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1. Focus of the German national project
Research questions

1) Can we find relationships between effective leadership, teacher cooperation and teaching practice in classrooms?

2) Does it make a difference concerning teaching quality, whether teachers are participating in institutionalised teams with characteristics of professional learning communities?

3) Is professional learning in teacher teams able to influence learning achievements of students over time of one school year?

4) Which process factors of developmental work have an impact on improvement of teaching practice and student`s achievements?

5) Are different teaching arrangements able to reduce the relation between student`s achievements and social background? What kind of role does the composition of pupils on classroom level play?
Assumptions concerning teaching development

• Effective leadership patterns with focus on teaching and instruction is closely related to a high readiness of innovation and intensive development of teaching.

• Teacher collaboration in institutionalised teams with characteristics of professional learning communities is able to enhance systematic school development and improvement of teaching.

• Goal orientated and professional teamwork with focus on student learning can contribute to added value on student`s achievements.

• Schools with systematical and goal orientated development strategies (school program work, self-evaluation, teacher trainings etc.) are able to enhance teaching quality over time.
Model of research for school quality

Input:
Pre-conditions on system level, steering processes on system- and regional level

Process:
Quality on school and classroom level

Output:
Cognitive abilities, learning-related dispositions, social behaviour

Socioeconomic background of the pupils
Educational level of family, migration background, social environment, extracurricular learning resources
2. Design and methods
Sample

- Sample
  - Each participating country 50 up to 60 schools with about 1,500 - 3,000 pupils, all teachers
  - Germany: 54 schools with about 1,500 pupils, all teachers
    - national addition: all headmasters and parents
Instruments and analyzing methods

- **Achievement test**
  - Test booklets with released items from TIMSS 2007 (mathematics and natural science), Development of pupils‘ achievement within one year in school (beginning and end of grade 4)
- **System level**
  - Half standardised interviews with stakeholders of education policy
  - Content analysis of documents concerning school policy (curriculum, guidelines, etc.)
- **Headmasters, teachers, pupils, parents**
  - Standardised questionnaires

- **Multi-level analyses**
- **Triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data**
We created a 'Social Index' for an adequate measurement of the pupils' socioeconomic background. Further development of this index with the teams from Ireland and Cyprus for the ESF project:

Instrument is based on Bourdieu’s dimensions:
Economic & Cultural Capital:
- e.g. In your home, do you have? (A newspaper, A second car, A gardener etc.)
- About how many books are there in your home?
Social Capital:
- e.g. My parents always know where I go after school, I tell my parents about my friends and our activities
- e.g. Migration background
- e.g. What language do you speak at home most of the time?
Measurements: culture of organisation

• readiness for innovation of the staff
• goal orientated leadership
• leadership related to teaching practice
• management competencies of headmasters
• intensity of teacher cooperation
• involvement of teachers in institutionalised teams
• time space for cooperation (team time)
• activities and characteristics of teamwork (concerning basic dimensions of professional learning communities: shared goals, deprivatization, reflexive dialogue and analysis, focus on student learning, efforts für effective teaching)
• goals and benefits of teamwork for teachers (support, learning opportunities, capacity building for change through analysis and diagnosis, improvement of teaching quality)
Measurements: school development work

- intensity of developmental efforts
- use of systematical and goal orientated activities within school program work
- participation of teachers in school program work
- intensity of practice on internal evaluation
- perception of effects on teaching and on school level
- development activities after data feedback from periodical student assessment
- development activities after feedback from external evaluation/inspection report
- goal orientated steering by steering committee
- special practices on teaching development
- school policy and strategies for teaching improvement
Influence factors on school level

• Validation and evaluation of arrangements concerning the learning environment:
  – Are there guidelines in school for the development of teaching?
  – Which arrangements of organisational culture contribute to the improvement of teaching?
  – How does the school support the establishment of a conducive learning environment?
Influence factors on classroom level

• Role of the teacher in arranging and developing of teaching
  – Methodical approach and structuring of teaching
  – Steering of learning and teaching processes
  – Differentation and support for learning
  – Time management in teaching
  – Creating learning climate in classroom
Influence factors on individual level

- Socioeconomic status of pupils
- Structure of labour force and prosperity in the familiar environment
- Motivation with regard to subjects and self-concept
- Analyses on learning processes, pupils’ abilities, use of learning possibilities
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3. Outlook
• Delivery of first data in January 2011 → Cross-sectional analyses
• Second Measurement in June 2011
• Longitudinal analyses
• Final report to be finished until September 2012
Thank you very much for your attention!

Contact:
officebos@ifs.tu-dortmund.de, holtappels@ifs.tu-dortmund.de
Institute for School Development Research (IFS),
University of Dortmund, Germany
Goals for working in teams as professional learning communities

- Reducing isolation through intensive communication
- Enhancing the capacity for development of teacher staff with regard to pedagogical work and problem-solving
- Creating a supportive and productive environment for teachers
- Giving opportunities for further learning
- Common efforts for improvement of organizational and teaching quality

(reference: Hall/Hord 2001)
Characteristics of professional learning communities
(based on: Leithwood 2000)

- reflexive dialogue and continuous analysis
- intensive communication about teaching and learning
- focus on student’s learning achievements
- teacher cooperation for enhancing effectiveness of teaching
- shared goals and values
Acting as professional learning communities: Quality of professional teamwork of teachers in institutionalized teams

Means of scales concerning teamwork acting in PLCs

- Goal orientated teamwork: 3,03
- PLC: faculty teams focusing on development of teaching patterns: 2,89
- PLC: analysis and diagnosis in faculty teams: 2,26
- PLC: focusing improvement of teaching patterns: 2,46
- PLC: focusing student learning: 3,14

Project Self-managing Schools; Holtappels 2008
## Relationships between teacher trainings and teaching patterns results on school level (n=69) - regression coefficients/explained variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>patterns of teaching and learning in classroom</th>
<th>Teach.train.</th>
<th>Teach.train. + PLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student orientated teaching</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>(10,9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal differentiation</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>(1,4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrangement for self-regulated learning</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>(2,2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students work with self-chosen exercises</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>(6,3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students present learning results</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>(2,6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students on task working in groups</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>(7,3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 69 schools (teacher data aggregated on school level); Signific.: * p<.05
Impact of process variables on quality of teaching
- result of multiple regression (beta-values) on school level

Multiple R = .822 / explained variance = 68 % / Signific.: ** p<.01, ***p<.001
n = 42 schools (teacher data aggregated on school level)

readiness for innovation within staff

professional teamwork in faculty groups with focus on teaching development

professional teamwork in faculty groups with focus on analysis and diagnosis

steering style of steering groups through bargaining

differentiated teaching patterns (teacher data)
Impacts of leadership competencies and acting of steering groups on quality of teaching in mathematic lessons

Structural Equation Model (teacher data 2007 aggregated on school level)
(CFI= 0,943, TLI= 0,934, RSMEA = 0,081, Chi²/DF = 1,46, n=70)

Project Self-managing Schools; Feldhoff 2008