andrew Aitken	Principal, Ste-Foy Elementary School
Spencer Boudreau	Professor, Faculty of Education, McGill University
Noel Burke	Director, Instructional Services, New Frontiers School Board
Ron Canuel	Director General, Eastern Townships School Board
Scott Conrod	Deputy Director General, Lester-B.-Pearson School Board
John Cyr	Director General, Central Québec School Board
Diane Fyfe	Director General, Western Québec School Board
David Hogg	President, Association of administrators of English Schools of Quebec and Principal of Merton School, English Montréal School Board
Cyrus Journeau	Director General, Eastern Shores School Board
Patricia Lamarre	Assistant Professor, Education Department, Université de Montréal
Anne-Marie Léveillé-Shields	Principal, Elizabeth Ballantyne School
Charley Levy	Deputy Director General, English Montréal School Board
Lucy Mendonça	Representative of Medric O'Brien, Administrator, Du Littoral School Board
Maria Michielli	Centre Director, Rosemont Technology Centre
Yolande Nantel	Coordonnatrice, Secteur de développement des compétences, Commission scolaire de Montréal
Alexander Norris	Reporter, Montreal Gazette
Diane Ratcliffe	President, Québec English School Board Association (QESBA)
André Reid	Coordinator of the Education Management Sector of Faculty of Education, Université de Sherbrooke
Richard Schmid	Chair, Department of Education, Concordia University
Howard Schwartz	Principal, Souvenir Elementary School, Sir-Wilfrid-Laurier School Board
Howard Simpkin	Director General, New Frontiers School Board
Jim Sullivan	Responsible for teacher pre-service and in-service, MEQ / SCA-DPP
David Wells	Program Coordinator, Educational Technology, Concordia University

Appendix

D

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BERGER, Marie-Josée, (1999) *Education Canada* 39(3), pp. 28-31 "Enjeux de la responsabilisation en milieu éducatif minoritaire franco-ontarien.
- BITTLE, J. (1995). Primary Responsibilities of School Administrators. *The High School Magazine*, September, p. 38-42
- BROOKER, J. (2000). A top educator in our midst! *The Informer Montreal West*, June.
- CONSEIL SUPÉRIEUR DE L'ÉDUCATION, (1993). Rapport annuel 1991-1992. *La Gestion de l'éducation: nécessité d'un autre modèle*.
- CONSEIL SUPÉRIEUR DE L'ÉDUCATION, (1999). *Diriger une école secondaire: Un nouveau contexte, de nouveaux défis*. Québec.
- CONSEIL SUPÉRIEUR DE L'ÉDUCATION, (1999). *L'évaluation institutionnelle en éducation: une dynamique propice au développement (Rapport annuel)*, Québec.
- CONSEIL SUPÉRIEUR DE L'ÉDUCATION, (1999). *Le renouvellement du curriculum: expériences américaine, suisse et québécoise*. Québec.
- CONSEIL SUPÉRIEUR DE L'ÉDUCATION, (1999). *Le rôle des headteachers en Angleterre et les enseignements à en tirer dans un contexte de décentralisation*, Québec.
- CONSEIL SUPÉRIEUR DE L'ÉDUCATION, (2000). *La reconnaissance des acquis, une responsabilité politique et sociale*. Québec.
- DRUCKER, P. F. (1999). "My mentor's leadership lessons." In F. Hesselbein & P.M. Cohen (Eds.) *Leader to leader: Enduring insights on leadership from the Drucker Foundation's award-winning journal*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- FULLAN, M. G. & Hargreaves, A. (1991). *What's worth fighting for? Working together for your school*. Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.
- FULLAN, M. G. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.
- GAUTHIER, R. (1998). Planification stratégique ou improvisation stratégique dans un contexte de turbulence au sein des organisations publiques? *Source ENAP*, 14(1), p. 1-4.
- GIBTON, D., Sabar, N. & Goldring, E.B. (2000). How principals of autonomous schools in Israel view implementation of decentralization and restructuring policy: Risks, rights, and wrongs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(2), p. 193-210.
- GOVERNEMENT DU QUÉBEC, Ministère de l'Éducation (2000). *The Québec Education Program – Preschool Education Elementary (cycle one) approved version Elementary Education (cycles two and three)*. Preliminary version. (13-0003-01A).
- GOVERNEMENT DU QUÉBEC, Ministère de l'Éducation. *Strategic Plan of the Ministère de l'Éducation for 2000-2003*. Summary (49-1325-A).
- GUAY, M-M. (2000). Le Mentorat. *Source ENAP*, 15(1), p. 2,4.
- HENRY, J. & J. Cormier. *Les nouveaux besoins de perfectionnement des directeurs d'écoles. Document produit pour le Comité de perfectionnement des directeurs d'établissement d'enseignement (DICAS)*, Québec, November 15, 1997.
- KATZENBACH, J.R. & Smith, D.K. (1993). *The wisdom of teams: Creating the high-performance organization*. NY: Harper Collins.

- KATZENBACH, J.R. (1999). In F. Hesselbein & P.M. Cohen (Eds.) *Leader to leader: Enduring insights on leadership from the Drucker Foundation's award-winning journal*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- KERNAGHAN, K. (1994). The emerging public service culture: values, ethics, and reforms. *Canadian Public Administration*, 37(4), p. 614-630.
- LEE, V.E., Smerdon, B.A., Alfred-Liro, C. & Brown, S.L. (2000). Inside large and small high schools: Curriculum and social relations. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(2), p. 147-171.
- LIEBERMAN, A. (1996). Creating intentional learning communities. *Educational Leadership*, 54(3), pp. 51-55.
- LINDQUIST, E. A. (1994). Recent administrative reform in Canada as decentralization: who is spreading what around to whom and why? *Canadian Public Administration*, 37(3), p. 416-430.
- LINN, R.L., and Baker, E.L. (1998). Back to basics – Indicators as a system. *The CRESST Line*, Winter, p. 1-3.
- LUSTHAUS, C., Anderson, G., and Murphy, E. (1995). *Institutional Assessment: A Framework for Strengthening Organizational Capacity for IDCR's Research Partners*. Ottawa: International Development Research Center.
- MABRY, L. & Ettinger, L. (1999). Supporting community-oriented educational change: Case and analysis. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 7(14), p. 1-19. <<http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/vol7n14.html>>
- MANNING, M. L. and R. Saddlemire (1996). Developing a sense of community in secondary schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, December, pp. 41-48.
- MOLLER, G. & Katzenmeyer, M. (Eds.) (1996). *Every teacher as a leader: Realizing the potential of teacher leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- PAYETTE, A. (1997). Gestionnaires formateurs. *Sources ENAP*, 13(6), p. 1-4.
- PERRENOUD, P. (1999). L'établissement, principal garant du renouveau pédagogique. *Le Point de Réflexion*, in *Le Point en administration scolaire*, 2(1), p. 1-16.
- PURKEY, S. C. and M. S. Smith (1983). Effective Schools: A Review. *The Elementary School Journal* 83(4), pp. 426-452.
- SARASON, S.B. & Lorentz, E.M. (1998). *Crossing boundaries, coordination and the redefinition of resources*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- SERGIOVANNI, T.J. (1994a). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- SERGIOVANNI, T.J. (1994b). *Organizations or Communities? Changing the Metaphor, Changes the Theory*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(2), pp. 214-226.
- SCHEETZ, M. and T. Benson (1994). *Structuring Schools for Success: A View from the Inside*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Corwin Press Inc.
- SHIELDS, A-M. Personal communication. June 9, 2000. E-mail on qualities of school leaders.
- SMITH, W.J. et al. (1998). *Student engagement in learning and school life: Case reports from project schools*. Montréal: Office of Research on Educational Policy, McGill University.
- SMITH, W.J. et al. (1998). *Student engagement in learning and school life: National project report*. Montréal: Office of Research on Educational Policy, McGill University.
- TARDIF, N. (1999). La Direction d'établissement et le renouveau pédagogique, Position stratégique. *Le Point en Administration Scolaire*. 2(1), p. 9-14.

Appendix E

Websites to be consulted

www.schoolfile.com/cap.htm

The Canadian Association of Principals (CAP) represents and serves the Principals and Vice-Principals of schools across Canada. The Association has a School Leaders Listserv that delivers messages on a regular basis to all list member schools

www.enap.quebec.ca/Observatoire/Vigie/accueilvigie.htm

This newsletter provides periodic updates on certain reforms currently under way, as well as information on significant events in public administration in other jurisdictions and on interesting publications related to these themes.

www.acea.ca

Canadian Education Association

www.casa-acas.org

Canadian Association of School Administrators

www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap

Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy (electronic journal)

www.qesn.meq.gouv.qc.ca

Quebec English Schools Network

www.meq.gouv.qc.ca

Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec

www.qesba.qc.ca

Quebec English School Boards Association (QESBA)

<http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/>

Educational Policy Analysis Archives is a peer-reviewed scholarly journal published entirely on the Internet.

www.middleweb.com/ash.html

The principal as Chief Learning Officer by Ruth Ash and Maurice Persall

English School Boards

www.csnewfrontiers.qc.ca

– New Frontiers SB

www.wqsb.qc.ca

– Western Québec SB

www.cqsb.qc.ca

– Central Québec SB

www.etsb.qc.ca

– Eastern Townships SB

www.easternshores.qc.ca

– Eastern Shores SB

www.emsb.qc.ca

– English Montréal SB

www.lbpsb.qc.ca

– Lester-B.-Pearson SB

www.rsb.qc.ca

– Riverside SB

www.swlauriersb.qc.ca

– Sir-Wilfrid-Laurier SB

