Schools at Risk: Dilemmas and Solutions

**Paper presented to: AARE-NZARE Conference 1999: December, Melbourne
Australia**

**By: Kay Hawk and Jan Hill
        Institute for Professional Development and Educational Research
        Massey University: Albany Campus**

Background

This study is the result of eight years of research and development in twenty-four
primary and secondary schools that, for a range of reasons, have found
themselves being identified as being seriously at risk. In many instances the
work in the schools has continued over a number of years, which has enabled us
to gain some valuable insights into the change processes that have taken place.

This paper identifies what the research indicates have been the key risk factors
and the indicators of the risk, in the experience of these sample schools. It looks
at the impact of the factors on the schools and at the dilemmas associated with
being at risk. How school personnel respond and how problems are resolved are
critical to the ability of a school to turn itself around. Interventions at a macro and
micro level are analysed and implications for policy makers, school leaders and
governors are discussed.

It is important to differentiate between schools that cater for 'at risk students' and
schools that have become so dysfunctional as to be 'at risk' as an organisation.
It is the latter that we are discussing in this paper although some of the at risk
schools do cater for a disproportionate number of at risk students.

Indicators that may provide early warning that a school might be at risk

- ***Reputation***

    An early lesson learned as we worked in a wide range of schools was the
    difference between the reputation a school has with parents, and
    sometimes the educational community, and what we observed happening
    in classrooms and within the organisation. We began referring to it as the
    gap between the rhetoric and the reality. In a city where there are many
    schools, a 'pecking order' or 'parent preference ladder' of schools
    develops. This usually correlates directly with socio-economic community
    and league tables of student achievement (McKenzie, 1999), as
    measured by external exams. Although there are good New Zealand data
    (Nash,R and Harker,R, 1997) **to** demonstrate that the value a school can
    add to the achievement of its students often does not correlate directly

with either of these indicators, parents persist in judging schools by these criteria. This puts all the schools at the bottom of the low socio-economic ladder (in New Zealand called low decile[1]), potentially at risk, in that they have little or no choice in the selection of students (Ainsworth 1994; Hughes and Lauder et al 1996; Lauder and Hughes et al 1994). They get all the students that other schools reject as well as those that cannot afford to travel outside the area to a more 'desirable' school. This means these schools have a wide range of significant poverty related student needs to attempt to meet, for which they are not resourced. What this does **not** necessarily mean is that the schools are poorly functioning organisations or that they are not delivering a sound education to the children.

- *Falling roll*

    Closely linked to this factor is that of a falling roll. Most parents who live in low socio-economic areas are seeking upward mobility for their children and those families with sufficient financial resources, confidence and determination move out of the area for schooling. If there are no school zones and if the schools higher up the socio-economic ladder have the capacity, the schools at the bottom of the ladder will always have falling rolls. For these lowest socio-economic schools, therefore, a falling roll is often **not** an accurate indicator of a poorly performing school.

    In a higher socio-economic community, on the other hand, it is usually a very important indicator of problems. Even if the problem(s) that initially caused the roll to begin dropping are removed or resolved, the fact that the roll has fallen, in itself, puts the school more at risk. There are economies of scale that benefit larger schools and as a roll falls, so also does staffing, income, senior curriculum and flexibility.

    Whatever the cause of the falling roll, it is critical that action is taken before a school's roll falls so low that it becomes unable to compete with neighbouring schools in terms of the programme it provides. If not, it ends up being at risk because of the public's perception.

- *Staff turnover*

    A regular turnover of staff can be an indicator of an extremely healthy and vibrant school because good people are attracted to work there, grow strongly in the job and gain promotion out of the school after a reasonable time. Some schools are recognised as 'producing Leaders'.

    If the rate of turnover becomes very rapid, however, it is probably an indicator that there are serious problems of some kind. This also becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy because the original cause of the

---

[1] All New Zealand schools are ranked on a decile scale of one to ten. It is a measure of the socio-economic position of the contributing community, with decile ten schools having the highest status. Some funding is allocated on the basis of decile ranking in an attempt to provide for equity

problem is still there but the people who are potentially the most able to deal with it are the ones who choose to move on in order to protect their own careers. In our experience, this indicator is one that signals the need for highly skilled external intervention.

- ### *Staff morale*

  Low staff morale over a period of time is not to be ignored. In the schools we have worked in, where there have been problems amongst the adults, the students have told us that they are very aware of the problems and feel unhappy and pressured by the situation. They are often more analytical, objective and honest about the problems than are the adults. It does adversely effect their learning as well as their happiness.

- ### *Conflict*

  This can be within the staff, between staff and management, between significant individuals, between the staff and the Board, within the parent community or between different parts of a school. Not all conflict is unhealthy or unproductive but, if it continues without being fronted and resolved, it diverts the energy needed for positive and pro-active development to be used reactively to 'put out fires'. Some of the schools we have worked in reported such conflict continuing for up to fourteen years. Most people involved in the schools were aware of the conflict. Frequently people remove themselves from the school for their own protection leaving behind those who are responsible for causing the problems, who are new to the school, or who choose to live with it rather than challenge it.

- ### *Poor organisation/administration*

  When we reflect on our first contacts with the schools in major difficulties, there were usually signs of poor organisation, lack of systems, poor communication, lack of follow through on decisions and a lack of documentation. These are products of other deeper-seated problems. They are not the cause of the problem(s).

- ### *Community discontent*

  This is a complex indicator because, although it can be a result of real problems within the school, it can also result from unfair bad-mouthing of a school by unprofessional colleagues or by one or more individuals with a grudge or personal agenda. The power of one unreasonable and determined individual should not be underestimated. One school we worked in had lost four Principals in six years and, in the final analysis, it was mainly a result of the bad behaviour of one parent who surrounded his/herself with others who gossiped and who acted on his/her suggestions. Whatever the cause of the discontent, it must be correctly identified and resolved if the school is to rebuild.

- *Poor quality teaching*

    This is an indicator that is usually not obvious to someone outside of the school. It is not always obvious to people inside a school either. For an experienced educationalist, it is relatively easy to identify by observing teachers, listening to students and/or asking teachers to discuss their lesson planning. A major problem we have observed is when teachers in a school have not had the support and development they deserve and, over a period of time, the culture of the school becomes such that what is 'normal' drops to a level that would be regarded as unacceptable in other schools. When this happens, the people inside the school become unable to recognise the inadequacy of their performance.

    Of all the issues that have contributed to serious problems in the schools, this has proved the most difficult for the Principals and the Boards to deal with. One complication has often been that although the teacher is clearly not meeting the needs of the students, and often of the school, they are not deemed to be 'incompetent' by appraisers, reviewers or Union advocates. We have watched many instances where a teacher has been put under review and has come out of the process having 'achieved' what has been required, only to be re-identified for review soon after. The problems remain ongoing and Principals and/or Boards are afraid to deal with them for fear of litigation and bad publicity.

- *Major financial problems/imbalances*

    If a school stands out as being significantly worse off financially than schools of a similar size and socio-economic group, it warrants urgent investigation because, whatever the cause, the lack of funding will soon directly impact on curriculum provision.   Some of the schools we have worked in have finally presented enough other serious indicators to be identified as at risk. A retrospective analysis of the school finances and their use showed signals that could have been picked up earlier.

Factors that can contribute to placing a school at risk

We have alluded to some of these in the earlier section because some are closely related to specific indicators. As with the indicators, these factors do not always impact negatively to the extent that they alone cause the decline of a school. Our observations, however, demonstrate that one or more of these factors has been the primary cause of the difficulties for at least one of the schools in which we have worked.

- *Serving a low socio-economic community*

    The New Zealand education system provides additional funds for the schools that serve economically poorer areas. It is still obvious even to a casual visitor, however, that their facilities and resources do not compete with those of their higher socio-economic neighbours. Financially poor

communities find it more difficult to participate in and contribute to their schools in most ways and the needs that the children present are great (Hawk and Hill 1996)

Many of the poorest schools are well managed, have superb teachers and care for their students in an outstanding way. These schools are not currently organisationally at risk. However, the financial and staffing fragility that results from serving a poor community means that the schools are more vulnerable, are exhausting places to work in and have fewer resources to use in response to a problem that emerges (Waldegrave, Frater and Stephens 1997.

- ### *School competition*

  There was probably never a time when city schools have not been 'in competition' with each other, but in recent years this has intensified because of a number of changes to policy and funding provision. Dezoning[2], contestable funding[3] and changes in school status[4] are three examples. In an era in which information, public relations and publicity play an important role and are expensive, poor schools find themselves increasingly disadvantaged. Some have found themselves spending thousands of dollars projecting an image when they want and need that money for their students.

- ### *Inappropriate appointments*

  Several of the schools which ended up in major difficulties had principals and/or deputy principals who had been appointed well beyond their level of experience or ability. Some of these were appointed on the basis of ethnicity and Board members at the time have since reflected, with regret, giving in to the pressure they were put under to do the 'politically correct thing'. In most instances, the decline was slow and not especially eventful. In several instances the ethnicity of the leader did play a role in the unwillingness or inability of others, who could see there were problems, to speak up or attempt to do something.

---

[2] Secondary schools were required to have a geographic zone within which students had priority entry. When zoning was abolished in New Zealand in 1992, it resulted in hundreds of students leaving low socio-economic schools for 'better' schools. The effect on the poor schools was devastating.

[3] There are now many types of educational funding, as well as health and welfare funds, that schools apply for on the basis of putting forward a written application. In recent years the direct resourcing of teachers' salaries has provided unexpected financial windfalls for some schools but would place others in a financial loss situation

[4] Some primary schools have changed to become full primaries by keeping the year 7 and 8 students. Some intermediate schools have become middle schools by keeping their year 9 and 10 students. Each time a school has changed status this has adversely impacted on its receiving school.

- *Lack of leadership training/support*

  Principals have historically had to fend for themselves once they have been appointed. In recent years there has been a heightened awareness of the importance of training opportunities and support networks for school leaders. One problem with the traditional professional networks[5] has been the tendency for them to become places where you only talk about your successes. Most principals have told us that it is not safe to discuss problems in these professional forums.

  Principals and senior management staff tend to neglect their own professional development and consider going to a conference as all that is needed. Intensive reflective opportunities, which are more effective, are time consuming and expensive.

- *Community conflict/factions*

  Occasionally a school becomes the battleground for local community conflict. Examples we have experienced include factions related to a liberal/conservative approach to education, new versus old residents, inter-ethnic competition, personality conflict and family rivalries. It may be a school issue that triggers the conflict, such as introducing/abolishing uniform, or the school may be the site at which outside issues cause inside tensions.

- *Personal agenda(s) of individuals*

  Our data demonstrate that, in several instances, the major problem in a school was directly linked, often over a long period of time, with one individual. It is not for us to speculate on the motives these people had for behaving in the ways that they did, but it was evident that 'power games' always played a significant role in the interactions that we witnessed and had reported to us. Patterns of behaviours developed which other adults in the school found difficult to deal with. It was sometimes, but not always, the Principal who exercised the destructive power. Other examples we have recorded include a teacher, a trustee, a parent, a deputy principal, an ex-Principal and a community leader.

- *Publication of external reviews*

  Sometimes, an external review has been the best mechanism to trigger positive change. When a review with negative findings has received media publicity, however, it has escalated the crisis because parents have lost confidence in their school and staff and student morale has declined. Sometimes a school has needed such public pressure to force acceptance of the need for change. If, however, they accept the challenge and begin the reform process, they need to be allowed to progress safely without further negative publicity. We recorded three examples of schools that were beginning to make important progress

---

[5] Such as Principals' Associations and Principal cluster groups

when they received a follow-up review, six months later, that did not just record the change, but revisited all the original problems. The publicity from this damaged public confidence and progress severely and did not contribute in any positive way to school reform.

- ***Reviews and appraisals that are not honest***

    Most of the schools in this sample had, at some stage, received an ERO report or a written appraisal that avoided or did not identify the severe problems that existed. Trustees are usually lay people and rely on the advice they receive from professionals. If that advice is not accurate, they usually have little reason or opportunity to take remedial action.

    Most of the schools in the sample have ERO reports that were completed during the period in which the problems were evident. Hardly any refer to the difficulties in a direct or usable way. A problem with the Principal was referred to as "senior management". In most of the reports, "the Board" is directed to address a need that is identified in a vague way, but is given no clues as to the reason for the problem.

    It is distressing to read past appraisal reports for three Principals who had almost destroyed their schools over a number of years. Principal colleagues had written these documents without referring in any way to problems that were glaringly obvious to most of the people in their schools. Some were full of positive and affirming comments.

    Such inadequate reviews allow the parties involved to ignore or deny the problems and stop others from being able to deal with them.

- ***Band-Aid or quick-fix solutions***

    A strategy employed by some leaders, when a problem has been fronted, has been to come up with a strategy that has temporarily taken the heat out of the situation but has not treated the underlying cause of the problem(s). This has sometimes been deliberate and sometimes a well meaning but misguided attempt. When a school has been in trouble for some time it is often very difficult, or impossible, for the people inside to know how to go about dealing with it. If this were not the case, it would have been resolved earlier. Clear, full and accurate identification of the underpinning causes(s) of the problem is pivotal to finding a solution.

School response to identification

People, individually and collectively, have responded in a range of differing ways to their school being identified as at risk or in crisis. A specific crisis can bring long-standing problems to a head so that school personnel are forced to make a collective response. An outside agency, such as the Ministry of Education, may intervene. A particular group within the school, such as a Trust Board or Board of Trustees might decide that action needs to be taken. A Principal or senior

team may decide they need to act or get outside help. The responses outlined in this section of the paper have sometimes been those of an individual, sometimes a group of people and, on occasions, the whole school.

- *Withdrawal/avoidance*

  Some of the schools that ended up in difficulties had, for many years, avoided getting into any situation that might have found them exposed or recognised for what they were. Examples of such avoidance include not being active in a cluster group, minimal interaction with neighbouring schools, not taking teacher trainees, not applying for professional development contracts and not trialling new initiatives. Viewing a record of the school's involvement in school wide developments may be a useful indicator of the professional health of the organisation.

- *Denial*

  It has been more the norm than the exception that the first response to having a problem pointed out has been to deny it exists. Responses to ERO reports, refusal to deal with parent complaints, criticism of the review methodology and blocking help from outsiders are some examples.

  This type of response sometimes caused people to block information from others or even to lie in order to cover up 'evidence' of the problems.

- *Blame others or circumstances*

  Making some one, or some group, a scapegoat has been a frequent response to having problems highlighted. The Government, the Ministry, the past Principal, the Board, the Church, the parents, the staff and the students have each been reported to us as the reason for 'the problem'. The blaming has sometimes become a delaying tactic as the individual or the group went to their MP, the Ombudsman, the Union, School Trustees Association or an Ethics Committee.

  A skilled and honest reviewer or appraiser needs to be very thorough in their preparation and documentation so they can protect themselves against attack. 'Shooting the messenger' has often been an early response from some individuals who have felt threatened by the feedback and have tried to blame or discredit the evaluator.

- *Get rid of challengers*

  This has been a very common response in the early stages of emerging problems. Some individuals, or groups of individuals, became targeted, persecuted, sidelined, ridiculed, disciplined or fired/sacked when they dared to express their concerns. School personnel then responded to this in a range of ways. They sometimes left as soon as they could so as not to 'go down with the ship', to keep their own careers on track and/or to avoid having to deal with difficult issues or people. A contributing factor

has been the lack of communication skills and/or confidence many adults have, especially in dealing with the difficult behaviours of other adults.

At the same time as getting rid of challengers, the person(s) at the heart of the problems have tended to surround themselves with either supporters or people who will go along with the situation.

- *Exhaustion*

  It has often been a great relief to people to have a problem exposed and clarified. At the same time, the enormity of future challenges has become evident at the same time. This has sometimes left people feeling exhausted and paralyzed, not knowing where to start and very aware of the work that will be involved to redress the difficulties.

- *Ask for help*

  A few of the schools have accepted, prior to any external intervention, that they need help and have asked for it. Between 1989 and 1995 in New Zealand, the Ministry of Education was expected not to interfere or intervene in school problems because the Government policy at that time was one of school self management and individual school responsibility and accountability. During this period, some of the sample schools had asked for help and were refused it. The School Support Project, which began in 1995, was an acknowledgement on the part of Government that there were some schools who did need help. Some are now receiving support through this division of the Ministry.

  The analysis is only the first step. The school then needs ongoing help to work through the development of a coordinated plan of change, growth and development. Because the people whose behaviour has been the main cause of the problems are still there and because they still exercise power, using an independent facilitator, researcher or developer is the most effective way of ensuring the behaviours change.

  Not all of the contributing factors are within the control of the school.

Effective intervention strategies

We have monitored the progress of each of the 24 schools as they have worked through different strategies in their reforming and rebuilding process. Not all strategies have been tried, or have been available, to all the schools. Some have worked more effectively and more quickly than others. Each situation has had its own unique mix of issues, needs and personnel. The following are a synthesis of what we have observed to be the most effective strategies.

- ***External intervention***

  Some of the schools have managed to turn themselves around because a group or a new individual has succeeded in finding a way to expose the problems and seek help. Examples include a new Principal, some new trustees, a new Deputy Principal, a group of parents and a team of senior staff.

  In other instances external intervention has been the trigger for change. The Ministry has offered some schools the opportunity to receive help through the School Improvement initiatives or the School Support programme. Sometimes, working in partnership with the ERO, the Ministry have required a school to take action such as setting up a task force. Some schools have had a Commissioner appointed. In two instances the Church Proprietor has intervened.

  In our experience, most of these interventions have been important and necessary. They have often not happened early enough and sometimes have not provided effective follow-on processes or support. It is very important that such organisations are willing to intervene before the damage is too great or too expensive to repair.

- ***Accurate analysis of the problems and their causes***

  The first requirement is always a clear independent analysis of the problems and their underpinning causes. The more honest this analysis can be, the more use it is to the school. The importance of getting the issues out in the open for discussion cannot be over-emphasised. At the same time, it is ideal if the school can keep such information confidential so that it does not become accessible to the public or the media.

  This analysis will always need to be at the macro level if a school has serious difficulties. It may also need to be done, in depth, at a micro level. Reviews of individual departments (teaching and non-teaching), reviews of systems (such as the recording of absences) and reviews or appraisals of the performance of individuals are examples.

  It is our experience, in this sample of 24 schools, that while ERO reports have sometimes been useful tools later in the rebuilding, they have never analysed the difficulties in a way that has been needed for the causes to be properly explored and addressed. ERO reports have tended to describe rather than analyse. This is particularly the case if there are one or more people whose behaviour, rather than competence, is the underpinning problem.

  The methodology used by the Ministry in the preparation of Business Cases is to call for historic and viability reports on the school that then get developed into a full Business Case plan. This can be useful provided that the school has a capable and strong Principal who is backed by an effective and supportive Board and they are both willing to address any personnel issues. If this is not the case, the changes will be superficial

and the problems will remain. Improvements to buildings, policies, documents and systems do not necessarily change what happens in the staffroom or the classrooms.

Using external evaluators in a school is a new area of professional expertise and there are not many experienced practitioners. It is a difficult, demanding and often unpleasant task. Without exception, in the 24 schools, there have been people who have not wanted the feedback they have received. We have witnessed anger, aggression, lies, sabotage and even a death threat. On the other hand there have been those who are relieved and grateful to have the issues clarified.

- ***Getting expert advice***

In the sample schools there have been a very wide range of outside experts used in a wide range of areas requiring specific knowledge. Examples include finances, property, human resource management, curriculum areas, student assessment, marketing, policy making, strategic planning, communication skill development, research, facilitation and mediation. Usually this has cost money and some school personnel are reluctant to spend money in this way. It has, however, been well worth it in almost every instance we have recorded. As well as receiving quality advice, it adds credibility to the actions taken and it gives much needed confidence to the decision-makers.

- ***Ongoing external support and monitoring***

It is our experience that most schools have not had the expertise they have needed to work through the early stages of the reform process. Even if school leaders have the expertise, they have a specific role to play as the leader and so it is a great advantage if an outside facilitator is available to oversee the rebuilding process.

Monitoring has taken several forms. Whatever the process, what is important is to ensure actions are taken that have quality outcomes and are not merely on paper. Timeframes need to be set and adhered to, whenever possible. School personnel need to be involved and informed at all stages. The parent and education community also need to know of the developments so that confidence is restored. An external view of the progress being made is important for the school's credibility because outsiders will usually not be prepared to take the school's word about the improvements.

- ***Clustering***

Some clustering of schools is beginning and is being encouraged by the Ministry. Early indicators are that there are benefits for some schools in these arrangements. It is critical that the schools involved feel they have ownership and control over the process. If the cluster is imposed or if the

management of it is imposed the response from the schools can be less positive.

Clustering will not solve all the problems for these schools. In one instance, belonging to the cluster is propping up a school with major problems that will not be resolved through the cluster plans. In this instance, belonging to the cluster may prolong and hide the problems for longer than would otherwise be the case.

- *Listening to students*

  At an intermediate and secondary level, students are very wise and can be very articulate about their needs, their concerns and the health of their school. It is essential that it be made safe for them to discuss such opinions and feelings in the knowledge that they remain confidential to the listener. The ideal situation is that the listener is an outsider. If the school uses someone from inside they need to be a person that the students respect highly and trust. The most useful insights we have received into school issues have been from students.

- *Support for the school to become self reviewing*

  The ideal situation, in the longer term, is that the school will reform and rebuild into a healthier organisation. The way it can be helped to stay this way is to become skilled and practiced at self review. Not all the schools in this sample have achieved this yet but those who have progressed sufficiently to begin a reviewing process do not find it easy. Unless a cycle of review is planned over a number of years, the selection of areas for review tends to be ad hoc and reactive. Another frequently missing component in a review process is the development of a plan of action using the review data and the monitoring of its implementation.

  The key message in this section is that schools that have found themselves in a seriously "at risk" situation can hardly ever get themselves out of it without external guidance and support. If they could, they would not have ended up in that situation. Some of them have needed to be forced into taking action. Also, they can be stretched financially because of their vulnerable situation and cannot afford the expertise they need to begin the reform or to restore facilities and equipment to a viable level.

Implications for policy makers and school leaders

The following are a summary of what, in our opinion, are the learnings that can be taken from the data we have collected and the insights we have gained from the 24 schools.

- *Policy implications*

  Early intervention is critical. This has improved greatly in New Zealand over the last year or two but could still be improved. Any school that asks for help deserves a careful and open-minded analysis as soon as it asks.

  Analysis of relevant data at a national level should be able to improve the early identification of schools becoming at risk. Examples of relevant data include staff turnover, finances, participation in professional opportunities, destinations of students at key transition points and ongoing monitoring of at risk groups of schools e.g. low decile, small and rural schools.

  Enabling the Education Review Office to have the numbers of quality staff and the time needed in the school to provide more usable information. We believe there are instances when it is destructive to publish progress reports. If ERO hold to their policy of making everything public, then there is a place for another review system that supports and does not work against positive change being encouraged in schools already identified as at risk.

  Reviewing the funding allocated to the low decile schools to areas of identified need. A key example is to provide for the non-teaching professional staff that these schools need in order that the teachers can focus on teaching rather than health, truancy, welfare and community liaison.

  Building on the new provisions for alternative educational opportunities and monitoring the way schools deal with suspending and suspended students so that the lowest decile schools do not become the dumping ground for students with serious problems.

  Finding ways to minimise school competitiveness so that school energy and funds are directed back to meeting student needs rather than marketing and publicity.

  Continuing to provide some of the School Support and Schooling Improvement initiatives but make the delivery systems more manageable and meaningful for the schools.

  Continuing to support the clustering of schools in ways that enable the schools themselves to feel they have a high level of control over the decision making.

  Providing effective training for new Principals and ongoing support and development opportunities for at least the first two years.

  Providing effective training for at risk Principals through professional development groups, mentoring, supervision, or a combination of similar support opportunities.

On-site training for Boards of trustees that is designed to meet the needs of each individual school and is not just a reproduced package.

- ***Leadership implications***

    To ensure that leaders continue to be learners and that the types of professional development provide the knowledge and skills necessary as well as professional support and challenge.

    School self review is only effective if it is honest and wide ranging. There is a place, from time to time, for an independent review of certain aspects of the school, especially if there appear to be concerns about it.

    Boards must find a means of appraising their Principal that is rigorous. The best way to ensure this happens is for the Principal to encourage such a process.

    Leaders need the skills to appropriately front issues at the first sign of problems. If they lack the confidence or the skills they must find a way to ensure it happens.

    The main goal a school should have is ensuring that teachers are performing at a high standard and that they contribute positively to the wider life of the school organisation. To ignore, or lower, expectations is often the beginning of a spiral of decline.

    Being a good change manager is critical. This means having the knowledge to prioritise wisely, the courage to control the pace and extent of change and the ability to identify the most urgent and the most important.

    Encouraging a climate in the school where it is safe to disagree or complain, and where people are listened to, will help to ensure that issues are dealt with before they develop into problems.

    Every leader will need help, support and advice from time to time. Knowing who to go to, and when, are critical.

    Leaders need the skills for school self-reviewing such as facilitation, data gathering and analysis, presenting and using analysed data and planning.

References

Ainsworth, V. (1994**) Tomorrow's Schools and Freedom of Choice: A recipe for disaster:** A study of the effects of roll changes on Christchurch state schools. Christchurch: University of Canterbury

Hawk, K. and Hill, J. (1996) **Towards Making Achieving Cool: Achievement in Multi-Cultural High Schools**. Wellington: Ministry of Education

Hill, J. and Hawk, K. (1998) **Achieving is cooler than it was: Achievement in Multi-Cultural High Schools.** Report to the Ministry of Education. Wellington: Ministry of Education

Hughes, D., Lauder, M., Watson, B., Hamlin, J. and Simlyu, I. (1996**) Markets in Education: Testing the polarisation thesis**. Wellington: Ministry of Education

Lauder, H., Hughes, D., Watson, S., Waslander, S., Thrupp, M., Strathdee, R., Simlyu, I., Dupuis, A., McGlinn, J., and Hamlin, J. (1999) **Trading in Futures: Why markets in education don't work**. Philadelphia: Open University Press

McKenzie, D. (1999) The Clouded Trail: Ten Years of Public Education Post-Picot. **New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies**, Vol. 34, No. 1

Nash, R. and Harker, R. (1997) **Progress at School**: Final report to the Ministry of Education**.** Palmerston North: Massey University

Waldegrave, C., Frater, P. and Stephens, B. (1997) An Overview of Research on Poverty in New Zealand. **New Zealand Sociology** 12(2)