Presentation Title	**A Critical Analysis of the School Effectiveness Framework and the Research Implications of Its Implementation**
Format	**Paper Session [6.01]**
Sub-theme	**School Leadership and Management**

A Critical Analysis of the School Effectiveness Framework and the Research Implications of Its Implementation

Marie Josée BERGER
Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa

Georges J. DEI
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

Renée FORGETTE-GIROUX
University of Ottawa

Abstract

The Canadian educational system continues to search for more effective ways to enhance learning for all students. Schools and educators are being asked to ensure that schools are truly inclusive and that students from diverse backgrounds are exposed to effective teaching and learning to ensure educational success for all. It is no secret that the so-called "achievement gap" between students from diverse ethnic background continues to grow (Heiling & Darling-Hammond, 2008).

The School Effectiveness Framework (SEF) of the Ontario (province in Canada) Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat targets inequity of student outcomes. SEF aims to reduce the achievement gap between struggling schools and those reaching provincial standards. The SEF's focus is professional accountability within a process of ongoing school-based self-assessment and district review processes that assess individual school strengths and needs in order to determine areas for directing support and resources. We detail in this article the context, objectives, components and theoretical underpinnings of the SEF and provide a critical analysis of the SEF's strengths, possibilities and limitations.

Keywords: School Effectiveness; Learning; Diversity

Introduction

The Canadian educational system continues to search for more effective ways to enhance learning for all students. Schools and educators are being asked to ensure that schools are truly inclusive and that students from diverse backgrounds are exposed to effective teaching and learning to ensure educational success for all. It is no secret that the so-called 'achievement gap' between students from diverse ethnic background continues to grow (Heilig & Darling-Hammond, 2008). It is argued by some communities and critical educators that there is not a level playing field and that schools have still not found a way to fully engage all students. As a society we have not provided all the necessary supports for struggling communities to achieve educational excellence. Despite good intentions what many schools and educators are currently doing is not working for all our students. Students come to school from diverse backgrounds - home, cultural, economic, racial etc − with complex issues, different experiences, histories and knowledge. These are not just challenges but *opportunities* and *possibilities*, and our schools have not fully tapped into them to ensure success for all. Unless we see these differences as opportunities and possibilities and take them up in the teaching, learning and administration of education − curriculum, pedagogy, assessment and evaluation − we will continually see the gaps in academic achievement.

The existence of the 'achievement gap' implies that the 'one size approach' to educational change will not work. The existence of the wide gap calls for multiple approaches to schooling and education, including learning from the successes of alternative schooling and education. We need schools in which local communities and parents, their cultures, histories and experiences are central to the education of youth. We need schools where the emphasis is on education rather than schooling (Shujaa, 1994). Such education will be about the totality of a people's experience, including cultures, histories, identities, resistance and survival (see also Asante, 1992; Karenga, 1986, 1988; King, 2005). We need schools where success is defined broadly – beyond test scores/standardized testing (of 3R's) to creating a 'community of learners' who are conscious of their social responsibility. Schools where every teacher believes in the capability of every learner to succeed (see Kunjufu, 1984; Brathwaite & James, 1996; Dei, et al, 2009; Hilliard, 1992), and develops high expectations in them. We need schools which constitute conducive learning environments where learning can happen and educators value the contributions of all our learners. In such schools the expectation is that all students will be fully engaged in their learning (Asante, 1992).

In the context of Ontario the disparity in learning outcomes among students from diverse backgrounds has long been documented. As Dei (2008) notes, the Royal Commission on Learning Report (1994) described a crisis among Black youth with respect to education and achievement. We also know that in the study 'Every Secondary Student Survey' of 1990 the Toronto Board of Education revealed a disturbing drop-out rate for Black, Portuguese and Aboriginal students. Specifically, Brown (1993), in a follow-up to the "*Grade 9 Cohort of 1987 Every Secondary Student Survey Participants*" noted the graduation rates for Black students as 44% and a dropout rate 42%. Comparable figures for White students were 59% (graduation rate) and 31% (dropout rate). The dropout rate for Aboriginal students in the cohort was 42%.

In 2007, the Toronto District School Board (TDSB) began to identify factors within the school system which might inhibit student achievement, focusing particularly on

differences in race, ethnicity, gender, mother tongue, income and place of residence. In a February 2009 report from the comprehensive parent census, K-Grade 6 parents' attitudes and opinions towards their child's education and experience in school and outside school were analyzed and made public. The reading, writing and mathematics test results of the Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO) were linked with the parents' census demographic information. The results mirror a similar report released for the secondary school (see TDSB, 2009). The study reveals race and poverty are consequential for students' academic achievement as early as grade 3! In fact, the TDSB study reveals a wide achievement gap by ethnic background and family income. The three groups experiencing the most challenges were identified as Black, Latin American and Middle Eastern students. Some of the differences between the groups, Whites, Asians, Blacks, Middle Eastern and Latin American students are as high as 40 percentage points, especially in the area of mathematics. The greatest discrepancies are among different racial groups, followed by income groups. While the report does not over generalize, pointing out that there are high achieving students in all groups, it concludes that it is clear that race and poverty are the major factors (see TDSB, 2009).

How have we responded to these challenges? Educational reforms of the 1990s have focused on development of new standards for students in the areas of curriculum and instructional guidelines and frameworks, new assessments and evaluation measures, all in a bid to test students' knowledge and academic performance particularly in reading, writing and mathematics. Such policies primarily aim to close the 'achievement gap' through such measures as instituting testing reforms, the formulation of content standards, accountability and reporting procedures, graduate requirements and expectations. While these measures may have the best of intentions, they have been limited and not really produced academic achievement for all students given that the measures pay little attention to the key structural problems and educational challenges of schooling that create inequities in educational opportunities and outcomes for students from diverse backgrounds in the first place.

The School Effectiveness Framework

In Ontario a much-touted educational reform initiative, the School Effectiveness Framework (SEF), has been undertaken for enhancing educational outcomes for youth by the Ontario Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat (2007/2008). The SEF can appropriately be situated in the current context of the neo-liberal educational initiatives around testing and standardization measures intended to measure student achievement levels. The SEF is specifically intended to address the problem of 'inequity of student outcomes in Ontario'. It is noted that there are schools in Ontario with persistent patterns of low achievement on the Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO) assessments in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics in grades 3 and 6. SEF aims to reduce the "achievement gap" between struggling schools and those that are reaching provincial expectations. The focus is on professional accountability within a process of ongoing school-based self-assessment and district review processes that assess individual school strengths and needs in order to determine areas for focus and support.

School Improvement Processes

The SEF represents equity of outcomes as a function of four essential components of school capacity (curriculum and instructional strategies, student learning and achievement, instructional leadership and assessment and evaluation). Additional components (visioning, school culture, interpersonal relations, community outreach, student leadership and engagement and in French schools, transmission de la langue et de la culture française) influence the relationship between essential components and outcomes. For each component, the SEF provides indicators of high capacity schools, e.g., ambitious student achievement targets is an indicator of the student learning component. Schools are required to focus on all of the essential components and may choose to address one or more of the additional components.

Two accountability mechanisms drive school improvement in the SEF. School Self-Evaluation is a multi-step process in which the School Improvement Team reviews its improvement history, collects evidence on indicators of school capacity (i.e., the essential components), designs a School Improvement Plan, and monitors plan implementation. These internal accountability processes are implemented by teachers and the school leadership team working in overlapping professional learning communities; each member acts as a critical friend to support collective reflection on practice. District Review occurs at the end of an improvement cycle. A district team headed by a supervisory officer reviews school data, visits the school to collect additional information and sharpen the focus of self-evaluation, gives feedback on school planning and identifies capacity-building needs across schools. Provincial staff support accountability processes by working intensively with struggling schools and by providing professional learning to district leaders.

Theoretical Framework of the SEF

It is important to ask, what is the theory that informs the SEF? Professional accountability in education has become an important issue in our society. The public demands equal outcomes for all students and not just those who are advantaged (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006). The pressure to change highlights school improvement that focuses on raising student achievement and ensuring equitable outcomes. Teachers are required to do more than implement technical changes in their classroom practice; they need to embrace the new norms for student achievement and school-wide collaboration.

Professional development has traditionally been viewed as a means to achieve the end of school improvement. However, externally-driven professional development is not always compatible with a school's culture, instructional philosophies, or curriculum materials (Newmann & Associates, 1996). Moreover, these initiatives tend to pay little attention to issues of sustaining improvement or deepening practice (Tyack & Cuban, 1996). To accomplish this, teachers need to situate themselves in their own school and classroom contexts (Hannay, Wideman & Seller, 2006). Sustained change in classroom practice comes from within the school and begins with teachers themselves. They need opportunities to work together and reflect on where they are at, establish goals for student learning, develop specific strategies to meet those goals, and assess the outcomes. McLaughlin and Talbert (2006) underscore that improved student learning depends on "teachers' opportunities and commitment to work together to improve instruction for the students in their school." (p. 3). More specifically teachers need to access, use, and manage data; create a shared language and meaning of evidence and expectations coupled with a sense of purpose related to practice and

student outcomes; and sustain those parts of the school culture that support the use of high-yield instructional strategies and norms of collaboration (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Freeman, 1999; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006).

Diaz-Magglioni (2004) drew upon concerns-based adoption theory (Hall & Hord, 1987) to focus professional development in relation to a particular program innovation as teachers proceed from a stage of non-use to full use of the innovation. It is assumed there are gaps between existing practices and what is intended by the innovation and that teachers will be at different levels of implementation and will have different needs. Levels of use describe the teachers' development in acquiring new skills as they use the innovations. Six different patterns of use can be observed:

1. Orientation: where the teachers are acquiring knowledge of the innovation and are exploring its values and its demands upon them and their classrooms.

2. Preparation: where teachers are preparing for the first use of the innovation.

3. Mechanical use: the teachers are focusing most of their efforts on the short term, day to day use of the innovation and have little time for reflection. Changes are made more to meet the needs of the teachers than the students. Teachers are attempting to master the tasks required, often resulting in disjointed and superficial use of the innovation.

4. The next level is described as Routine and Refinement.

    4A. Routine: the teachers' use of the innovation has stabilized. Few changes are being made on an ongoing basis, but little preparation or thought is being given to improving the use of the innovation or the consequences of using the innovation.

    4B. Refinement: the teachers are varying the use of the innovation to increase the impact on the students in the classroom. Variations are based on the teachers' knowledge of short and long-term consequences for the students.

5. Integration: where the teachers are combining their personal efforts to use the innovation with the related activities of their colleagues to achieve a collective impact on students within their sphere of influence.

6. Renewal: where the teachers are re-evaluating the quality of their use of the innovation. They are examining modifications of the present innovation, new developments in the field, and exploring new goals for themselves and the system (Diaz-Maggioli, 2004).

The Organizational Profile Model of implementation is complementary to the Levels of Use Profile because it recognizes that individuals have specific needs for growth and development but they need the organization to support them. A sense of community, collaboration among the various sectors of the system and a focus on student learning are all factors of a successful implementation. It revolves around data collection, feedback, planning development strategies, evaluation and maintenance (Guskey, 2005). The Organizational Profile and Levels of Use Profile should guide any examination of the impact of the implementation of the School Effectiveness Framework.

The question for us is to suggest ways to strengthen the SEF to achieve its intended success in enhancing the educational outcome for all students given the diversity of today's

schools and classrooms. For example, we need to ask how do students become major players in our understanding and implementation of the SEF? How do we make equity and social difference issues (e.g., race, class, gender, sexuality and the link to knowledge production and schooling) central in discussions of School Effectiveness and Improvement? We believe these questions are important because although the SEF is an Ontario initiative it does have relevance for Canadian and North American education in general given the diversity of the student population and the nagging challenge of a widening 'achievement gap' that confront most schools. We also hear continuing critiques that our current school system is not serving the needs of all our students and consequently, a call for us to rethink schooling and education.

Discussion: Towards a Critical Analysis of The School Effectiveness Framework

It is no secret that in recent years a host of educational initiatives and policies have characterized a neo-liberal trend in education emphasizing the intricate relations between markets and global knowledge economy. Hatcher (1998) writing on events in Britain aptly pinpointed the extent to which the prevailing discourse and practice of 'school effectiveness and improvement' has sidelined equality and social justice concerns. He noted, for example, that race and equity issues remain peripheral to educational policy developments despite the fact that there continues to be "....profound inequities .... affecting students from ethnic-minority backgrounds" (p. 287). Through a deracialised approach to schooling, Hatcher (1998) argued that 'school effectiveness and school improvement' touts "corporate managerialist model of education" (p.268) to respond to the requirements of a global market competition. He faulted the then Labour government's modernist project/policy of 'School Improvement' for its limited focus with 'raising standards' rather than addressing the unequal educational effects of race, gender and social class patterns of educational attainment. Hatcher (1998) concluded that through the combination of four characteristics of 'abstract universalism' (that downplays the specificities of local school situations), 'decontextualization' (that gives no recourse to the importance of students' experiences, histories, cultures and identities in the learning process), 'consensualism' (that avoids dealing with conflict and controversy), and 'managerialism' (that privileges a top-down approach to schooling administration), school improvement as a reform has failed to address the structural, political and historical dimensions of change.

The School Effectiveness Framework (SEF) of the Ontario Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat (LNS) offers insights into the possibilities of enhancing learning outcomes of youth through the processes of educational delivery. It addresses some of the problems noted in the British context and enunciated by Hatcher (1998). But the current economic and socio-political climate of educational delivery presents additional challenges for schools and boards. At the time of writing this paper (March 2009) the Toronto District School Board (TDSB), for example, had announced it was planning to cut back on educational assistants and increase class sizes in order to deal with a $23 million dollar budget deficit. The fear was that it was such educational staffing needed mostly in inner city schools and/or schools with high concentration of racial/ethnic minorities that would suffer the most from such cuts. How are schools to respond to such educational changes while ensuring effective learning outcomes for youth? A sole focus on teacher preparation and professional development goals and objectives will not be enough. The SEF document heralds opportunities for self-

reflection, intentionality, collegiality. These are very much needed in the work of today's teacher. As educators being self-reflective on our work, examining what, why and how we teach, asking about who are the students we work with and why, how we create a community of learners from such diversity, what informs our pedagogic practices, how do our classroom practices take into account the question of social difference, and the implications of all this for learning and educational delivery are important. But self-reflection, intentionality and collegiality take time and energy and cut-backs reduce the opportunity for these processes to unfold in the schools/workplace. What the SEF document presents us with is that this language of self-reflection, intentionality, collegiality, accountability can also be used in some way to hold the administration and politicians accountable. The shift here will provide the opportunity to actually engage the schooling processes in meaningful ways now that these ideas and concepts have been written into the document – perhaps an opportunity for teachers to work with their unions to operationalize these concepts as they articulate a "vision" of an effective school and district.

However, in order for these goals to be materialized we must sharpen our analysis of school effectiveness and improvement. Notwithstanding the strengths and possibilities for meaningful action, the Framework adopts an uncritical assumption that EQAO testing is a valid measurement of student achievements. It is also assumed that the pairing of professional accountability with EQAO testing will improve student outcomes. But evidence of the effects of accountability on equity outcomes is mixed at best (Lee, 2008) and there are valid concerns about the accuracy and fairness of mandated assessments for racial and linguistic minorities (Solarzano, 2008). Recently, the Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario (2009) argued that standardized tests such as the EQAO's grade 3 and 6 assessments do not give parents a true picture of their child's progress. The federation identifies multiple concerns that challenge the validity of the measurement, for example, students cannot interact with their teachers or other students during the tests as they do in normal classroom activities.

In examining many of the current policies of schooling and education one could rightly argue that we need to move away from defining success narrowly as academic achievement. The policies and practices associated with students testing and measurements of skills, scholastic aptitude and learning do not pay attention to the structural barriers and systemic conditions of schooling that hinder educational attainment [as broadly defined] in the first place. These policies aim at 'helping' a few students willing to buy into what it takes to ensure academic success. These policies however well-intentioned may end up helping only students and parents from high socio-economic backgrounds, thereby widening the achievement gap. These policies and practices operate within the dominant paradigm of education while leaving the project of education as broadly conceived and engaged intact. In other words, schooling is approached within the established knowledge paradigms emphasizing the rhetorics about 'quality' 'accountability', 'competencies' 'excellence', standards' and 'merit'.   These educational policies and practices fail to place equity considerations as central to schooling in ways that ensure the needs of racialized and minority students are being met.

What is needed in rethinking schooling and education is paying serious policy attention to systemic inequalities. This is one of the most genuine ways to promote effective educational outcomes for all students. There has to be a recognition that students coming from diverse backgrounds experience 'different educational realities' that cannot simplistically be understood as 'challenges' and 'problems'. There needs to be a shift away from the understanding that "students, not their schools or classroom circumstances…are the sources of unequal educational attainment" (King, 2005 p. 201). We also need education that

focuses on students' problem solving skills, promotes learners to critically read and reflect on classroom texts, ideas and assignments and not lower order rote learning. Schools must be well-resourced with funds directed to the most needy areas and groups of learners. Students must have easy and quick access to qualified and well-trained teachers (who have high expectations of each learner), sophisticated curriculum and instructional methods, high quality classroom materials, laboratories and equipment (Lee, 2005). In this context teacher training is relevant to the extent that educators are well equipped to deal with the diversity in their classrooms, i.e., critically teaching and instructing about difference by engaging the issues of power, social inequity and responsibility. Students must be exposed not only to caring and well-prepared teachers with exceptional teaching skills but also to challenging and high quality curriculum material (Lee, 2005).

Rather than use the new standards to improve teaching, knowledge base and educational delivery, in fact, one of the many disturbing outcomes of testing is the sorting/tracking of students. For example, there is tremendous amount of research that shows that Black and poor working class students are disproportionately assigned to special education classes, applied and vocational streams (as opposed to academic) and consequently such practice inhibits access to knowledge (Garcia & Cuéllar, 2006). Most of these policies and practices around testing, standards, 'school improvement and effectiveness' and school choice constitute compensatory approaches to schooling and do not in reality address the structural and institutional problems of underachievement in schools.

We also want to point to other significant areas of concern so as to strengthen the SEF. Within the context of neoliberal restructuring in schools, the Framework represents an on-going shift away from the provision of equity measures that promote student success in favour of policies that target greater efficiency, self-reliance (both for teachers and students) and competitiveness between schools and districts. While the framework makes use of terms such as 'collegiality', 'teams', 'collaboration', and 'consensus building', there must be corresponding mechanisms put in place that could build these processes to ensure educational success. We cannot expect to see change if teachers and students are simply encouraged to align themselves with the broader socio-political objectives of neo-liberalism in order to secure competitive advantage.

We are encouraged to bring more clarity to the SEF document to help avoid any vagueness that may suggest to critics the document is a public relations exercise. Bringing such clarity requires the discussion and implementation of SEF engage a more concrete action on the issues that impact on student achievement. For example, how do we address the issues of racism, classism, sexism, homophobia/heterosexism, poverty, community and student alienation? Children learn in safe and respectful environments where they and their families and communities are respected and included. It is hard to focus on 'reading, writing and mathematics' when the school or classroom environment is "chilly" or disrespectful, or when a family's socio-economic needs are not being met. To respond to this challenge research needs to pay attention to the most important voices, i.e., the voices of the students. For example, what do children say they need in order to learn more effectively? How do they relate to the curriculum? Does the curriculum reflect their lived experiences and actual interests? Do they see themselves represented in the curriculum and in the teachers who are delivering the curriculum? What of the voices of the parents and community activists? What do these parents say are the barriers to student achievement? Thus, the Framework as a focus on professional capacity building within schools must be strengthened in its operationalization to involve families, students and other community stakeholders. A 'top-down' model of change, can only be a narrow view of the child's context that ignores

important students' voices. In this context, the implementation of the SEF would need a re-focus on critical research into students' voices concerning their schooling experiences and how such knowledge informs educational practice.

Feminist scholars describe "putting the person in the problem, rather than the problem in the person". The inference is to a misdiagnosis of an important problem. For instance, the SEF focuses on individuals more so than the under-resourcing of some schools; e.g., inner-city schools. In the 1990s the Ontario provincial government of Mike Harris demonized teachers and reduced them to a special interest group. It is important that the SEF document speaks to and addresses the contextual issues that have resulted in teachers being demoralized. It is critical to engaging educators that we move away even from a "softer" form of teacher-bashing in the claims that teachers need to "accept responsibility to hold themselves accountable". We must ask of our provincial politicians to engage in the same process of accountability to students, parents and communities. Our politicians, after all, are the ones who hold the balance of power for making decisions that impact schools.

The Framework is strong in the provision of indicators for critical analysis of key components of school effectiveness and improvement. We need to pay more attention to the existing research-informed literature dealing with the development of the components for critical thinking and practice as a way to challenge (rather than reinforce) dominant (neoliberal) perspectives on student outcomes. For example, what could be viewed as social problems that imply government and community accountabilities cannot solely be framed as the individual problems of students, families and teachers. These are wider structural, systemic and societal problems of education. Additionally, it is likely those teachers who exhibit resistance, i.e. those who resist defining the problem as professional capacity building, will be held responsible for their and their school failings.

The Framework rightly notes that "one size does not fit all". This means that we pay attention to issues of diversity and power differentials that challenge/subvert this "one size does not fit all" starting point. This is even more important when considering the role of "Critical Friend" that staff members are expected to play as they invite each other to engage in self-analysis. In implementing the framework we must ask questions about whose feedback as a "Critical Friend" will be accepted and whose will be rejected, who will feel empowered to act as Critical Friend and who will be seen as "having a chip on their shoulder" should they advocate for changes that challenge the powers-that-be; for instance, how will feedback from a racialized teacher advocating for more inclusive curriculum for marginalized students be accepted? What will be the consequences for taking strong stands on behalf of marginalized students, parents and communities? What protections, if any, will exist for Critical Friends who are truly critical and self-reflective and wish to hold themselves accountable to students and the communities from which they come instead of being accountable to the EQAO?

Finally, the Framework expresses a commitment to promoting equity of outcomes in Ontario schools. In pursuance of the objectives of the framework we must guide against what Sara Ahmed (2007) calls a performance of a 'tick box' approach where 'doing well' is presumed to be something that can be ticked and measured. Good performance on 'equity' becomes associated with accountability, efficiency and quality as goals for schools. Connecting this to the 'audit culture' that is valorized by neoliberalism, Ahmed explains that an audit establishes only if a particular process has been followed, not whether organizational culture has been altered in any meaningful way. As a result, people become good only at showing how processes are being followed.

Conclusion and Future Directions of Research

In this paper we have presented the key philosophical, conceptual and methodological underpinnings of the School Effectiveness Framework of the Ontario Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat. We have argued that this framework is a collegial process for continued growth in the effectiveness of Ontario Elementary Schools. This initiative entails professional accountability which assumes control of essential components and the components for local selection within a process of self-assessment of schools and districts. Despite its perceived strengths we have read the SEF within the context of the broader systemic and structural processes for educational delivery. The critical analysis of the document is intended to contribute to the Secretariat's understanding of how schools are implementing the Framework. In concluding the discussion, we would like to propose for future research direction to examine the implementation process of the Framework for School Improvement and its impact on school-based improvement and student achievement. The overall purposes of such research study will be:

1. To determine the ways equity issues and social difference, questions of race, class, gender, sexuality can be made central to the understanding and implementation of school effectiveness and improvement strategies;

2. To determine how board and school capacity is developed to identify strengths, areas that require attention, and next steps; (e.g., the extent, nature and role of student's voices and accounting for educational successes);

3. To determine under what conditions introspection, reflection, and analysis occurs among school staffs and board review committees;

4. To examine school and board planning processes that promote precision and intentionality;

5. To identify how the framework acts as a catalyst for collaborative and collegial conversations about improvement from within;

6. To study the implementation of high-yield, research-based strategies;

7. To identify the monitoring and feedback strategies necessary for improvement and accountability;

8. To study how the Framework provides a forum for consensus building around school improvement;

9. To provide a deeper understanding of the unique improvement needs of schools; and

10. To examine how districts communicate, celebrate, and continue to build public confidence around school effectiveness.

Contemporary changes in the geo-political scene and the broad macro-economies of schooling pose fundamental challenges in rethinking education. Market-driven reform policies have serious consequences for understanding education as we move into the next millennium. Discourse about school effectiveness and improvement must centre on multiple actors, subjects of actual schooling experiences as well as the different sites/structures of engagement, and

interventions in promoting educational change (e.g., structures for teaching, learning and administration of education). In proposing that the School Effectiveness Framework will enhance academic performance of learners, there are key implications regarding how we come to understand social equity and educational justice. We can no longer couch diversity, educational competencies and social integration within a safe liberal and depoliticized understanding of schooling and education. We must critically engage difference as a site of power and knowledge in schooling and educational processes. We cannot afford the potential of a School Effectiveness Framework/model to be muted over a failure to engage students' voice, equity and the pointed notion of difference as critical to enhancing learning outcomes for all.

References

Ahmed, Sara. 2007. 'You end up doing the document rather than doing the doing': Diversity, race equality and the politics of documentation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 30 (4): 590-609.

Asante, M. K. (1992). Afrocentric Curriculum. *Educational Leadership,* 28-31.[December 1991-Jan.1992].

Brathwaite, K. and C. James (Eds.) (1996). *Educating African Canadians*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Co.

Brown, R. (1993). *A Follow-Up on the Grade 9 Cohort of 1987 Every Secondary Student Survey Participants.* Toronto: Toronto Board of Education. Research report #207.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. In A. Iran-Nejad & P. D. Pearson (eds.), *Review of Research in Education*, *24*, 249-305. Washington, DC: American Education Research Association.

Dei, G. J. S. (2008). *Racists Beware: Uncovering Racial Politics in Contemporary Society.* Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Dei, G. S. S., with Butler, A., Charamia, G., Kola-Olusanya, A., Opini, B. Thomas, R., & Wagner, A. (2009). *Learning to Succeed: The Challenges and Possibilities of Educational Development for All*. New York: Teneo Press.

Diaz-Maggioli, G. (2004). *A Passion for Learning: Teacher-centered Professional Development*. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario. (2009). Issues on Education: EQAO Testing. http://www.etfo.ca/ISSUESINEDUCATION/Pages/default.aspx Retrieved: March 03, 2009.

Freeman, D. (1999). *Towards a Descriptive Theory of Teacher Learning and Change*. Brattleboro, VT: Center for Teacher Education, Training and Research, School for International Training.

Garcia, E. E., & Cuéllar, D. (2006). Who are these linguistically and culturally diverse students? *Teachers College Record*, *108*(11), 2220-2246.

Guskey, T.R. (2002). Does it make a difference? Evaluating professional development. *Educational Leadership, 59*(6), 45-51.

Hall, G., & Hord, S. (1987). *Change in schools*. New York: State University of New York.

Hannay, L., Wideman, r. & Seller, W. (2006). *Professional Learning to Reshape Teaching.* Toronto: Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario.

Heilig, J. V., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). Accountability Texas-style: The progress and learning of urban minority students in a high-stakes testing context. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *30*(2), 75-110.

Hilliard, A. (1992). Why We Must Pluralize the Curriculum. *Educational Leadership* 49 (4): 12-15.

Karenga, M. (1986). *Introduction to Black Studies*. Los Angeles: university of Sankore Press.

Karenga. M. (1988). Black Studies and the Problematic of Paradigm: The Philosophical Dimension". *Journal of Black Studies* 18: 395-414.

King, J. (2005)(Ed.). *Black Education. A Transformative Research and Action Agenda for the New Century.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Kunjufu, J. (1984). *Developing Positive Self-images and Discipline in Black Children. African American Images*. Chicago, Illinois.

Lee, J. (2008). Is test-driven external accountability effective? Synthesizing the evidence from cross-state causal-correlational studies. *Review of Educational Research* , *78*(3), 608-644.

Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat. (2007/2008). The School Effectiveness Framework: A collegial process for continued growth in the effectiveness of Ontario elementary schools. Toronto: author.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2006). *Building School-based Teacher Learning Communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Newmann, F., & Associates. (1996). *Authentic Achievement: Restructuring Schools for Intellectual Quality.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Royal Commission on Learning. (1994). *For the Love of Learning*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Shujaa, M. (1994). *Too Much Schooling, Too Little Education*. Trenton, N.J. Africa World Press.

Solorzano, R. W. (2008). High stakes testing: Issues, implications, and remedies for English language learners. *Review of Educational Research* , *78*(2), 260-329.

Toronto District School Board (TDSB) (2009). *2008 Parent Census, Kindergarten- Grade 6: System Overview and Detailed Findings- Executive Summary.* [Janet O'Reilly and Maria Yau, Research Coordinators]. Toronto: Organizational Development Department, Research and Information Services, TDSB.

Tyack, D. B., & Cuban, L. (1996). *Tinkering Toward Utopia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Authors

Marie Josée BERGER
University of Ottawa
Faculty of Education
145 Jean-Jacques Lussier
PO Box 450 Stn A
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5
CANADA
Tel: 001-613-562-5800, ext. 4062
Fax: 001-613-562-5144
Email : deduc@uottawa.ca

Georges J. DEI
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

Renée FORGETTE-GIROUX
University of Ottawa