SCHOOL LEADERSHIP IN SINGAPORE

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SINGAPORE
• Primary (6 years), Secondary (4 or 5 years), Junior College (2 years)
• 350 schools
• 532,225 students
• 29,000 teachers
• www.moe.gov.sg
BACKGROUND:
Singapore
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- Service: 64.7%
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Denmark and Singapore 2007 GDP

**Denmark**
- Agriculture: 4.6%
- Industry: 30.7%
- Service: 64.7%

**SINGAPORE**
- Agriculture: 0%
- Industry: 31.2%
- Service: 68.8%

CIA World Fact Book
One of the best performing education systems (McKinsey)

TIMSS
High O-level passes 88.1%
(5 or more passes Education Statistics)

2 out of 3 Jobs in Services sector (62.7%)
(2008 Ministry of Manpower Singapore)

GDP $51,656
(2009 Statistics Singapore)

Restructuring of economy

TLLM, C2015, PERI, MP3
• Higher-value chain
• Productivity
• Global workforce and rooted citizens
Competencies for 21st Century

**Personal Competencies**
- Motivation (self)
- Flexibility and Adaptability
- Integrity
- Active learner
- Problem solving ability
- Decision making ability
- Creativity/innovative
- Academic Achievement
- Technology

**Globalization**
- Team player
- Cross-cultural intelligence
- International knowledge
- Second/third language
- Networking
• Future Effectiveness
• World-class education movement
• Multiple intelligences
• Learning paradigm
• Individualization
QUESTIONS

• What’s next in our education system?
• How do we prepare for future effectiveness?
• Will our current success lead to failure?
• What do we value in our children, in society and in our lives? What are the tangible and intangible values?
Role of School Leaders
• Flexible and diverse education system
• Broad-based, holistic education
• New Buzzwords:
  ➢ creativity, intellectual curiosity and risk taking, innovation, entrepreneurial, broad-based education, passion, R&D, global mindset, rootedness, continual learning
Leadership Structure in Schools

- School Principal
- Vice Principal
- Head of Department
- Level Head
- Subject Head
Nurture and Develop Teachers in Career Path

**Career Advancement**

- Director – General of Education
- Director
- Deputy Director
- Cluster Superintendent
- Principal
- Vice Principal
- Head of Department
- Subject Head / Level Head

- Master Teacher
- Senior Teacher

- Classroom Teachers
- Leadership Track

- Senior Specialist 4
- Senior Specialist 3
- Senior Specialist 2
- Senior Specialist 1

Teaching Track

NIE: LEP 2010
• Professional Development of Teachers
  • 100 hours of professional development time
  • In-house development
  • Teachers’ Network
  • Communities of Practice
Role of School Leaders

- Defining school vision/direction
  - Process of creating vision and mission
  - Process of defining and unpacking values

- Managing Instructional Programme
  - Supervising & Evaluating Instruction (EPMS)
  - Coordinating curriculum
    - ‘Teach Less, Learn More’
    - Curriculum reduction, engaging pedagogies
    - Curriculum framework (e.g. Understanding By Design)

- Monitoring student progress
  - School cockpit
Role of School Leaders

- Creating school climate
  - Creating relevant environment for teaching and learning
  - Emphasizing innovation and entrepreneurship
- Developing staff
  - Enhanced Performance Management System
  - Professional Community
• Strategic Planning
  • student and school data (entrance level), projected scores, comparative schools etc.

• Performance Appraisal
  • Enhanced Performance Management System. (For professional development, performance appraisal, remuneration and rewards)
• Innovation and Enterprise
• School Improvement using ‘School Excellence Model’ (SEM)
• Branding and marketing schools
• Managing competitive schools
• Art and Science of Teaching for Results
• Creating and managing niche schools
• Developing centres of excellence
• Managing collaborations and international exposure for teachers and students
• Curriculum design
• Futuring
Educational Leadership Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era 1 (1900 – 1946)</th>
<th>PRESCRIPTIVE (Great man and trait theories)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Era 2 (1950s – current)</td>
<td>BEHAVIOURAL (Efficiency and pre-determined knowledge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Era 3 (Emerging alternatives)</td>
<td>EMERGING: COGNITIVE LEARNING THEORY, COMPLEXITY (Complexity of interactions, diversity and creativity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Three Eras**

(Ng, David (2005). Framework for Leadership Development)
Innovation Cycles of Educational Leadership Development

Technological Substitution (1)

Technological Discontinuity

Era of Incremental Change (1)

Era of Ferment (1)

Era of Dominant Design (1)

Prescriptive Era (1900 - 46)

Selection

Era of Incremental Change (2)

Era of Ferment (2)

Era of Dominant Design (2)

Behavoural Science Era (1950s - present)

Variation

Complexity Science Era?

Selection

Dominant Design (3)
| Paradigm 1 | INTERNAL LEADERSHIP  
(Internal Improvements for planned goals) |
| Paradigm 2 | INTERFACE LEADERSHIP  
(Competition in the market, cost-return) |
| Paradigm 3 | FUTURE LEADERSHIP  
(Multi-level learning leadership) |
• Varies widely – from mandated requirements to ad-hoc development

• Formal educational leadership development through the academic route

• Largely driven by course work but increasingly emphasizing on local knowledge (USA: Harvard, Stanford UK: National College)
Maintain a commitment to academic excellence AND a bold advocate of change and innovation

Programme Goals

• To develop ‘principalship’ capability in an increasingly complex world
• To inculcate innovative thinking
• To create new knowledge for effective school leadership
Course Learning Objectives (examples)

• Understand how mental representations drives leadership behavior

• Know how you could foster a school culture that puts student first
• **Design Framework** (How learning takes place)
  • Blend of complexity and constructivism

• **Thinking Framework** (Future-oriented)
  • Designerly Thinking

• **Leadership Frameworks**
  • Eclectic approach encompassing Instructional, Transformational & Distributed leadership
• Lecture series
  • Example: MOE’s Philosophy for Education Leadership: what it means for school leaders & how to interpret it to meet current & future challenges)
• 4 Core courses
  • Ed Leadership; Developing People; ICT; Curriculum
• 5 Electives
• Lecture series
  • Example: MOE’s Philosophy for Education Leadership: what it means for school leaders & how to interpret it to meet current & future challenges)
• Associate Fellow working with NIE, participants on the Creative Action Project
• Mentor
Future Oriented: Designerly Thinking And Creative Action Project
Integrative thinking - the ability to exploit opposing ideas and opposing constraints to create new solutions

The application of design thinking to educational challenges

Examples:

1. How did CMCH (Vellore) fulfilled their purpose of a mission hospital and stay competitive in the region?

2. How do we remain in the top tier accountability measures (TIMSS, PISA etc.) and be flexible, nimble, relevant and responsive to the changing landscape?
1. Human-centered
   • Manifested needs and latent needs
   • Tangible and intangible values

2. Building to think
   • Prototyping in order to think (slow down in order to speed up)
   • Real and virtual worlds

3. From consumption to participation
   • Creating for people, creating with people, Creating by themselves
   • Participative system
## Features

### Purpose

1. Challenge current practices and assumptions
2. Explore, create and innovate new practices for the 21st century

### Dimensions

- Leadership
- Technology
- Innovation
- Values

### Core Competencies

- Teaching and Learning
- Character Development
- Citizenry
- Future Effectiveness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group-based</td>
<td>3- 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Partner</td>
<td>• Active interest in Partnership with programme participants and the LEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools and Associate</td>
<td>• Cooperative and communicative about the processes in which participants will be engaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>• Responsible and accountable with the participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lead learner i.e., possessing a learning disposition, not simply a management disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Confident enough to be an informed risk-taker, not just a risk miminiser.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td>LEP 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Mainly Complexity and supported by Behaviorism and Cognitive constructivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>National, Organizational, Personal values and MOE’s Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Poetic Strategist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Process-as-content Course content as support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Design Features of LEP 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>LEP 2010</th>
<th>LEP 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>4 Core Courses and expanded elective choices</td>
<td>Electives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor component</td>
<td>One-to-one pairing</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Design Features of LEP 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>LEP 2010</th>
<th>LEP 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Creative Action Project</td>
<td>Innovation Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team-based</td>
<td>Individual-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Involvement</td>
<td>Involvement of senior MOE and Civil Service staff for Lecture series, and dialogue</td>
<td>Involvement of senior MOE staff for dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment for learning</td>
<td><strong>Individual Development Portfolio</strong></td>
<td>Journal Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal Assignments</td>
<td>Innovation Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative Action Project</td>
<td>Future School Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International visit</td>
<td>International visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NIE: LEP 2010
Poet *poieō*

- literary, humanistic aspect
- making, producing, creating, inventing, envisaging possibilities
- artfulness in the midst of intractable problems and unexpected contingencies

Strategist

- turning possibilities into action
- resourcefulness
- harmonizing competing objectives
Thank You
Question: Why do we adopt an eclectic approach of leadership frameworks? And why NOT instructional leadership alone?

- World-wide wave of **internal** and **external accountability** to address achievement gap – reemergence of instructional leadership
- The fallacy of ‘one-size-fits all’ leadership framework
USA: National Assessment of Education Progress

http://www.heritage.org/research/Education/bg2179.cfm
USA: National Assessment of Education Progress
Math Score
USA: National Assessment of Education Progress
Math Score
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Student Achievement 2008</th>
<th>Secondary/High School Graduation Rate 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>O-Level (5 or more passes) 80.8%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>*refer to Reading and Math scores slides 13-15</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>GCSE (A* - C passes) 50.4%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS

• How does the change in world reality affect us?
• Are we rule-takers or rule-makers?
• How do we compete?
• How does the learning paradigm affect us?
Work of Principals

• Pace: The executives worked at an unrelenting pace, with no breaks in activity during the day.

• Fragmentation: Their days were characterized by interruption, discontinuity, and fragmentation.

• Personal Tasks: They spared little time for activities not directly related to their work.

• Preference of Interaction: They exhibited a preference for live action encounters.
Work of Principals

• Networking: They maintained a complex network of relationships with people outside their organizations.

• Reflection: Because they were immersed in the day-to-day need to keep the organization going, they lacked time for reflection.

• Professional Identity: They identified themselves with their jobs.

• Information Sharing: They had difficulty sharing information.