

**ICSL – Prague meeting
10-12 October 2012**

10th October 2012

1. Competency framework – discussion

1. a. Introduction – Glynn

Everyone shared their feelings, opinion on the framework we have developed:

- It should be reduced, it is too long and not adaptable for use in this format (Alena)
- Hierarchy within the areas: for SLs the most important is L&M the Institution, it's "safer" to manage the institution, Managing Self was considered secondary by stakeholders (Astrid on AT adaptation)
- Where does system thinking appear in the CF? It is somewhere between the areas (between L&M the Inst and L&M Others...).
- Where is behaviour described? Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes are elements of a competency but not the competency itself. (Michael)
- The framework has to be detailed (or there has to be a detailed/full version). Behaviour is in the focus, it mirrors that sy is able to do sg. (Tibor)
- A version which shows the interrelations and inner structure (subcategories/clusters) could be useful
- It would be helpful to have a glossary to explain some terms, Czech had problems/questions about the terminology
Czech stakeholders were surprised to see Leading and Managing in all areas, they separate it more: some areas/fields are "led" others are "managed" (Eliska)
- Development process is very interesting, different from SE. In SE the training programme is based on evaluation, closely connected to curriculum work (political input is embedded in history) (Kristina)
- Notion of accountability is starting to be realised in some of the countries (eg. SK, HU)... The CF should represent "forward thinking" not just what we usually do in schools; CF is securely grounded methodologically (Glynn)

1. b. Coherence & Validity – Tibor

See presentation: Coherence and validity (Tibor)

1. c. Comparative analysis

See presentation: Comparative analysis of frameworks (Glynn)

Australian framework:

- putting in a global context: global economy and society / Inclusive Australia / Uniqueness of each school within its community / The principal
 - would be important to think of in our CF
 - not just European but a global framework
- Michael: Uniqueness of each individual (student) should be thought of - Inclusiveness used to be integration (of SNI, migrants etc.) which presupposes separation of the diff. groups, while inclusiveness = sensitive to equality (separation creates inequality)

1. d. Central European Competency Framework – finalising

How do we make it more user friendly?

Different stakeholder groups have different needs and can use different formats.

Produce three versions:

Version 1: full version with detailed K, S, A and the vignettes

- Target group: experts, trainers
- Potential uses: design or evaluate and improve a training programme for school leaders

Version 2: a shorter “synthetic” version: description of areas and a few bullet points for each area

- the pairs would write it for their area – Glynn and Polona produce a sample version
- Target group: school leaders, teachers, trainers
- Potential uses: self-evaluation

Version 3: 2 A4 pages

- Target group: policy makers
- Potential uses: ?

Vignettes:

- vignettes give a personalized aspect with emotions
- still missing for 2 areas: L&M Others and L&M Self

1. e. Project overview - Nora

See presentation here: http://prezi.com/_jwjbiebsahn/icsl-prague/

2. Czech PLA

2. a. The Czech School System

Jakub Stárek, Ministry of Education, director of Educational System and Further Education Department

See the presentation here: <http://prezi.com/lc6ij26wbwdw/copy-of-the-education-system-in-the-czech-republic/>

2. b. Discussion with Czech stakeholders

Participants:

Project partners: Alena, Astrid, Michael, Eliska, Glynn, Kristina, Thomas, Tibor, Eszter, Nora

Guests:

Irena Lhotková, Centre of School Management, Charles University

Milan Hausner, director of Basic School Lupáčovka Prague

Václav Nádvorník, deputy director of Basic School Londýnská Prague

Stanislav Karabec, project manager (Project Career Development of Teachers in the Czech Republic)

Some topics:

What is the purpose of this framework?

- It is difficult to use it in this format
- Could be used for self-evaluation but not like this (too long)
- A SL who has all these competencies is Jesus
- To evaluate and improve SL training programmes
- To generate thinking and reflection (which it does). The purpose is not necessarily a concrete and direct use/adaptation but rather a starting point for reflection for whichever target group.
- A communication tool –

Priority of areas

- Many school leaders consider L&M the Institution as their primary focus (financing, budget, day-to-day administrative and management issues), they feel that they don't have time to focus on anything else (eg. L&M Self/Others).
- What is a priority in leadership training programmes? It is often administration (legal issues etc.).
- The framework raises awareness of the importance of other competency areas as well.

11th October 2012

2. c. School Visit: Elementary School Prague 2, Londynska 34

Public elementary school

Uses many “alternative” pedagogic tools, but belong to no particular alternative movement (eg. Waldorf, Montessori etc.)

Some main pedagogic principles of the school:

- Management: director, 2 deputy directors, 1 financial head – work as a management team without a particular hierarchy (that is, they make decisions together, staff can consult any of them)
“The door is open” – the management is in one office, the door of which is always open, teachers come and go
- Lower management: all grades have a leading teacher (of that year) who coordinates the curricular work of the teachers (see below in more details)
- Evaluation:
 - Pupils by teachers: no marks, only percentages and twice a year written report on their development by all teachers
 - Pupils self-evaluation: Ps have a portfolio in which they collect evidence of their progress; self-evaluation is used in all ages: they evaluate themselves against different criteria in a self-evaluation booklet (little ones color images)
 - Teachers by pupils: Ps draw little pictures, images about how they perceived the teacher and how they felt themselves during a lesson
 - Teachers by teachers: teachers regularly observe each other’s lessons
 - Teachers self-evaluation: Ts have a portfolio documenting their professional progress
 - Teachers by the management: twice a year 1 hour long interview according their portfolio
 - Management by teachers: during the same interview Ts give feedback to management
 - All evaluation is supportive: based on discovering areas to develop and making a plan of development
- Curriculum
 - Czech schools have considerable freedom to develop their own curriculum, which has correspond to the national framework (core curriculum)
 - Subjects are more holistic, history and geography are taught together, Maths and Physics is one subject, Arts (music, drawing, dance...) is one subject etc.
 - Teachers match the curriculum of their subject to each other during regular consultations: in a week the same period / topic is dealt with in Czech Literature, History and Geography, Science etc.
- The classroom
 - Ps are engaged in various activities (participative learning): group works etc. in all subjects
 - In every classroom there is a mezzanine with toys, cushions, wall-to-wall carpet: a place with a different atmosphere where some parts of the lessons can be held, pupils can spend their pauses etc. (some mezzanines are used as staff room)
 - ICT equipment: Computers – in the computer room Apple computers; laptops are available for pupils; Smart boards are available in certain classrooms

- Community involvement
 - Parents are involved in the school's life;
 - Open doors 3 times a week for several months: future parents can visit the school, including classroom visits by taking an appointment
 - Some of the methods, pedagogic principles of the school are adapted in other institutions (usually not the whole pedagogy as such, as different frames, different needs might require different methods)

3. Adaptation process

3. a. Presentation country by country

See the presentations attached

3. b. Discussion on the adaptation

The framework raises several dilemmas, questions:

- Does it include every important aspect?
- It is a demand-driven framework, based on the sentences coming from the stakeholders themselves (as such is unique)
- Some aspects may not concern everyone, contexts differ: eg. in Slovenia a national school curriculum is defined, so school leaders do not (cannot) engage in curriculum development. / in Austria school heads concentrate on administration above all
- How concrete/specific should the sentences be? Eg. "is honest" – what does it mean? Can/should it be formulated differently? Should it be included at all?
- Who sees what behind the terms? Eg. "When I go in a classroom I see learning" – Vaclav; But what is learning? In a classroom you can see a learning environment...
- What is the best format for the different target groups? How could we present it?
- In the final publication it is also possible to describe all these dilemmas – they are an important added value to the product – can be part of the conclusion

Conclusions:

A strong need was formulated to produce a shorter version (see in section 1.d.).

4. Peer review

4.a. The focus of the review - Kristina

See presentation

4. b. Focus group interviews

Country reflections based on three questions:

1. What are the three or four main achievements of the development and adaptation process?
2. What has been most fruitful for the development and adaptation process in relation to activities and work during the project?
3. What are – from your point of view – the most significant learning outcomes of the development and adaptation process?

In parallel...

Mixed country group reflections (recorded) – 1st group: AT, SK, 2nd group: HU, CZ

5. Assessment tools

Puzzle-bubble model (Michael) – *see the ppt attached*

This model could be used as self-evaluation and/or as a qualitative evaluation to support professional development.

RDA tool (Tibor)

Quantitative evaluation tool that can be completed by qualitative evaluation (based on interview)

Online questionnaire (Eliska)

Based on the CF

12th October 2012

6. Competency Framework – shorter version

Discussion:

- The shorter version should contain a summary of the main “key” competencies of each area
- About 3-5 sentences (competencies) for each area
- Developing prototypes – pilot work: identify the 5 main competencies for L&M Learning and Teaching
 - School leaders ensure that learning and teaching lead to the improvement of student achievement.
 - School leaders establish a culture of feedback and evaluation with a view to improvement.

- School leaders ensure that curricular activities meet the demands of all learners.
- School leaders critically engage teachers with (research) literature to improve their teaching.
- School leaders care for an inclusive learning environment which is characterised by respect and justice.

Task:

5 “key competencies” should be formulated for each area:

Self: Vladimir

Others: Tibor, Alena

Institution: Nora, Astrid

Change: Michael

Deadlines: 29th October

7. Final publication

See the structure we agreed on attached

As for the adaptation chapter: each country writes their report as they want, the report template previously circulated can be used as a crutch

Chapters that need common agreement are the following:

4. Methodology of the competency framework development

5. Leadership competencies - the competent leader (THE PRODUCT)

11. Summary of conclusions and recommendations for policy makers and users of the competence profile

Deadline: 16th November

Deadline for all the other chapters: 26th November

Reading and feedback until Innsbruck: 28th November

Finalizing in Innsbruck...

8. Planning the Innsbruck meeting

arrival: 28th November

departure: 30th November

Planned programme:

School visit (primary and maybe VET secondary)

Discussions

Project programme:

Peer-review on the development process

Brushing up the final publication

9. Tasks to do..., deadlines

1. Write missing vignettes – deadline: **29th October**

Alena, Tibor: L&M Others

Eliska, Vladimir: L&M Self

2. Formulate 5 synthetic sentences (“key competencies”) – deadline: **29th October**

Self: Vladimir

Others: Tibor, Alena

Institution: Nora, Astrid

Change: Michael

3. Write the relevant chapters of the final publication

Chapters that need common agreement: Deadline: **16th November**

Reading and feedback: **23rd November**

Modifications according to feedback: **28th November**

Deadline for all the other chapters: **26th November**

Reading and feedback until Innsbruck: **28th November**