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Education Reform Context

Policy Demands
- Diverse and expanded learning outcomes (e.g., 21CC)
- School-Based Curriculum Development
- Innovations in Curriculum, Pedagogy & Assessment

Capacity Building
- Teachers
  - Curriculum
  - Pedagogy
  - Assessment
- Leaders
  - Instructional leadership
  - Distributed leadership
  - Teacher Leadership

School Capacity

Pace of Change

Digital Technologies

VUCA World

Complexities

Diverging Identities

GAP
More resources to increase output? | Same output with less resources?
Focus!

Professional Learning through PLCs

Distributed Instructional Leadership through Teacher Leaders
Teacher Learning

Collective Learning

Network Learning Communities

Professional Learning Communities

Lesson Study

Action Research

Mentoring

Coaching

Communities of Practice

Learning (etc) Communities
Practice

Distributed Instructional Leadership

Senior Leaders
(P / VP)

Middle Leaders
(SH, YH, HOD)

Teacher Leaders

Formal
(STs, LTs)

Informal
(PLC Team Leader, Subject Coords, Level Coords)

PLCs

Teaching Practices

Student Learning
ESSENTIAL PRACTICES

Because each learning community develops in its own way and within its own particular context, it is difficult to isolate a set of generic practices. What follows is a list of ways that we have seen successful communities go about their work:

- They meet regularly and take the time to build collegial relationships based on trust and openness.
- They work hard to develop a clear purpose and a collective focus on problems of practice.
- They create routines and rituals that support honest talk and disclosure.
- They engage in observation, problem solving, mutual support, advice giving, and peer teaching and learning.
- They purposefully organize and focus on activities that will enhance learning for both the adults and students in the school.
- They use collaborative inquiry to stimulate evidence-informed conversations.
- They develop a theory of action.
- They develop a core set of strategies for connecting their learning to student learning.

LEARNING COMMUNITIES

The starting point for professional learning is in schools and classrooms

Lieberman & Miller (2011, p. 19)
### Study 1: PLCs Impact on PLCs

**Quasi-Exp**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T₁</th>
<th>T₂</th>
<th>T₃</th>
<th>T₄</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>O₁</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>O₁</td>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>O₃</td>
<td>O₄</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXP (T₄-T₁)**
- Rate of growth of EXP P5 students statistically higher than CON P5 students (p < .05), small effect size (0.124)

**CON d (T₄-T₁)**

Sample: 9 primary school | 3 Experiment 6 Control | 1389 50 Primary 5 Students
Study 1: PLCs Impact on PLCs

1. PLCs impact on student learning is indirect through teaching practice – a pragmatic need

2. Collective learning enhancing PLC effectiveness

3. Collective learning translating to collective teaching approaches, but individualised in teaching practice enhancing PLC effectiveness.

4. Assessment data insights to individual students’ learning determine effectiveness of instructional practice and refine individual teachers’ instructional practice enhancing PLC effectiveness

5. Teacher leadership enhancing PLC effectiveness

6. Organisational support strengthening the capacity of PLC practices impacting on teacher teaching practices enhancing PLC effectiveness

Sample: 11 primary school | 22 FGDs | 11 SLs, 11 Math HODs, 50 Primary 5 Math Teachers
Teacher Leadership

Influence towards shared goals on student learning

Collegial and collaborative relations

Teacher learning and development

Change in teachers’ teaching practices

Study 1: PLCs Impact on PLCs
Study 1: PLCs Impact on PLCs

- Student Level Predictors
- Teacher Level Predictors

Regression Coefficient

Outcome

Sample: 7 primary school | 35 Math PLCs | 1108 primary 5 students

HLM
Table 5: HLM analyses predicting Primary 5 students’ growth in mathematical problem solving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Effects</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept Level 1</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Attitude towards PLC</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ perception on Assessment Knowledge</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ perception on PLC Facilitator: Participation</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ perception on PLC: Community</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-government schools</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ age group</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ ethnicity</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ perception in Self-Efficacy in Mathematics</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001
Study 1: PLCs Impact on PLCs

Articulation of common goals on student learning

Collegial sharing and collaboration

Rasch Analysis

- My PLC group members share the same goals even though they are not explicitly spoken.
- My PLC group members believe that all members' voices are heard first before decisions are made.
- My PLC group members make known explicitly the shared goals pertaining to student learning.
- My PLC group members believe in coming to an agreement before decisions are made.
- My PLC group members share the same vision pertaining to student learning.
- My PLC group members believe in the same values pertaining to student learning.
- My PLC group members respect our individual differences.
- My PLC group members share with one another successes and challenges in the course of our work.
- My PLC group members mutually trust one another in the course of our work.
- My PLC group members contribute our strengths to the work that needs to be done.
- My PLC group members share the work that needs to be done.
- My PLC group members share common goals on student learning.
### Study 2: Predictors of Student Learning Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Effect</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>Approx. d.f.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For INTRCPT1, $\beta_0$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRCPT2, $\gamma_{00}$</td>
<td>0.517259</td>
<td>0.045905</td>
<td>11.268</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL_LC_M, $\gamma_{01}$</td>
<td>-0.484758</td>
<td>0.113189</td>
<td>-4.283</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL_CL_M, $\gamma_{02}$</td>
<td>0.148237</td>
<td>0.048800</td>
<td>3.038</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL_EM_M, $\gamma_{03}$</td>
<td>-0.132473</td>
<td>0.061038</td>
<td>-2.170</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL_LD_M, $\gamma_{04}$</td>
<td>0.207068</td>
<td>0.051247</td>
<td>4.041</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL_CE_M, $\gamma_{05}$</td>
<td>-0.141997</td>
<td>0.053591</td>
<td>-2.650</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL_LD_M, $\gamma_{06}$</td>
<td>-0.157964</td>
<td>0.057693</td>
<td>-2.738</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL_TP_M, $\gamma_{07}$</td>
<td>0.219253</td>
<td>0.068217</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL_RK_M, $\gamma_{08}$</td>
<td>-0.268647</td>
<td>0.096745</td>
<td>-2.777</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL_GK_M, $\gamma_{09}$</td>
<td>0.221607</td>
<td>0.141323</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL_AK_M, $\gamma_{010}$</td>
<td>0.197133</td>
<td>0.077489</td>
<td>2.544</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL.VK_M, $\gamma_{011}$</td>
<td>-0.128361</td>
<td>0.055349</td>
<td>-2.319</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO_CU_M, $\gamma_{012}$</td>
<td>0.095760</td>
<td>0.043684</td>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO_PE_M, $\gamma_{013}$</td>
<td>0.101364</td>
<td>0.039257</td>
<td>2.582</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For GENDER slope, $\beta_1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRCPT2, $\gamma_{10}$</td>
<td>-0.086781</td>
<td>0.055461</td>
<td>-1.565</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample: 28 primary school | 58 SLs | 93 Math Teachers | 1778 primary 5 students
Study 2: Predictors of Student Learning Growth

Distributed Leadership
- Bounded Empowerment (More further empowering) - 2.170 *
- Developing Leadership 4.041 ***
- Collective Engagement (More synergistic collaborations) - 2.650 *

Teacher Leadership
- Promote Professional Learning (Value it but not practice it) - 2.738 *
- Change in Classroom Teaching Practices 3.214 **

Collective Learning
- Reflecting Knowledge (Greater initiative to share practices) - 2.777 *
- Applying Knowledge 2.544 *
- Innovating Knowledge (Greater risk-taking and trust) - 2.319 *

Teaching Competencies
- Curriculum Content Knowledge 2.192 *
- Pedagogical Knowledge 2.582 *
Study 2: Predictors of Student Learning Growth

**Goodness-of-Fit Statistics**
(No. of students = 1679, schools = 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square / df / p-value</td>
<td>90.636 / 15 / .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI/ TLI</td>
<td>1.000 / 1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-Level Path Analysis
Key Levers

Teacher Leadership

Collective Learning
I – trust – We Inter-Dependent Synergy

Community
Diverse – specific learning goals – Diverse Purpose-Mission

Praxis
Classroom – PLC – Classroom Practice-Theory-Practice

Assessment
Teaching – link – Learning Evidence-Based
Pursuing the elusive construct of distributed leadership: Is the search over?

Salleh Hairon and Jonathan WP Goh

Abstract
Distributed leadership is one of the most prominent contemporary leadership theories in education. Its attraction in education is perhaps due to its potential to bring about school improvement. A review of the literature, however, reveals broadness in the way the construct is being conceptualized and operationalized; thus making it elusive. The elusive nature of distributed leadership could be down to the lack of attempts to unpack and measure this construct, and/or because of the contested definition of the term ‘leadership’ itself. The purpose of this article is to elucidate this construct by addressing possible dimensionality issues. To do this, exploratory factor analysis was performed using Rasch (linearized) standardized residuals to examine the factor structure of distributed leadership. The analysis provided a lucid interpretation of the data to build a theoretical (measurement) model of distributed leadership. The distributed leadership instrument consists of 25 items, and the sample involved 1,232 schools leaders from Singapore. The findings indicated the presence of four possible factors of distributed leadership which include bounded empowerment, developing leadership, shared decision and collective engagement.
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