



THE UNIVERSITY OF  
**WAIKATO**  
*Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato*

# Teachers and Curriculum

KAIAKO ME TE MARAUTANGA

VOLUME 16, ISSUE 2, 2016



## Editors

Special Section: The sigmoid curve

Rosemary Hipkins and Bronwen Cowie

General Section

Kerry Earl and Bill Ussher

## Editorial Board

Nigel Calder, Bronwen Cowie, Kerry Earl, Pip Hunter, Judith Mills, Carol Murphy, Kirsten Petrie, Carrie Swanson, Correspondence and articles for review should be sent electronically to Teachers and Curriculum Administrator, Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, Faculty of Education. Email: [wmier@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:wmier@waikato.ac.nz)

## Contact details

Teachers and Curriculum Administrator  
Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research  
Faculty of Education  
Private Bag 3105  
Hamilton 3240  
New Zealand

Phone +64 7 858 5171

Fax +64 7 838 4712

Email: [wmier@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:wmier@waikato.ac.nz)

Website: <http://tandc.ac.nz>

## About the Journal

Teachers and Curriculum is an online peer-reviewed publication supported by Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research (WMIER), Faculty of Education, The University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand. It is directed towards a professional audience and focuses on contemporary issues and research relating to curriculum pedagogy and assessment.

ISSN 2382-0349

## Notes for Contributors

Teachers and Curriculum welcomes

- innovative practice papers with a maximum of 3,500 words, plus an abstract or professional summary of 150 words, and up to five keywords;
- research informed papers with a maximum of 3,500 words, plus an abstract or professional summary of 150 words, and up to five keywords;
- thinkpieces with a maximum of 1500 words; and
- book or resource reviews with a maximum of 1000 words.

## Focus

Teachers and Curriculum provides an avenue for the publication of papers that

- raise important issues to do with the curriculum, pedagogy and assessment;
- reports on research in the areas of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment;
- provides examples of innovative curriculum, pedagogy and assessment practice; and

- review books and other resources that have a curriculum, pedagogy and assessment focus.

### **Submitting articles for publication**

Please consult with colleagues prior to submission so that papers are well presented. Articles can be submitted online at <http://tandc.ac.nz/>

### **Layout and number of copies**

All submissions must be submitted online as word documents. Text should be one and a half spaced on one side of A4 paper with 20mm margins on all edges. Font = Times New Roman, 11 point for all text and all headings must be clearly defined. Only the first page of the article should bear the title, the name(s) of the author(s) and the address to which reviews should be sent. In order to enable 'blind' refereeing, please do not include author(s) names on running heads. All illustrations, figures, and tables are placed within the text at the appropriate points, rather than at the end.

### **Foot/End Notes**

These should be **avoided where possible**; the journal preference is for footnotes rather than endnotes.

### **Referencing**

References must be useful, targeted and appropriate. The Editorial preference is APA style; see *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (Sixth Edition). Please check all citations in the article are included in your references list, if in reference list they are cited in document, and formatted in the correct APA style. All doi numbers **must** be added to all references where required. Refer: <http://www.crossref.org/>

### **Copyright**



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

### **Acknowledgement of Reviewers**

Thank you to the reviewers for their contribution to the process and quality of this issue. Many thanks to those who also helped with a review but the paper did not make it to this issue.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Special Section

<i>The sigmoid curve as a metaphor for growth and change</i> Rosemary Hipkins and Bronwen Cowie	3
<i>How can innovative learning environments promote the diffusion of innovation?</i> Mark Osborne	11
<i>The changing landscape of one primary school's mathematics curriculum</i> Wendy Dent and Jane McChesney	19
<i>Staying on the journey: Maintaining a change momentum with PB4L School-Wide</i> Sally Boyd	27
<i>Planning for sustainability from the outset</i> Janet Bourne	37

### General Section

<i>Introduction: General Section</i> Kerry Earl and Bill Ussher	45
<i>Reflective Practice AND Inquiry: Let's talk more about inquiry</i> Kerry Earl	47
<i>Listening to the voices of struggling students: A literature review</i> Janet Blaauw	55
<i>ThinkPiece: "Tell me, where do the children play?" Encouraging cross-sector conversations</i> Jeanette Clarkin-Phillips	61
<i>Thinkpiece 'We need something different to make a difference': Applying for the Teacher Led Innovation Fund</i> Rachel Allan	65

# STAYING ON THE JOURNEY: MAINTAINING A CHANGE MOMENTUM WITH PB4L SCHOOL-WIDE

**SALLY BOYD**

*New Zealand Council for Educational Research  
New Zealand*

## Abstract

*How do schools maintain momentum with change and enter new cycles of growth when they are attempting to do things differently? This article draws on a two-year evaluation of the Positive Behaviour for Learning School-Wide initiative to identify key factors that enabled schools to engage in a long-term and iterative change process. Fullan's systems-thinking ideas about school leadership and change, along with literature on the sustainability of educational initiatives, are used to analyse the interrelated factors that assisted schools to successfully embed this new initiative and address challenges. The design features of School-Wide, the way in which support for schools was organised, and practices within schools that created a continuous improvement culture, all contributed to schools being able to maintain a change momentum and continue to grow School-Wide in the longer-term.*

## Keywords

School reform; Collaborative leadership; Continuous improvement; Student behaviour; School culture

## The changes schools are attempting to make through *School-Wide*

For teachers and schools, having difficulties managing student behaviour can be a major barrier that gets in the way of learning. To provide new forms of assistance to schools, in 2010, representatives from a range of education sector groups made the decision to invest in Positive Behaviour for Learning (PB4L) *School-Wide*.<sup>i</sup> *School-Wide* supports schools to make a whole-school cultural change to ensure schools foster positive behaviours and relationships in a consistent manner. At the heart of this change is a paradigm shift away from punishing unwanted behaviour and towards building approaches that teach and acknowledge positive behaviour. The box below illustrates the nature of this shift by implying that approaches to behaviour need to be aligned with teaching and learning approaches.<sup>ii</sup>

### ***In the past in education***

“If a student does not know how to read, we teach  
If a student does not know how to swim, we teach  
If a student does not know how to multiply, we teach  
If a student does not know how to behave, we punish.”

*School-Wide* requires schools to engage in a substantial change process to create new ways of thinking and operating. Consistency is key and *School-Wide* supports schools to align systems, processes, and teacher practice so they all promote positive approaches to behaviour. Creating this

---

<sup>i</sup> For more information about the School-Wide initiative see: <http://pb4l.tki.org.nz/PB4L-School-Wide>

<sup>ii</sup> This text box is a slide that was adapted from School-Wide training materials. It was used by a case study school for whole-school professional learning and development.

Corresponding author

Email address: Sally Boyd [sally.boyd@nzcer.org.nz](mailto:sally.boyd@nzcer.org.nz)

ISSN: 2382-0349

Pages 27–36

kind of consistency is hard, especially if teachers and school leaders have different ways of thinking about and managing student behaviour, and school systems are unclear or complex to use.

### Putting in place the foundations for change

This article draws on the experiences of seven case study schools to explore the conditions which enable schools to successfully embed and grow *School-Wide* in the longer-term (Boyd, Hotere-Barnes, Tongati'o, & MacDonald, 2015). These schools were selected for their effective practice in *School-Wide*. The case studies were one component of a two-year evaluation of *School-Wide* (Boyd & Felgate, 2015).

A team of two researchers visited each case study school to interview a mix of school leaders and other *School-Wide* team members, teachers, and students. At most schools we also talked to a small number of parents and whānau or community members, and collected relevant school documents or summaries of data. The case study data from each school was summarised in a template and analysed qualitatively for themes.

All but one of the case study schools had been part of *School-Wide* since 2010. We visited most schools in their 5th year of involvement in *School-Wide*. We thought we might find that *School-Wide* had become 'business as usual', i.e., that it had faded into the fabric of school life. Instead, we found an initiative that was very much alive and had spread into other facets of school practice. With the school leaders and teachers at the seven schools, we reflected on how they were able, as was aptly described by some, to 'keep *School-Wide* fresh'.

Building understandings about how to keep the momentum going and enter new growth phases is a concern for schools, as well as for those who design and support initiatives in schools. First, this article briefly considers what the literature tells us about change in school settings. It then discusses three inter-related factors which contributed to the case study schools being able to maintain a momentum for change and continue to grow *School-Wide* in the longer-term. These factors are the design features of *School-Wide*, the way in which support for schools was organised, and practices within schools.

### The challenge of change

I have been involved in a number of studies where the research team have pondered the question "what enables some schools to maintain their momentum with new initiatives in ways that enable them to continue growing, whilst others seem to get stuck on a challenge or start to revert to previous practices?" The international educational literature tells us this is a common pattern. Findings from school improvement studies suggest that successes can be fragile (Fullan, 2007; Goldenberg, 2004; Hargreaves & Goodson, 2006). In a summary of studies about change in secondary schools, Hargreaves and Goodson (2006) found change initiatives rarely lasted or spread. One reason is 'reform fatigue' which can occur when funding for an initiative ends or when key staff leave (Goldenberg, 2004). Another reason is that, in an effort to find something that 'works' some schools go through a 'cycle of reforms' as they move from one school reform fad to another (Borman, Hewes, Overman, & Brown, 2003). As a result, schools can end up being involved in a package of initiatives, which are not necessarily connected. Fullan (2007) calls this 'initiative-itis'.

Fullan (2007) identifies that the success of change processes is influenced by a wide range of interrelated factors which include: the nature of the expected change; the way support for schools is designed; the level of alignment between the expected change and the system around schools; and the characteristics of each school. Thus prior research suggests that making a whole-school and system-wide paradigm shift, like the one expected through the *School-Wide* initiative, is not a quick fix or easy task.

### Assumptions about change

All initiatives designed for schools are underpinned by either explicit or tacit assumptions about how change happens. In New Zealand, many initiatives are funded for a few years with the expectation that practices will become embedded in schools. Then a new initiative comes along and funds and

attention are diverted. Underpinning this approach to change is the assumption that the implementation of each initiative is a linear process that results in a fixed and final end-point, and therefore ongoing action by the school or external support is not needed. Fullan (2004) challenges this assumption of linearity. Instead, he suggests that change processes in schools often take the form of multiple cycles of growth phases and plateaus that look like an s-shaped growth curve.

The seven *School-Wide* case study schools all appeared to be working in an iterative way through cycles of growth phases. Survey findings from the wider evaluation also suggested that many of the other schools that joined *School-Wide* in 2010 or 2011 were also maintaining or growing the initiative (Boyd & Felgate, 2015). However, a small number of the survey schools (around 15%) appeared to be in a ‘decline’ phase. Coaches at these schools reported their colleagues were starting to lose interest in *School-Wide* and were returning to previous practices. Some of the experiences that could rapidly shift a school’s focus and send it into a ‘decline’ included a change in school principal or among the teachers who were leading *School-Wide*, or high teacher turnover which led to inconsistent use of previously shared behaviour systems.

The case study schools had found ways to address (or avoid) some of the common challenges experienced by other schools that were in a ‘decline’ phase. This article will now consider the system-wide and school-level foundations that were needed for these schools to avoid decline phases, and make the adaptive breakthroughs necessary to solve challenges and enter new growth phases.

### Designing initiatives to assist schools to maintain a change momentum

The design of an initiative is one factor that can facilitate or hinder schools’ ability to maintain and build practice. The core features of the *School-Wide* framework, and the support structures to which schools had access, provided a foundation that assisted schools to avoid decline phases, or start new growth phases. The main design features of *School-Wide* are summarised in the text box below.

#### What is School-Wide? \*iii

*School-Wide* is the New Zealand version of an international evidenced-based initiative<sup>iv</sup> for primary, intermediate and secondary schools. *School-Wide* aims to support schools to engage in a cultural shift to ensure that staff practices, and school processes and systems, all work together to foster positive behaviours. *School-Wide* has been running in New Zealand since 2010. *School-Wide* is not a set ‘programme’, instead it is a framework of seven key features (in bold below) that can be adapt to suit the culture of each school and its community.

***School-Wide* prioritises leadership by the principal and a team.** A school team is created to implement *School-Wide*. The team has two core roles: team leader and coach. This team works collaboratively to develop **3–5 shared school values** and related behaviour expectations, and an **approach to behaviour that is used across the school**. This approach has three core aspects: the active **teaching of school behaviour expectations**; processes and systems for **acknowledging positive behaviour**; and **consequences that discourage unwanted behaviour**. A system is developed for recording behaviour incident data and the team meets regularly to **use this data** to identify unwanted behaviours, and to work collaboratively to find solutions.

Support for school leaders and team members includes a small initial participation grant, professional learning and development (PLD) in the form of training days, local school cluster meetings and access to regionally based advisors and annual conferences. Most of the support is funded and managed by the Ministry of Education.

*School-Wide* is the first layer of a three tier initiative. During *School-Wide*/Tier 1 (which is the focus of this article and the evaluation) schools put in place the seven core features to develop consistent approaches across the school. Then schools can move to Tier 2 (developing targeted interventions for small groups of students who need additional support) and Tier 3 (developing specialised interventions for students who need individualised support).

\* This description was adapted from Boyd and Felgate (2015).

<sup>iv</sup> *School-Wide* is the New Zealand version of *Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports* (PBIS). See <https://www.pbis.org/>



### **Using systems-thinking: Balancing top down and bottom up knowledge**

The design of *School-Wide* brings together local knowledge and evidence-based practice in a way that finds a balance between being ‘too tight’ and ‘too loose’. This dichotomy is one of the tensions that successful reforms need to balance (Fullan, 2007). Processes for change are less effective if they are too tight (e.g., top-down mandated reforms which do not create ownership) or too loose (bottom-up change where educators are left to shape an initiative to their own design) (Fullan, 2007; Hargreaves & Ainscow, 2015).

Fullan (2007) suggests a balance can be found by creating a continuous improvement culture which values innovation as well as accountability. This balance is clearly evident in the design of *School-Wide*. To enable local innovation, *School-Wide* is positioned as a framework which can be adapted to suit the context of each school. However, the initiative also has a strong focus on implementation fidelity as a form of accountability. The extent of school implementation of the key features is measured via the internationally developed *School-Wide* Evaluation Tool (SET).

Accountability is promoted through the use of data to review progress and identify needs. The results of SET are used formatively by schools to set goals and chart progress. These results are also used by regions or at a national level to identify areas in which schools might need more support. *School-Wide* also assists schools to develop processes to use student behaviour incident data to address concerns and review progress against goals.

The focus on data-driven problem-solving within each school and region, as well as nationally, fosters a continuous improvement culture within *School-Wide*. Schools or regions work to find solutions to concerns and therefore avoid ‘decline’ phases.

### **Knowledge-spreading networks that problem-solve**

Momentum is more likely to be maintained if reforms have systems thinking ideas embedded within their design (Fullan, 2004). To harness top-down and bottom-up knowledge and expertise, Fullan (2007) and Bentley (2010) suggest we need to shift away from ‘expert’ top-down leadership approaches towards models that share knowledge and build practice through open, collaborative processes and networks. In education settings, this implies we need an increased focus on creating and spreading knowledge through networked communities (Fullan, 2007; Hargreaves & Ainscow, 2015; Louis, 2010). These networks need to enable schools to learn from people within their own setting as well as in collaboration with other schools (Fullan, 2007; Hargreaves, Lieberman, Fullan, & Hopkins, 2010). For knowledge-spreading networks to become a reality, initiatives need to create the conditions that amass and mine these different sets of local expertise (Fullan, 2004).

Systems-thinking based understandings about how knowledge spreads are embedded within *School-Wide* support structures which are designed to facilitate knowledge sharing through a series of interconnected networks. These networks enable local expertise and the knowledge of the wider system to be shared in ways that strengthen school, school cluster, or national practice. One network is the *School-Wide* team within each school. Schools are also networked with each other through meeting at local cluster sessions or training days. At these sessions, *School-Wide* advisors encourage schools to work with each other to find solutions to challenges and share new innovations.

*School-Wide* advisors have regional networks and national connections that enable them to share emerging practice with each other and work together to find solutions to national or regional challenges. School staff and *School-Wide* advisors also meet at annual conferences to share emerging practice as well gain external input from international presenters. This range of structures assists both advisors and schools to harness expertise to solve challenges in ways that enable schools to stay on plateaus or start new growth cycles.

### **Support systems that assist schools to avoid decline phases**

A few of the different ways the expertise that exist within the wider *School-Wide* system has been used to assist schools to stay on plateaus or make adaptive breakthroughs are discussed next.



### **Problem-solving at a regional level**

Identifying common implementation barriers, and providing support to address these barriers, is one way of assisting schools to continue with a change journey. At a national level, *School-Wide* advisors and practice leaders form needs-based teams to support schools. As one example, over time it became evident that some schools were getting stuck at different points in the implementation process as they had not developed a strong enough collaborative foundation with their parent community, and particularly their Māori and Pasifika communities. A team of *School-Wide* advisors and practice leaders with relevant cultural expertise worked to redesign the *School-Wide* training process to ensure it offered more guidance to schools. The timing of this aspect of training was also altered so it became a more central part of the training process.

### **Creating space for sharing between schools**

Creating networking opportunities to share the expertise developed in individual schools assists the wider network of schools to learn. This sharing occurs at local cluster sessions where schools work collectively to share solutions and innovations. If needed, the *School-Wide* support system is also flexible enough to create new knowledge-spreading networks in response to emerging needs. One key challenge for secondary schools was making use of their existing Student Management System (SMS) to record and analyse behaviour incident data in the ways that are suggested by *School-Wide*. To spread local knowledge, school staff who had found solutions to this challenge were contracted by regional managers to run sessions for their peers about making the most of SMS systems. Thus, the expertise developed in one school could be shared with a wider range of schools.

### **Bringing together ‘outsider’ and ‘insider’ knowledge to promote change**

Bringing together ‘outsider’ and ‘insider’ knowledge assisted some of the case study schools when they were having difficulty moving forward. Research and new theory is one set of ‘outsider’ knowledge, and teacher expertise and practice-based knowledge is one set of ‘insider’ knowledge. Louis (2010) suggests that for change to be sustained, we need to create the conditions that bring together these two sets of knowledge. As a practical example of the sharing of these sets of knowledge, one school found it hard to move forward because they could not reach consensus about the nature of rewards to include in their student acknowledgement and reward system. Some staff did not agree with the use of extrinsic rewards, and wanted a system that promoted intrinsic rewards. At a whole school meeting, staff debated this issue. The local *School-Wide* advisor was invited to the school to present research findings about the benefits of different types of rewards. Staff used this knowledge, as well as their understanding of their school culture and what worked in their context, to develop a set of possible options. They then voted on one approach. Resolving this issue through the collaborative sharing of knowledge created a new growth phase for the school. One next step was to re-develop their acknowledgement system so that it had a good fit with their agreed-on approach.

### **Getting the foundations right at a school level**

At the case study schools, *School-Wide* had clearly been through more than one growth cycle. To be in a position to harness internal expertise to maintain a change momentum schools needed to invest time and energy in building a collaborative culture that enabled problem-solving and continuous improvement. With this foundation, they were able to solve their own challenges or identify the external expertise they needed to support them. The way schools went about building this foundation is discussed next.

### **Leadership that is both strong and collaborative**

Leadership of the principal and the school’s *School-Wide* team was critical to the success of *School-Wide*. Collaborative and distributed leadership approaches, and a strong team, assisted schools to avoid losing momentum and reverting to former practices.

The leadership style of the principal helped maintain a change momentum. Fullan (2007) considers that effective change requires schools to build their capability to self-improve by navigating through the seemingly contradictory positions of strong versus collaborative leadership. Most of the *School-Wide* case study schools had leaders who were strategic about finding this balance. They had a strong moral purpose and a clear vision for their school. However, they also worked in a highly collaborative way.

One of the key design features of *School-Wide* is that each school builds a team to manage the change process. The principal was usually a member of the team, and their continued involvement was one factor that assisted in keeping momentum going. The team includes two key leadership roles: a team leader and a coach. Principals supported the growth of a distributed leadership network by finding ways to formalise these new leadership roles. Leadership by a team fosters collaboration and makes use of a wide range of expertise as each team role harnesses different expertise. Leadership by a team rather than an individual also supports sustainability of initiatives, as if one leader leaves, there are others on the team who can keep the momentum going.

### **Fostering collaboration and innovation**

Working collaboratively assists schools to maintain a change momentum because ownership of an initiative is shared. The deliberative leaders at the case study schools worked in a highly collaborative way with all staff. They were aware that to create change in their setting they needed to take everyone with them on the journey. One *School-Wide* team leader summed up a sentiment we heard across many of the case study schools “Everything we do is school wide—it makes everyone accountable”.

The case study and survey data suggested that schools which were the most successful at maintaining and growing *School-Wide* placed a high priority on working collaboratively with teachers, support staff, students, and their parent communities right from when they joined *School-Wide*. They continued their collaborative focus over time.

Fullan (2011) suggests that when school’s capacity reaches a certain level, it is educators’ peers who become the main innovators. This was evident at the case study schools. The foundation of teamwork and collaboration that schools had put in place appeared to strengthen the continuous improvement culture at each school. The schools had become well versed in using collective expertise to solve problems and move forward.

### **Prioritising ongoing learning for all**

School leaders made a long-term commitment to teacher learning. This commitment assisted schools to access the knowledge and learning they needed to maintain a change momentum. A number of schools re-focused their whole school PLD programme to ensure it supported teachers to build capacity in practices relating to *School-Wide*, or that it provided new learning that addressed an identified challenge. One common challenge was fostering consistency in staff’s interactions with students. Some school leaders realised staff needed a stronger shared base of strategies for positively managing interactions. Whole school PLD was planned that offered strategies that were aligned with *School-Wide*. Examples included Incredible Years Teacher or restorative practices PLD. Joining Tier 2 of *School-Wide* was another way schools found opportunities for learning which supported new growth cycles. (See the earlier “What is *School-Wide*?” text box for information about Tier 2).

Aligning their PLD focus with *School-Wide* was one way school leaders created the sorts of learning culture and conditions that Timperley, Wilson, Barrar, and Fung (2007) suggest are likely to support changes to student outcomes. Knowing the importance of learning and working alongside teachers, principals were involved in these whole school-learning experiences.

Monitoring outcomes against a new school vision is another feature of teacher learning that supports change. As well as using student data to monitor change, most schools had developed systems to monitor teachers’ use of shared strategies and offer teachers feedback. Some schools developed a peer observation process. Others built teacher observations into their appraisal system.

### **Recursive elaboration: Spreading practice through new growth cycles**

A sense of coherence was a strong feature of the schools. Over time, these schools had worked in a cyclical way to revise many aspects of practice so they were better aligned with *School-Wide*. Working iteratively prompted new growth cycles.

*School-Wide* is a framework that can be adapted to suit the context of different schools. Thus, we would expect that schools would be revising aspects of practice that are related to the key features of *School-Wide*. For example, we would expect that schools would be reviewing and revising their values and behaviour expectations, acknowledgement and reward systems, consequences for unwanted behaviours, and system for recording and reporting behaviour incidents. As an example, most schools had revised their behaviour expectation matrix a number of times. One school had made at least six revisions. Through this iterative process, they built a stronger alignment between the behaviours in this matrix, the lessons they taught about behaviours, and the way they collected data.

Common across many of the schools was that they had also revised many other aspects of practice that at first glance did not appear to be core aspects of *School-Wide*. Some had revised their appraisal systems, curriculum planning foci, PLD focus, staff selection and induction processes, ways of communicating student successes to parents and whānau, and SENCO (Special Education Needs Coordinator) and deputy principal roles to ensure a closer fit with *School-Wide*. Each time they revised an aspect of practice they deepened their understanding of *School-Wide*. Thus, rather than getting ‘stuck’ on a challenge or a perceived lack of alignment between *School-Wide* and other aspects of school practices, the schools entered new growth cycles as they harnessed the expertise of staff to build stronger coherence across the school.

As teachers made new connections between *School-Wide* and other aspects of practice, they were prompted to review prior changes and their underpinning assumptions. Sometimes earlier practices were discarded, but they were also seen as an important step in the journey. A tolerance for uncertainty appears to be a necessary foundation for iterative change (Hipkins & Boyd, 2011; Hipkins, Cowie, Boyd, Keown, & McGee, 2011). An acceptance that some messiness was part of the process was a feature of the schools. As one teacher from a *School-Wide* team described:

[The school leaders] acknowledged it was a journey ... the fact it wasn't going to happen in five minutes ... It was spread over years—it's a marathon not a sprint. It was ok to say something didn't work, and we'd try something new.

### **Using evidence to inform change**

The case study schools had a highly collaborative approach to interpreting and using data. *School-Wide* prioritises data-driven and collaborative problem solving, and this assisted a stronger culture of continuous improvement to emerge in schools. At many schools, data was frequently shared with staff, who unpacked it together and used their collective expertise to develop solutions to concerns identified in the data.

Recursive elaboration was a feature of school data collection and usage processes. By their fifth year of *School-Wide*, the case study schools had well-developed systems for recording and using behaviour incident data, so most had turned their attention to broadening the way they used data. Some started to collect additional data that could assist them to redesign their transition and class placement processes. Others used data to identify teachers who needed more support to manage behaviour. Some turned their attention to systematising the recording and analysing of student acknowledgement and reward data. This enabled them to identify and target students who were ‘under the radar’ and could be missing out on positive acknowledgements. When we visited, a number of schools were engaged in a growth phase as they developed new ways to positively target and acknowledge these students. Widening the range of purposes for using data often required schools to revisit their initial systems to make sure they provided the needed information. Thus, data systems were revised and strengthened over time.

### **Maintaining AND growing: A strategic approach to change**

School leaders and teachers at the case study schools were aware that changing school cultures is a long-term process with no end-point. To maintain momentum with *School-Wide* they simultaneously employed a mix of strategies. Some of the strategies discussed above created new growth phases. Other strategies were aimed at enabling schools to stay on a plateau by maintaining consistency of practice. The case study schools had found solutions to the common challenges that could send other schools into a 'decline' phase. Across the wider group of schools, staff turnover was one such challenge. This turnover could impact on staff consistency in how they responded to behaviour incidents. The case study schools put in place a range of processes to address this challenge. Most had developed rigorous *School-Wide* induction and PLD processes for new teachers and support staff to ensure they were offered similar learning experiences to existing staff. Some altered their recruitment criteria to ensure they employed teachers who had knowledge of *School-Wide* practices or were supportive of its aims. Others had altered their appraisal criteria to incorporate a focus on practices that aligned with *School-Wide*.

### **Looking to the future**

#### **Scale up and spread**

Every year *School-Wide* is scaled-up to more schools. Coburn (2003) challenges the idea that the scale-up of a reform is only about expansion to extra sites. Her ideas about 'depth' and 'spread' are particularly pertinent to *School-Wide*. 'Depth' is related to the idea that a first priority is ensuring a reform promotes deep change to school and teacher norms, principles and beliefs, and thus underlying pedagogical principles. At the case study schools, depth was fostered through providing teachers with cycles of learning relating to *School-Wide* and opportunities to collectively build and revisit practice.

Coburn (2003) suggests that 'spread' can be thought of within classrooms, within schools, and within regions or nationally. For *School-Wide*, the first level of spread (or growth cycle) in schools appeared to be across teachers and the school practices that were more clearly related to *School-Wide*. At this point teachers could still perceive *School-Wide* to be an 'add-on'. Over time, *School-Wide* spread to ever widening circles at schools and thus became more embedded within the school culture. *School-Wide* also spread into the curriculum as teachers found new ways to interweave their school values within learning experiences. At some point during this slow spread of practice teacher thinking shifted to see *School-Wide* practices as an integral way of working rather than an 'add-on'.

Some schools entered new growth phases as they created further coherence by spreading their practice to include groups outside of school. For most of the case study schools, *School-Wide* had provided a vehicle to enhance how they consulted, communicated, or worked with their parent and whānau community. Some schools had developed processes for sharing their way of working with external professionals such as Resource Teachers: Learning and Behaviour (RTL) or Child, Youth and Family (CYF) social workers. Others forged stronger partnerships with local community groups such as local library staff or sports providers.

#### **Sustaining growth in the longer term**

Fullan's (2004) view of change describes a process of multiple cycles of growth phases and plateaus that looks like an s-shaped growth curve. In the introductory paper in this journal, Hipkins and Cowie (2016) suggest that the label 'plateau' is deceptive, in that it could be read as implying that no further actions are happening or needed. The experiences of the *School-Wide* case study schools suggest that during a 'plateau' schools are actively engaged in strategic actions to ensure key practices and systems are maintained. In addition, rather than their change journey being one linear sequence of growth phases and plateaus, these schools were engaged in more than one change sequence as they simultaneously maintained some practices, whilst growing others.

Building a culture that enables schools to sustain a change momentum involves a complex mix of factors that exist in the leadership approach and culture of each school, in the design of the initiative they are implementing, and in the system of supports that schools can access relating to this initiative. One learning from the *School-Wide* evaluation is the extent to which the design features of an

initiative can actively support schools to build a continuous improvement culture. This culture assists in creating the enabling conditions needed for schools to develop strategies for maintaining practice as well as self-generating new growth phases. The *School-Wide* focus on collaborative leadership, teamwork, and data-driven problem-solving assisted in strengthening this culture for schools and for the advisors who worked with schools.

Another *School-Wide* design feature that supported schools to maintain a change momentum is the use of networks to spread new ideas. These networks created a space in which innovations could be shared or ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ knowledge could be bought together. *School-Wide* has layers of networks, and accessing these provided a channel for schools to harness emerging expertise to address challenges.

The way the system of *School-Wide* supports was organised was another enabler. Access to external input and ideas could facilitate new growth phases for schools. Joining Tier 2 was one way schools accessed the learning and support needed to create another growth phase.

A future test for *School-Wide* will be whether it can sustain this momentum in the longer-term, as evident overseas (Simonsen et al., 2012). As schools progress through Tiers 1 to 3, findings from the evaluation and the school change literature suggest that some form of longer-term support or networks will be needed to ensure schools are enabled to maintain current practice as well as enter new growth phases.

## References

- Bentley, T. (2010). Innovation and diffusion as a theory of change. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational change* (Vol. 1, pp. 29-46). London, England: Springer.
- Borman, G., Hewes, G., Overman, L., & Brown, S. (2003). Comprehensive school reform and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 73(2), 125-230. doi:10.3102/00346543073002125
- Boyd, S., & Felgate, R. (2015). *A positive culture of support: PB4L School-Wide final evaluation report*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from [https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/special\\_education/a-positive-culture-of-support-pb4l-school-wide-final-evaluation-report](https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/special_education/a-positive-culture-of-support-pb4l-school-wide-final-evaluation-report)
- Boyd, S., Hotere-Barnes, A., Tongati'o, L., & MacDonald, J. (2015). *"It's who we are": Stories of practice and change from PB4L School-Wide schools*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from [https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/special\\_education/its-who-we-are-stories-of-practice-and-change-pb4l-school-wide-schools](https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/special_education/its-who-we-are-stories-of-practice-and-change-pb4l-school-wide-schools)
- Coburn, C. (2003). Rethinking scale: Moving beyond numbers to deep and lasting change. *Educational Researcher*, 32(6), 3-12.
- Fullan, M. (2004). *Systems thinkers in action: Moving beyond the standards plateau*. Nottingham, England: DIES Publications.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change (4th ed.)*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (2011). *Change leader: Learning to do what matters most*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goldenberg, C. (2004). *Successful school change: Creating settings to improve teaching and learning*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hargreaves, A., & Ainscow, M. (2015). The top and bottom of leadership and change. *Kappan*, 97(3), 42-48. doi:10.1177/0031721715614828
- Hargreaves, A., & Goodson, I. (2006). Educational change over time? The sustainability and nonsustainability of three decades of secondary school change and continuity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(1), 3-41. doi:10.1177/0013161X05277975
- Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M., & Hopkins, D. (2010). Introduction: Ten years of change. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational change* (Vol. 1, pp. xi-xxi). London, England: Springer.



- Hipkins, R., & Boyd, S. (2011). The recursive elaboration of key competencies as agents of curriculum change. *Curriculum Matters*, 7, 70-86.
- Hipkins, R., & Cowie, B. (2016, in press). The sigmoid curve as a metaphor for growth and change. *Teachers and Curriculum*, 16(2), 3–10.
- Hipkins, R., Cowie, B., Boyd, S., Keown, P., & McGee, C. (2011). *Curriculum implementation exploratory studies 2. Final report*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from <https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/curriculum/curriculum-implementation-exploratory-studies-2>
- Louis, K. (2010). Better schools through better knowledge. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational change* (Vol. 1, pp. 3–27). London, England: Springer.
- Simonsen, B., Eber, L., Black, A., Sugai, G., Lewandowski, H., Sims, B., & Myers, D. (2012). Illinois statewide positive behavioral interventions and supports: Evolution and impact on student outcomes across years. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 14(1), 5–16. doi:10.1177/1098300711412601
- Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2007). *Teacher professional learning and development: Best evidence synthesis iteration (BES)*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from <https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/series/2515/15341>