1994

Field of Dreams : Australia's National Schools Project

William Louden
Edith Cowan University

John Wallace
Curtin University of Technology

FIELD OF DREAMS: AUSTRALIA'S NATIONAL SCHOOLS PROJECT

William Louden (Edith Cowan University)
John Wallace (Curtin University of Technology)

Introduction

"If you build it, they will come," says one of the characters in the film *Field of Dreams*. In the key scene of the film, the magical power of belief draws dreamers and long-dead baseball heroes together in a baseball diamond cut from a mid-western farmer's corn field. Belief overcomes reality, and the film's characters and their baseball heroes play the perfect baseball games of imagination in the light of a long golden dusk.

The National Schools Project is like that, we think, in three ways. First, its creators' have believed that it is possible for Australian schools to be more participative, democratic and effective. They have dreamed of schools that are not stifled by the rigidities of the bureaucratic frameworks erected by generations of school system managers and union officials. Second, against a backdrop of falling resource allocations to education, industrial unrest and declining teacher morale, the creators of the National Schools Project have set up a framework for reform and invited teachers and schools to join them in their field of dreams. They built the National Schools Project and hundreds of schools have come to join them. Third, like the film itself, the project is surrounded by sceptics who want to replace the golden light of the dream with the harsher light of external evaluation, to tell us that it was all a dream. Perhaps this metaphor is a bit far-fetched, but the purpose of this paper is to explain why we think that the National Schools Project is a "field of dreams" — bravely imagined, worth believing in, if not quite tangible close-up.

The Dream: Building the National Schools Project

The National Schools Project is built on a particular analysis of the problem of school reform in Australia in the dying years of the century. Best articulated by Max Angus (1992, 1993), the analysis is that the fundamental problem in school reform is the structural rigidity of schools and school systems. New forms of work organisation are necessary to refocus schools on the student outcomes required for the new millennium, and these new forms of work organisation are prevented at the school level by the bureaucratic constraints applied by unions and employers. This

new paradigm for school reform emerged in the context of reforms to the whole system of labour relations in Australia in the late 1980s. Through the "structural efficiency principle", the nation's centralised wage-fixing agencies argued that wage rises could only be allowed from productivity gains. These productivity gains were expected to be made through the review of industrial agreements with the twin goals of increasing efficiency and providing workers with access to more varied, fulfilling and better paid jobs. It requires only a small translation to see the National Schools Project as a reflection of the structural efficiency principle. The National Schools Project involved union and employer representatives in equal numbers, working together to improve productivity (student outcomes) and working conditions (especially job satisfaction) by reviewing the regulatory frameworks of education.

This program of school reform grew out of the structural efficiency principle, and out of practical experience of frustration with the heavy weight of regulations on Australian schools. In a period of decentralisation and devolution of authority to schools, the possibility of reform was often frustrated by the capacity of middle-level employer and union bureaucrats to limit reforms that had bottom-up support in schools and top-down support from school systems and governments. One example of the regulatory restriction on school reform was the Managing Change in Schools Project, which was in many ways a precursor to the National Schools Project. This project, conducted by the Western Australian Ministry of Education in 1988-89, was designed to remove obstacles to devolution and decentralisation. A key element in the project was an undertaking by the Ministry to waive regulations, where possible, so that the schools would feel empowered to exercise self-determination. Schools were encouraged by the Ministry to undertake reviews of their institutions and to question the basic functions and structures of schools. Schools were told not to feel limited by existing rules because, where possible, regulations would be waived to allow experimentation to proceed. Central office stressed, however, that all proposals had to be

within acceptable workload limits for school staff and could not involve ongoing additional funding.

One of the seven schools engaged in this project was NDHS, a small district high school in a progressive country town. The school community began its involvement by spending a lot of time reaching agreement that its goal would be "contribute to make an independent, responsible, confident adult learner" (Chadbourne, 1991, p.30). As a next step, the school looked at ways in which its own structure could be reshaped to best achieve the agreed objective. One proposal from the staff centred on the idea of organising into four teams, each with an elected leader. It was felt that smaller teams had the advantage of being able to respond more readily to the needs of students. For the next two years, the school worked within this restructured model with some success. Teachers reported that they felt empowered by the team approach and that their contribution to the decision making and learning processes made a difference to student outcomes (Chadbourne, 1991).

To facilitate the school's restructuring, NDHS sent a request to the Ministry to replace the deputy principal position with a number of limited tenure leadership positions. The Teachers Union, which also received a copy of the school's request, was concerned with the industrial implications of the proposal and wrote to the Ministry with the advice that this was "a further example of the need to rein-in the [Managing Change] project so that ... schools participating in the project do not have their expectations dashed or the Ministry left with egg on its face" (Chadbourne, 1991, p.33). The issue was held over for some months until the incumbent deputy principal at NDHS applied for a promotion to another school. This time, when the school tried to force the issue, the principal was advised by the Ministry that it was unable to endorse the proposal, citing a list of industrial and human resource difficulties.

Without central support for school changes, the initiatives at NDHS faltered soon afterwards. The frustrations with the system response to the school's request for support were evident in the following comments by school personnel:

There were times when the school felt totally on its own as it tried to challenge existing practices. It seemed that the unions did not want to change and that some of the personnel in at central office wanted to maintain the status quo.

The message was sent to 'challenge the system' yet the message being enacted was 'don't bother to

challenge the system, it's too hard and if you do you are on your own'. (Chadbourne, 1992b, p.61)

When the National Schools Project was developed two years later, in 1991, it built on the experience of the difficulties in sustaining projects such as Managing Change in Schools. The key difference between Managing Change and the National Schools Project was the attempt to build a union-employer partnership that was resilient enough to ensure that permission would be granted to waive rules that fitted within the agenda for reform.

After several years of bitter nation-wide industrial disputes in education, culminating in a round of significant wage-rises in 1990, there was a period of uneasy acceptance by the national teachers unions and the major public and private employers of teaching that improvements in the quality of teaching and learning in schools could only be pursued in a climate of cooperation between the industrial parties. In this environment, the National Project for the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQTL) was born. The NPQTL was jointly sponsored by the Commonwealth government, the major employers of teachers in each state and territory and the national teachers' unions, and funded by the parties for three years of national-scale research and development projects. The National Schools Project is one of three initiatives which emerged from the NPQTL. In 1991 the National Schools Project set out to test 'the efficacy of giving schools the authority to manipulate their work organisation arrangements outside the current boundaries and within the framework of the systems work unit' (Angus, 1992, p.2). By using rule 'waivers', the project offered schools a mechanism to trial new types of work organisation currently prohibited by awards, regulations, and union and employer policies. Schools were invited to develop proposals for changes to work organisation to put before joint employer-union steering groups for approval. Once these proposals are successfully trialed, it was hoped that they could form the basis for reforming the structural and regulatory framework for the school system. In 1992, the project commenced with 50 schools which expanded to nearly 200 schools during 1993.

There are two key parts to the dream of the National Schools Project, the mandate to challenge the regulatory framework within which schools usually operate, and the 'template' for schools participating in the project. The template binds schools to the structural efficiency principle-inspired paradigm for school reform, but not to any particular views of curriculum,

assessment or instruction. The template includes the following articles of faith:

- acceptance that the school has primary responsibility for improving students learning outcomes;

- a commitment to greater participation of students in the learning process;

- a willingness to examine current work organisation to identify both good practice and impediments to effective management of the teaching/learning process;

- a willingness to develop and model participative workplace practice; and

- an understanding and acceptance of the industrial rights and responsibilities of all parties.

Within this framework National Schools Project schools have been free to find their own educational reasons for change, and their own solutions to problems. Unlike most contemporary educational reform programs in Australian schools — national curriculum profiles and state-wide devolution of responsibility to schools, for example — the details of the program have not been worked out by experts outside of the school.

The Dreamers: Schools that Joined the National Schools Project

The National Schools Project, then, cleared a space in the metaphorical corn field of schooling and made a commitment to cut away, bend or break the rules which prevented schools from getting on with the game of school improvement. The union and employer officials who planned the National Schools Project were right. When they cleared the Schools Project space, schools did come, and they wanted to share in the dream of more democratic, collegial and productive schools. According to David McRae, who prepared case studies of six National Schools Project schools early in 1993, what the key teachers in these schools had in common was their altruism:

The initial motives of the prime movers were, of course, varied. Essentially, however, they appear to have been universally altruistic. These reforms were not driven by individual financial or other rewards. None were available. Personal rewards for those at the centre of the process would include professional development and any satisfactions implicit in the experience and the results. (McRae, 1993, p. 103)

Their plans for change were varied, but what they had in common was a belief that the conditions of teaching and learning in schools could be improved. The three schools described below give a sense of the range of conditions under which National Schools Project schools pursued their plans for improvement.

School 1: BSHS

BSHS was one of seven Western Australian schools participating in the first year of the National Schools Project. A metropolitan senior high school, BSHS has approximately 940 students, 70 teaching staff, and 14 ancillary and support staff.

The school agreed to join the National Schools Project in the latter part of 1991. Reporting on the school's involvement in the project, Chadbourne (1992a) describes some of the internal difficulties experienced by the school. The decision to join the project was hurried and not unanimous. For the first term of 1992, the school's internal politics racked the project committee with many staff feeling left out of the process and frustrated at the lack of progress. From the outset, the project had to compete with many other priorities including school development planning, student discipline, school/industry links and monitoring student standards. Even six months into the project these ongoing priorities and seasonal activities such as the school ball and examinations meant that the National Schools Project was quite lowly ranked on the 'league ladder' of school activities.

Nine months into the project at BSHS, the achievements of the National Schools Project were unclear. Most of the project-related activities described by Chadbourne (1992a) such as an increased interest by some staff in more student centred teaching approaches, a more participative decision making policy and better links with local industry were already running prior to the National Schools Project. The school's only proposal to the state steering group for the school to retain its temporary teachers was rejected because of poor supporting rationale. The project committee were working on an initiative to introduce an alternative pastoral care structure based on smaller teams of teachers but this was still down the track. Chadbourne (1992a) concludes that many arguments still need to be won, that industrial issues negotiated and professional interests accommodated before the project flourishes at BSHS.

School 2: WHS

WHS was another one of the seven schools to accept an invitation to join the pilot group of schools in Western Australia. This country high school with approximately 160 students in Years 8-10, had 16 teachers and four ancillary staff. While the school was structured in a traditional fashion, school decision making was reasonably collaborative prior its entry to the National Schools Project in late 1991. The school was already engaged in the school development planning process.

The same kinds of National Schools Project reforms — changes to work organisation and rule waivers — were being tested at both WHS and BSHS. At WHS the project did receive a high level of support from staff from the outset. Project decisions were dealt with in a highly collaborative manner and the project soon became an umbrella for much school activity. However, like BSHS, the WHS staff directed the focus of the project onto curriculum and school development issues rather than the structural issues identified in the National Schools Project template. The school adopted as a goal the development of student skills in independent learning and invested considerable energy experimenting with student centred learning strategies. The school formed a student consultative committee and made plans to institute a cross-curricular approach to the teaching of Art and Technology for Year 8 in the following year.

The state National Schools Project project team, anxious to make progress on its work restructuring agenda, pressed the school to generate proposals for rule waivers. The school resisted the pressure to submit proposals for rule waivers. When the school did submit proposals to the state steering group — four were submitted during the year — none were approved. The proposal for more flexible deployment of non-teaching staff was unacceptable to the union; the proposal for more school input into teacher transfers was unacceptable to the employer. However, as Wallace and Wildy (1993) note in their review of the project, this failure to obtain approval for the proposals was not viewed too seriously by the school. As a small school with few structural rigidities, WHS found that it was able to proceed with most of its early plans without the need for central rule changes.

It was only into the second year of the project that WHS discovered any real system barriers to its work. Two issues were of particular concern. The first involved a desire on the part of the staff to have more say over staff transfers to the school. In some

cases, new staff moving into the school had some difficulty adjusting to the project philosophy. The second issue was related to the school's move to change its student reporting system in Year 8 to a system of student profiles. While the system had given some 'encouragement' for this initiative — and indeed was planning for state-wide implementation in the longer term — the school was concerned that it was too far in front of the system and that this might cause concern among the local community. The school sought reassurance that they had the full backing of the Ministry. In the words of the principal:

We have been encouraged by the Ministry and the National Schools Project to move ahead on student profiles and now the Ministry won't come out and say that this is the way to go.

Wallace and Wildy (1993) concluded that there is little doubt that the school's membership of the National Schools Project provided a focus for school-based learning, discussion and activity about teaching and learning which might not otherwise have taken place. It is not so clear whether the school's restructuring activity was of the kind and magnitude originally envisaged by the National Schools Project. Neither is it clear whether the National Schools Project is capable of responding to the school's particular concerns about external structural barriers.

School 3: Hincks Avenue

Hincks Avenue Primary School is a K-7 primary school in Whyalla, South Australia. Whyalla is a fading mining and industrial centre with a population of about 30,000. Reporting on the development of the National Schools Project at Hincks Avenue, McRae (1993, p. 28) notes that the school population "is characterised by a high level of transience and a considerable level of poverty". The school has 240 students and sixteen teaching staff. The beginning of the current round of changes at Hincks predates the National Schools Project by several years. The appointment of a new principal in 1990, followed a year later by a new deputy principal, provided the school with a powerful new leadership team. The changes began with the development of a new school plan, which included an attempt to develop a shared set of 'operating principles' for the school. The values of trust, open communication, team work, individual dignity and worth were not just words on a page. As one of the staff said, "We also felt that it was important to state them publicly and make them a feature of the school. 'This is what we believe in. These are our priorities.' You could make sense of things for people" (McRae, 1993, p.31). Alongside

this work teachers in the school also reconsidered their own role statement, emphasising the importance of collaboration and teamwork.

This period of refocussing paved the way for the school restructuring activities attempted when the school joined the National Schools Project. The specific changes in the school include some small-scale rebuilding to increase the space available for teaching, a school-wide behaviour management program which focuses on prevention rather than cure, and some changes in pedagogy intended to make explicit what is to be learned, how it can be learned and why it is worth learning. Perhaps the most radical changes have been in staff deployment. Three significant changes were cited: grouping of teachers into teams (junior, middle and upper school), grouping children in multi-age classes, and reorganising the school support staff. Instead of using the support staff for the usual purposes ("preparing signs, charts and posters, sticking up displays, photocopying print material and watering pot plants" [McRae, 1993, p. 38]), support staff have been integrated into the teaching teams. Their title in the school has also been changed to reflect the new role. Each class now has between eight and 27 hours of 'education worker' time each week, and the education workers have more responsibility and a deeper association with a particular class group.

This has been an ambitious program of reform, all of it has been consistent with the National Schools Project template, but the impetus has come from the staff's own appreciation of what needs to be changed. After three hard years, parents believe the school to have been transformed. They are "glowing in their appreciation of the changes in student behaviour and demeanour" (McRae, 1993, p.40). The staff are clearer about what they do — p.40). The staff are clearer about what they do — what's worth the effort and what is not — and there is a high level of collaboration and consistency among staff.

Dreams and the Light of Day: Evaluations of the National Schools Project

As the comments on these three National Schools Project schools have suggested, messages about the success of the National Schools Project to date are mixed. Schools have joined the National Schools Project for a variety of reasons and have used the National Schools Project as a very broad rubric which may stretched to fit the programs of change already under way in each school. Few schools have begun with the work organisation issues that are so central to the explicit goals of the National Schools Project. Judged by the specifics of the National Schools Project's hope that project

schools' structural experimentation would guide the reform of the bureaucratic framework for a larger number of schools, the evidence of the success of the National Schools Project is not convincing. McRae's set of six case studies of National Schools Project schools provides more examples of rethinking of administrators' roles than rethinking of teachers' roles (1993, p.106), some limited evidence of change in teaching strategies, particularly towards targeting of student outcomes, small group work and activity centres in classrooms (p.110); and extensive experimentation with student grouping (p.108). What impressed him as the most effective change was in the area of teacher collaboration:

At four of the schools formalised teaching 'teams' were in operation. Collaborative planning and occasional team teaching were widespread. Although not universally successful, increased levels of teacher collaboration were generally reported to have increased teachers' skill levels, resources and teaching strategies, to have produced higher levels of accountability (to each other) and shared responsibility, and to have significantly improved the sense of support. (McRae, 1993, p. 107).

Similarly, Lyndsay Connors' evaluation review panel (Connors, 1993) noted that in the forty schools they visited the National Schools Project had encouraged a sense of ownership and control by teachers of their own work, increased their opportunities to work collaboratively, and increased students' opportunities to take responsibility for their own learning.

So, what can we make of the dream of the National Schools Project, in the cold light of external evaluators' views of the schools? The first message from these studies is about the importance of school culture. Reforms, no matter how well conceptualised or powerfully sponsored, are likely to fail in the face of a culture of resistance. Equally it is important to recognise that overcoming cultural resistance takes time, preceding by many months (or years) any tangible structural shifts. Reflecting on schools' uptake of the National Schools Project ideas, Angus (1993) says that no-one in the project realised how long it would take schools to make decisions about the kinds of changes they wished to pursue. The cultural readiness of the schools described above was a critical ingredient in the progress of the proposed changes, and this conclusion. At BSHS, the National Schools Project barely touched the culture of the school. At WHS and Hincks, in contrast, the National Schools Project was co-opted to support

changes already under way in school cultures that were open to change.

The second observation is that structural complexity often serves to stifle change. The bureaucratic structure of organisations cultivates in people a bureaucratic mind set. At its worst, the consequence of this mind set is that people tend to work in isolation. There is little incentive to share ideas or explore ways of doing things differently. Moreover, the structures of complex schools such as BSHS are themselves resistant to change. So, projects like the National Schools Project which challenge teachers to generate alternative structures, tend to produce surface interest but the core structures remain firmly in place. Schools like NDHS and Hincks, which were able to make some internal structural adjustments — to decision making structures, teaching teams, joint planning arrangements — were already structurally more open than schools with three or four times as many staff. Pre-existing structural openness meant that schools could institute changes in the first instance without having to seek special sanction from the state authorities.

Thirdly, the prospects for change are greater when the change is seen locally as fundamental to the operation of the school. The principal in one of McRae's case study schools talked about having an "uncluttered" vision for the school, a simple idea which has the highest priority (McRae, 1993, p.113). While this might seem to be an obvious notion, it is not all that straightforward. Schools are faced with overloaded improvement agendas. Therefore, it is not only a question of whether a given need is important, but also how important it is relative to other needs. Often — as was the case with BSHS — the new project gets relegated to the 'second division' because of more pressing concerns. Moreover, precise needs are often not clear at the beginning especially with complex changes. As the WHS and NDHS experiences demonstrate, people often become clearer about their needs only when they start doing things.

The National Schools Project and the Prospect of School Improvement

One of the ways of conceptualising school reforms is in terms of centralised and decentralised initiatives. Cuban (1990) describes the cyclic nature of these reforms as they operated in the USA. The reform movements of the sixties produced the drive for participation and equity in schools and the push to decentralise authority to govern schools. By the late 1970s, centralising authority gained support from state policy makers who pursued school improvement through legislation.

Measures such as standardised testing, teacher certification and career ladders and were introduced as levers for change. Within a few years it was recognised that state bureaucracies were incapable of improving local schools. 'Third wave' reforms set out to restructure the school system by moving power back to the school which was now recognised as the unit of change. This decentralised reform effort was pursued through strategies such as school-site management and fostered by programs such as Ted Sizer's Coalition for Essential Schools.

Australia, with a distinctly more centralist history of educational governance, has experienced a different balance to the school reform agenda. Throughout the 1970s and early 1980s, the various state education authorities were preoccupied with reorganising the structure, content and delivery of the curriculum. Considerable resources to support curriculum implementation were distributed through the state education departments. These centralised state initiatives were offset by the largely decentralising effect of the participation and equity programs funded by the federal government in the seventies (eg. the Priority Schools Program, the Participation and Equity Program and the Innovations Program). This pattern was changed in the mid-1980s when the various state authorities began to restructure central bureaucracies, devolving responsibility for various tasks from head offices to schools and reducing central support services.

History tells us that neither top-down nor bottom-up approaches to school reform work on their own (Fullan, 1992). Central initiatives do not work because they attempt to standardise curriculum and performance in a way that is ineffective except for the narrowest goals. They simply fail to respond to the cultural complexity of schools. Bottom-up reforms are problematic because individual schools lack the capacity to manage the change and because the changes cannot be tracked and sustained. Site-based management has been criticised because of its failure to bring across-the-board improvement to the core function of schools, teaching and learning. Cultural reforms, such as those achieved by the Coalition of Essential Schools, while meaningful and effective at the local level are typically confined to small groups of teachers and schools. They are less than persistent and the findings from these efforts have not been transferable to other schools. In Australia, the school-based curriculum development movement and the various equity programs produced useful innovations which managed to mobilise communities and produce interesting local effects. However, the

idiosyncratic nature of the innovations and the broad parameters for what counted as success meant that there was little transference of ideas from one school to the next. In short, it would seem that neither centralised nor decentralised approaches to school reform are producing the broad *national* effects demanded by the wider educational community.

One of the strengths of the National Schools Project, we believe, is in the subtle balance between top-down-ness and bottom-up-ness A number of observations are worth making about this approach to school reform. First, it is clear that the structures of some schools — particularly larger schools — are in need of redesign. But, the structures of many other schools are already sufficiently open to allow for all manner of improvements. The paradox is that existing structural characteristics of schools affect teachers' capacity to imagine a new world. Schools that need to change can't change and schools that don't need to change can change. But this has always been the case. What the National Schools Project does which is different from other reforms is to recognise school structure as a fundamental issue in school reform. By constantly bringing teachers back to that issue, the National Schools Project holds some chance of helping schools break out of the structural paradox. The relative openness of the National Schools Project template, however, also means that schools have room to work through their own self-selected bottom-up issues until a genuine need for structural redesign emerges. The National Schools Project has adopted a process in which there is a role for central authorities and a role for local school communities. Success requires for merging of those roles in a complex and ambiguous way. It means an understanding on the part of policy-makers that progress needs to be measured from the cultural perspective of the school rather than from the technical time-lines of the project. Equally, it requires an understanding from teachers of the need to see and experience the world beyond the egg crate of their own classroom.

The second issue emerging from early experience of the National Schools Project concerns the assumption that the school is the unit of reform (what Michael Fullan (1992) regards as one of the most misunderstood concepts in school reform). From the emerging evidence of the National Schools Project, it would appear that this notion works well in those schools which exhibit cultural readiness and structural openness. However, we also know that larger school organisations such as BSHS present a particular challenge. It is here that the notion of the school as the unit of change falls

down. It could be that the unit is something smaller — the year group or the subject department.

The final issue concerns the starting point for change in schools. While the National Schools Project focus was clearly on work organisation, most schools chose teamwork as the place to begin. It was only after some months of activity that schools began, albeit tentatively, to tinker with school structures. The regulatory framework was tested only when schools encountered problems with their school-level structural arrangements. At WHS, for example, this phase was not reached until eighteen months into the project. Schools, in other words, had a different sense of the order of progress of reform than the National Schools Project. With the benefit of early evaluations of successful National Schools Project activities, we are easily persuaded that the regulatory framework of schooling is in need of reform. The danger is that impatience about the progress of schools on the work organisation agenda may lead to premature judgments about the National Schools Project and withdrawal of support before schools have had a chance to work through the issues.

We began by arguing that the National Schools Project is a field of dreams, and acknowledging that this may seem too far-fetched a metaphor for the practical educational reform community. But too often, we think, the economic, political and managerial impulses for policy are the only impulses that seem to count in explaining what lives and dies in schools. Close-up to schools, it is altruism — teachers' hopes and dreams for themselves and the communities they work with — that makes the difference. This, we think, is also the force that has kept the National Schools Project alive. Even the supposed hard-heads who run school systems and teachers' unions have hopes and dreams. Even when they have been locked in competition for scarce resources in the depths of a long recession, some of the hard heads have been prepared to build a field of dreams. They have imagined more participative, flexible and collegial schools, and invited teachers to share their dreams.

The early signs are encouraging but not yet convincing. In schools that are already on a path of cultural change, it seems likely that the National Schools Project can assist them to press on towards much needed structural changes. Because it requires agreement to broad principles rather than specific curriculum or organisational initiatives, it has been relatively easy for schools with their own reform agenda to pursue their own goals within the general rubric of the National Schools Project. In schools that have not yet developed a cultural

environment that will support and sustain change, it is not quite clear that the National Schools Project will be the key that unlocks the structure. In a profession that lives on hope, however, we are all better off for the existence of projects such as the National Schools Project which allow us space and a reason to build our own fields of dreams.

References

Angus, M. (1992). *The National Schools Project: An issues paper*. Report for the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning. Perth.

Angus, M. (1993). Ambiguity and compromise: Making a virtue of necessity in school reform. In J. Wallace & W. Louden, (Eds.), *Leaders among the learners*. Fremantle, WA: Fremantle Education Centre.

Chadbourne, R. (1991). *Managing change in schools: A review of the Western Australian project*. International Institute for Policy and Administration: Edith Cowan University.

Chadbourne, R. (1992a). *The National Schools Project at Belmont Senior High: A formative review of the first nine months*. International Institute for Policy and Administration: Edith Cowan University.

Chadbourne, R. (1992b). Managing change in schools: A Western Australian experience. *Unicorn, 18*(4), 52-64.

Connors, L. (1993). *Evaluation of the National Schools Project*. Report to the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning. Canberra: Department of Employment, Education and Training.

Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. *Education Researcher, 19*(1), 3-13.

Fullan, M. (1992). *Successful school improvement*. London: Open University Press.

McRae, D. (1993). *Reforming school work organisation*. A report to the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. Canberra: Department of Employment, Education and Training.

Wallace, J. & Wildy, H. (1993). *The National Schools Project: School site experiences at restructuring*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.