

Learning more about Supervisory Officer learning:

Update to the 2015 monograph

July, 2016

Introduction

This update describes the second phase of a partnership project initiated by the Ontario Public Supervisory Officers' Association (OPSOA) and supported by the Ontario Ministry of Education and Aporia Consulting Ltd. The project focused on the role of the Supervisory Officer (SO) school visit in supporting the Instructional Leadership (IL) capacity of school administrators. The project arose in response to SOs across Ontario asking about the role of the SO in supporting the IL capacity of the school administrator, and specifically, about the role of school visits for this purpose. As such, in the Fall of 2014, six SOs from six different Ontario public school boards (with elementary and secondary school responsibilities), supported by consultants/researchers from Aporia Consulting Ltd., came together to form a learning network, that took up a specific inquiry question: How do I learn which things I do as a SO (in relation to my school visits) make a difference on the Instructional Leadership capacity of principals? A representative of the Ministry of Education located himself as an observer and co-learner within the learning network, with the permission of the group.

The six SOs committed to engaging in individual inquiries to learn about this challenge “on behalf of” SOs across the province, using the collaborative learning network to gain critical feedback on their individual work. The six SOs engaged in their individual inquiries on an ongoing basis, and the group met together monthly. This process is fully articulated in a previous monograph¹.

In the 2015-16 school year, OPSOA and the Ontario Ministry of Education continued their support of the network, still in the service of learning “on behalf of” Supervisory Officers across Ontario. The goal was to build an even deeper understanding of both the process of Supervisory Officers working together in a cross-district learning network, as well as the content of what it means for SOs to effectively support the Instructional Leadership capacity of school administrators.

The learning from the first phase of the project is summarized in the previous monograph. That monograph focused on learning about the *process* of Supervisory Officers working together in a learning network, as well as learning about the *content* of the inquiries that the Supervisory Officers worked through (essentially, what have emerged as promising practices related to the SO school visit). The current monograph update goes deeper by investigating the learning “on behalf of” model. While the project intent has always been that the learning of the six SO

¹ See http://www.opsoa.org/Downloads/SO_Learning_Monograph_16-04.pdf

participants will spread to others, our “theory of action” suggests a foundational prerequisite of deep and sustained changes in practice among those directly involved.

This report considers the learning “on behalf of” model in two ways: First, we look at the depth of the learning of the Supervisory Officers directly involved in the project, as well as their beliefs about the sustainability of their changes in practice. Depth and sustainability of changes in practice are important to investigate because it is unlikely to expect an impact on those *not* directly involved in the project if the changes in those who have been directly involved are not deep and sustainable. Second, we consider the spread of the learning from this project, by exploring the extent to which others who were not directly involved in this project have been impacted as a result of it. Importantly, we consider depth, sustainability, and spread of the learning from the perspective of both process (learning via individual leadership inquiries and a collaborative group to provide feedback on the individual work) and content (what has been learned about the SO school visit and supporting school administrators’ IL capacity).

It is important to underscore that this monograph update is not intended to replace the 2015 monograph, but instead, to add to it. Importantly, in the first section below, where we report on changes in practice for the SOs directly involved in the project, we begin by listing the findings from the previous monograph. We do not describe that set of findings in depth here because they are fully explicated in the previous report. Instead, only new findings that were either not reported previously or that now involve a deeper understanding are discussed in some detail.²

Learning from the project: Deep, consequential, and sustained changes in practice on the part of the participating SOs

A deep and consequential change in practice

Coburn³ refers to “deep change” as that which goes beyond surface structures or procedures. This project considers a deep and consequential change in practice both in relation to the process (learning via individual leadership inquiries and a collaborative group to provide feedback on the individual work) as well as the

² Learning in year two was captured from a variety of data sources, including document analyses, group meeting notes, individual interviews, and direct observation.

³ Coburn, C. (2003). Rethinking scale: Moving beyond numbers to deep and last change. *Educational Researcher*, 32, 3-12.

content (SOs learning about the school visit and supporting school administrators' IL capacity).

Deep and consequential change with respect to the process

In the 2015 monograph, in the section entitled "Learning about the process: Supervisory Officers working together in a learning network", we reported a number of findings, including:

1. The power of a learning network is in each person working on his/her own slice of the problem, with the network aggregating the learning.
2. The inquiry template is a vital tool because it works as a scaffold to plan, capture, and label the learning.
3. Learning moves need to be small.
4. You need to follow through each row on the template.
5. Reflecting on both what you've learned FROM a move and ABOUT a move is critical.
6. Using a structured learning conversation protocol ensures that the group adds value to the work of each individual, well beyond what each individual could accomplish on his/her own.
7. Hearing about others' inquiries makes you consider new ideas both for yourself and for your board.
8. Documenting your own learning with a template helps you understand what this process is like for school administrators.
9. It's essential to establish group norms early on, to review them frequently, and to take them seriously.
10. Relationships don't need to come before the work begins; they can develop as you do the work.
11. Think about who you choose to work with when you are learning to hone your skills around the school visit. In other words, select your "learning spaces" intentionally.
12. Learning with an "outside" critical friend can be an important part of the learning experience.

Each of the 12 findings reported in the previous monograph are still considered to be essential learnings from this project. In addition, the SOs reported additional learnings about the process from the 2015-16 work:

13. Not every "challenge" requires an inquiry.

This process helped the SOs better understand that inquiry is only one strategy for approaching challenges and is in fact not always appropriate. This work has helped

the SOs differentiate among true adaptive challenges where no one knows the answer and an inquiry is appropriate, real challenges that they are experiencing but where evidence-based strategies to address them already exist and can be adopted without an inquiry, and problems that are “...just part of your job, where you just have to suck it up and do it, rather than launching an inquiry.” The SOs are concerned that provincially there are many individuals who are turning everything into an inquiry, and that this has the potential to be an “activity trap” (where time and resources are being spent on action research in places where evidence-based strategies already exist).

14. Regularly revisit the question of whether your “learning case” is in fact a good one to learn from.

The SOs involved in the project all worked with a “learning case”, which was one or two schools/administrators where the SO believed that s/he could add value in terms of building IL capacity, and where what was learned would have transfer potential into other similar contexts. Essentially, the SOs would engage in their small learning moves with the learning case to learn both “from” and “about” the moves. The “learning case” was intended to be representative of other members of the SO’s “class” of administrators, so that what the SO learned about the learning case could potentially be transferred to others. For a number of SOs involved in this project, however, at some point during the process they discovered that due to a better understanding of the question they were investigating or due to an evolution in their inquiry, the learning case was no longer proving to be representative, and they needed to make a change in order to continue the learning. This experience highlighted the importance of continually checking whether the learning case is in fact representative and continues to be a good one to learn from, to ensure that you’re engaging in the most impactful learning possible.

15. Moves that were successful for one individual can often be adopted by others.

One of the learnings reported in the 2015 monograph was that “hearing about others’ inquiries makes you consider new ideas both for yourself and for your board”. The SO group took this learning to a deeper level in the 2015-16 work. In the second year, participants understood the potential of adopting moves that others

“We build an archive of practices from our peers that we can use.”

had successfully done, such that they asked for very specific details in order to ensure that they could replicate the moves as closely as possible.

They would return to the following meeting and say things like “I tried ‘the [specific SO name] move’” and report on how it went for them in their context. This

replication of one another's learning moves, mediated by different contexts, is one of the strongest examples of what "learning on behalf of" looks like.

16. It is essential to reflect on the process of using a conversation protocol each time you use it.

The last step of the learning conversation protocol used by this group in their meetings involves reflecting on the process of using the protocol in relation to the success criterion of pushing all group members' thinking beyond what they could do on their own. As a group that had been working together for over a year, and had become very comfortable with one another and with the protocol, at some point in the second year they became lax with this last step of the protocol (reflection on how the protocol was working). At one meeting, the protocol seemed not to work as well as usual, and the group had an honest discussion about why. This led to the realization that even a group that uses the protocol regularly and is comfortable with it and with one another needs to regularly revisit the question of how well it's working, to ensure it's accomplishing what it is intended to achieve.

17. Cross-district networks can help keep the learning focus clear and apparent.

All of the SOs involved in the project reported that they found it easier to learn in a cross-district learning network with people they didn't previously know well than

"There's probably more traction for this type of work when you're not working with people who know your context. It's almost an advantage... We tend to focus in our own backyard, but having a more provincial perspective, the learning has more branches and tentacles...it's more genuine."

they tend to when they learn with close colleagues. While some were initially concerned that the very different contexts of different boards would prove to be problematic for a cross-board network, they came to find that this didn't get in the way at all, and might even have been advantageous. With no opportunity for distractions that were operational or based on story swapping about individual people known to all of them, they found that learning was

always at the forefront.

18. The leadership inquiry process is invaluable as a strategy to get to know your schools and administrators.

A number of the SOs reported that they feel they know their schools and their administrators significantly better as a result of participation in this project. They reported that using an individualized inquiry process that forces them to plan their moves in a detailed way, monitor the success or failure of each, and reflect on the learning to plan future moves, all the while receiving challenging yet supportive

feedback from colleagues in the group setting, has allowed them to understand their “class” of principals at a much deeper level.

19. Learning “on behalf of” can also inform system-level policy.

Some of the SOs involved in the project were engaging in inquiries that were not only about learning how to support the school administrators that they have direct responsibility for, but also about learning about processes that could potentially be systematized in their boards. Because boards already have formal leadership development strategies in place, one aspect of “on behalf of” can be an intentional opportunity to reflect on and supply precision around what the official leadership development policy (like the Board Leadership Development Strategy) articulates.

20. This kind of collaborative learning is a significant, personal commitment.

All six of the SOs involved in this project took their commitment to the group extremely seriously. Despite the roles that these individuals are in, and the fact that

“This is a learning piece that YOU have to do. You can’t outsource it!”

the nature of their jobs means daily emergencies that could distract them from undertaking their individual inquiries or call them away from participation in the group meetings, the accountability to the group was always present. The SOs arrived at every meeting prepared to learn, with detailed, thoughtful, updated templates completed. Meetings were almost never missed, and during the meetings, each participant was always fully attentive. As one SO said, “you have to be committed to being in the moment from the minute you come in until the minute you leave. That’s the only way this works.” The SOs were appreciative of this dedicated time for their own professional learning, which they feel they rarely get in other contexts.

Deep and consequential change with respect to the content

In the 2015 monograph, in the section entitled “Learning about the content: Promising practices related to the Supervisory Officer school visit”, we reported a number of findings, including:

1. Be intentional and deliberate about how various support structures fit together; the school visit does not stand alone.
2. Think about using school visits as an opportunity to learn about school administrators both individually *and* collectively.
3. Look at school visits as differentiated opportunities.
4. Think about who’s in your “class” and focus your work on them.
5. Be intentional about the purpose of visiting classrooms during a school visit.

6. Think about differentiating your school visits even within an individual school.
7. The frequency and length of visits depends on the purpose.
8. The kinds of questions asked at a school visit are critical.
9. Think about preparing administrators in advance of your visit.
10. The quality of reflection after a visit can be increased if you have more than your memory to rely on and reflect from.
11. Consider sharing the load and creating sustainable support structures.
12. Think about school administrators in an inclusive way.
13. Be familiar and comfortable with the school's data.
14. Every part of a school visit should be purposeful and intentional.

Again, each of the 14 findings reported in the previous monograph are still considered to be essential learnings from this project. In addition to these, the SOs reported new learnings about SO school visits and what it means for SOs to support the Instructional Leadership capacity of principals:

15. You need to practice differentiated support for principals in the same way as you would expect teachers to do it for students.

In the 2015 report, we described the key learning that school visits should be considered differentiated opportunities, in that the SOs learned that there was no such thing as what a school visit “should” look like generally. In the 2015-16 work, a number of the SOs reported that one of the biggest learnings after two years of involvement in this project is how important it is for them to differentiate for their school administrators all of the time, not just during school visits. As one SO said, “the notion of differentiated instruction is crucial... for students, good teachers assess and then realize what they need to do with a small group who doesn’t get it. That’s what this has taught me. This is no different. It is about growing capacity or fulfilling a lack of understanding with a subgroup. This is what DI looks like for administrators.”

16. Peer-to-peer support, when used appropriately, is invaluable.

In the 2015 report, we described the learning that the SOs developed around connecting principals with one another for support so that the work isn’t entirely dependent on the SO. This was a theme that emerged for a number of the SOs in the 2015-16 year, as some of them created structures for school administrators to be coached by an administrator colleague. This theme of having a target administrator coached by a peer was important for the SOs in two ways. First,

“You can’t be the one that does everything. Sometimes you need to learn to activate the right resource.”

dependent on the SO. This was a theme that emerged for a number of the SOs in the 2015-16 year, as some of them created structures for school administrators to be coached by an administrator colleague. This theme of having a

the SOs believe that peer coaching can be beneficial because principals are often able to add value in different ways than SOs. Second, the SOs learned that having principals work with one another can remove some of the pressure from the SO. They shared that once they acknowledged that they can't do everything and accepted that this is okay, they realized how much pressure peer-to-peer support could alleviate. As one SO said, "I wouldn't have done this before. In the past I would have said 'I need to be there'. I've learned that I don't need to listen to every minute of every conversation."

Importantly, using a peer coaching model does not mean that the SOs are giving full responsibility over to the coach, but instead, that the SOs are intentionally learning what it means for them to leverage the leadership of another individual to support a colleague. Some of the SOs in this project worked to intentionally inquire around the notion of peer coaching, by learning what the criteria are for an effective peer coach, what specifically the capacities are that the SO is looking for the coach to help build in the target administrator, and what the relationship is among those in the triad (the target administrator, the peer coach, and the SO). The SOs learned that having an administrator coached by a peer is a balance between complete involvement and hands-off on the part of the SO. They had to determine how to find their place in the relationship between the target administrator and the coach in a way that allowed them to support and influence the coach, and add value where possible, but not violate the important trust and confidentiality between the target administrator and the coach.

17. Whenever possible, ensure that your leadership decisions are rooted in evidence.

One of the SOs reported that one of the biggest learnings s/he has had from this project is the importance of ensuring that decisions are grounded in sound research and theory. This SO reported that one of the participants at the table is regularly making connections to research, and that this modeling has encouraged him/her to do the same.

18. There are various ways to support principals beyond face-to-face interactions.

The SOs reported that the structured process of deliberate and intentional reflection over two years has helped them learn about the range of options for supporting principals. Some of the SOs reported that they now understand that the moves they make to support the IL capacity of principals don't always need to be in-person, and that email or phone can be used for efficiency, even about instructional matters, as long as the requisite focus is there. Importantly, they explained that monitoring

learning moves has helped them learn which kinds of moves do need to be done face-to-face for them to work well and which can be done via other means.

19. What an SO learns from one structure can be used to support another.

The SOs reported that one key learning from this project is around being more intentional in the ways they work with their “class” of school administrators, and about the interconnectedness among the different structures they are involved in. Specifically, the SOs now have a better understanding of how they are using different structures in their boards, and the potential of learning about one to inform another. For example, an SO might plan an area meeting based on evidence that was gathered at school visits. One SO reported that s/he is now intentional about this and actually shares it with his/her administrators, saying things like “in my last round of school visits I noticed X, and so now I’m doing Y.”

20. It’s what you want to LEARN that’s important, not what you want to DO.

The inquiry template encourages leaders to think about moves in terms of what they are looking to *learn* rather than what they are looking to *do*. Some of the SOs reported that this shift in thinking has become so ingrained in them that they’re now thinking about their work in all contexts in that way. For example, one SO described the way s/he now plans all meetings, thinking about what s/he is looking to learn rather than the activities that s/he will do.

Sustainability

Each of the six SOs reported that they feel that the changes in their beliefs and practices that have resulted from their two-year participation in this project will be sustainable. This sustainability relates both to the process learning from the project, as well as the content learning.

Sustainability of the process

The SOs reported that using the plan, act, assess, reflect cycle to design and monitor their learning moves is now part of their regular practice. They explained that they

“I’ve been doing this for two years. And I worked really hard at learning how to do it. Now following the plan, act, assess, reflect cycle is just part of what I do.”

now approach their work using a cycle of inquiry because learning is tied up in how they operate. As one SO said, “I do my work through learning. I don’t have to think about it anymore, I just do it.” They also reported that the last column of the inquiry template, which has them reflecting both on what they learned FROM the move they tried (i.e., what have they learned that will move their inquiry forward?)

as well as what they learned ABOUT the move that they tried (i.e., was it a good move that they might want to do again?), is becoming embedded in their thinking. Importantly, all of the SOs described the importance of being involved in collaborative professional learning like this. Some reported that although this project is formally coming to a close, they will continue working with this collaborative group on their own time, as “it’s the best professional learning [they] do.” These SOs believe that they will feel a void and their learning will suffer if they discontinue working in this collaborative setting.

Sustainability of the content

Each participating SO reported that the inquiry work undertaken in this project has resulted in changed beliefs and practices that will be sustainable for them. An illustrative sample of these sustained changes include:

- The changed mindset about who the “class” of an SO is, and the focus of trying learning moves with principals rather than teachers or students. As one SO said, “I came into this role wanting to make a difference for kids, but I have learned that the true influence I have is over my principals so they can push things forward for teachers and kids. This will be a sustained change for me.”
- Constantly revamping the structure of the school visit, and differentiating

“I realized how ineffective I was before this work. It’s helped me consolidate better practices around school visits and now I can’t imagine going on a school visit without properly preparing. I thought I was prepared before but it was more generic... now it’s very specific. Now what I do is tailored to the specific school and I know much more about specific people. I can’t imagine I would ever go back to what I was doing before.”

support, based on the needs of particular principals.

- Questioning the existing structures and the existing prescriptions in a board to ensure that they are meeting a particular valued function.
- Regularly asking oneself the questions, “am I making a difference and how do I know?”, and using the cycle of inquiry to be able to answer them.
- In every context, using the language of “what do I want to learn?” rather than “what do I want to do?”

One SO reported that for her, evidence that she has built some sustainable practices comes from the fact that, toward the end of this project, she found herself including moves on the inquiry template that she already knew “worked”. She was tracking those moves because she needed to learn FROM them (i.e., to better understand the particular school or principal) despite not

needing to learn ABOUT them because she already had previous evidence that they were moves that worked. As this SO said, “These moves had become embedded in my practice... so that’s my evidence of sustained changes.”

Learning from the project: Spread of the learning from this project to others not directly involved

The previous two sections provide evidence that the six SOs who directly participated in this project have developed deep, consequential changes in thinking and practice that are sustainable. As described earlier, the purpose of engaging in the project for a second year was for these SOs to continue to learn “on behalf of” others across Ontario, and for the key learnings from the project to begin to spread. This section comments on that spread. Spread of the learning from this project can be thought of both in terms of how others have been impacted as a result of this work, as well as in terms of how the ideas from this project are beginning to have traction with others who were not directly involved.

The impact of this project on others

First and foremost, most of the SOs reported that they believe that they are more effective Supervisory Officers as a result of participating in this project, and that this has been the most important impact on others. They believe that they are doing a better job supporting their school administrators in developing Instructional

“Others have been impacted simply as a result of me being a better Supervisory Officer!”

Leadership capacity, which is having a positive impact on schools. In addition, some of the SOs who work with local learning teams in their own boards (either with their SO colleagues or with school administrators) believe that they are now better able to coach others on how to use the template and the protocol as they have now become the “knowledgeable other” as a result of practicing inquiry so thoroughly in this project. As one SO said, “my having more experience with [the process] has helped propel the group.” And another SO reported, “I feel I’ve gotten better at this, and that’s making the groups I work with better at this. People are saying our learning teams look and feel different from how they did in the past.”

In addition, the SOs reported that they took the learnings from the project in Year One and used some of them to intentionally design better learning opportunities for the school administrators that they support. For example, one SO reported that s/he thought a lot about the finding from Year One that showed that learning with people who were not close colleagues and didn’t know your local context (in this case, SOs from different boards) contributed to the positive nature of the learning. As a result

of this, this SO designed learning networks that were cross-family of schools in an attempt to replicate this experience within the local context.

Spreading of the learning from this project to others not directly involved

The SOs reported that the ideas from this project are beginning to have traction with others who were not directly involved. Again, this spread can be considered both in terms of the process and the content of the project.

Spread of the process

Spread of the process refers to the extent to which the process undertaken in this project (individual inquiry projects supported in a collaborative group) are beginning to spread to others, in that more people are taking up the process as a result of learning about this project. Perhaps the most interesting example of spread of the process is that one of the SOs involved in this project, whose board role changed during Year Two to become a Human Resources (HR) SO, carried this process into that new role. This SO has asked HR managers to use the inquiry process (and supporting tools) to build their own leadership skills within HR, and has developed a learning network to take up these HR leadership inquiries. As this SO said, "I've seen that everyone, even traditionally "operational leaders", can benefit from this type of learning... There is merit to bringing it into different contexts." This is interesting because it demonstrates that using inquiry to develop leadership practices, and engaging in a collaborative group to provide critical feedback on the inquiries, can be a promising practice for leaders outside of academic roles.

The process of SOs from different boards working together in an intentional learning network has also spread to other Supervisory Officer groups throughout Ontario who were already working together but have now changed their focus to engage in work that looks more like the work undertaken in this project. For example, various regional Supervisory Officer groups, made up of SOs from different school boards in the same region of Ontario, are now engaging in this process, with the support of one of the consultants involved in this project. This was a direct result of these groups hearing about the success of this project and wanting to become directly involved themselves.

We can also consider the extent to which this process is spreading within the individual boards of the participating SOs, either to other senior level administrators or to school administrators. There is variability in the extent to which the SOs believe that this process is spreading to their SO colleagues in their own boards. Some of the SOs reported that the process has not spread to all of their

SO colleagues, some of whom have not yet engaged. Other SOs reported that they believe there has been positive spread to their SO colleagues, who are now embracing the learning network process more willingly as a result of seeing the positive changes in the SO who has been directly involved. Importantly, however, the SOs believe that we need to be cautious about this kind of “spread”, because there is some evidence of others adopting the process without a complete understanding of it. As one SO said, “Some of my colleagues are trying to replicate what I am doing but don’t really understand it. So they are doing things like changing the protocol. They don’t understand the “why” behind it so it’s not working for them.” This is an important caution with respect to the spreading of the learning; the tools (or structures) appear to travel more easily than the underlying functions, but quality implementation depends on a deep understanding of the underlying functions.

Importantly, some of the SOs believe that the learning network process is gaining traction with school administrators in their local boards as a result of this project. They believe that school administrators are more committed to the learning network process as a result of hearing that their SO is participating in a similar process and clearly values it. Many of the school administrators seem to have bought into the process and are truly invested, in that they never miss meetings,

“Principals are telling me how much they value the learning they do in the network- without me even asking!”

always have the work done in advance, are asking to present their inquiries, and are disappointed when it’s not their turn to share. Some school administrators are even becoming coaches to their colleagues as they develop a

deeper understanding of the process, and have expressed that they want to help others understand it like they do. Although there are still some places where school administrators are not yet as invested in the idea of learning networks, there is considerable evidence of positive spread.

In addition, there appears to be more talk among school administrators about the value of the network. For example, in boards where not all school administrators are already in local learning networks, there has been more talk from school administrators about wanting to get involved as a result of hearing about the success of this project. Similarly, in boards where only some school administrators are involved in learning networks, the participants are expressing concern that they’ll be moved to a new area and will no longer be involved, which they are now expressing as a disadvantage.

Interestingly, in some places the process is also beginning to spread into individual schools. A few of the SOs reported that certain principals that they work with now

have individual teachers using the inquiry template to engage in their own learning about an adaptive challenge in their work, and that a few have adopted the process with Department Heads who are learning about leadership.

Spread of the content

Finally, we can consider the extent to which the promising practices about the SO school visit and supporting principal Instructional Leadership capacity that have been built through the two years of this project are beginning to spread to other senior-level administrators in these six SOs' local boards. Some of the SOs reported that their colleagues are interested in the enhanced understanding of the school visit that the participating SO has developed and are beginning to look more critically at how they do their own school visits as a result of hearing about their colleague's intentionality. The SOs also reported that in some cases, their board colleagues are replicating the participating SO's successful moves directly, the same way the SOs involved in this project are doing with one another's moves. One SO said that at his/her SO network table people are asking for details on others' moves (e.g., what questions did you ask?, how did you structure the meeting?) because they know they might want to try the moves themselves. Some of the SOs even reported that their colleagues are specifically asking them for support as they try to think intentionally about their school visits and supporting school administrators.

Conclusion

Earlier we referred to Coburn's⁴ notion of scaled change, which includes the key dimensions of depth and sustainability. Across two years, we have evidence that this process – using individual leadership inquiries to learn about supporting principals' Instructional Leadership capacity, and using a collaborative group for critical feedback on these inquiries – has led to deep changes in practice for the participating SOs, which will be sustained. The six participating SOs own this work; they don't participate in this learning network because someone else has said it's a good idea, but because they consider it crucial to their way of learning about leadership. Some of them have committed to continuing with the learning network despite the formal project coming to a close, and this is because they don't see it as a "project", but instead as their ongoing work of professional learning. As the two-year project that these six SOs embarked on "on behalf of" Supervisory Officers across the province comes to a close, the work continues, as it has become embedded in these individuals' ways of operating.

⁴ Coburn, 2003.

Appendix A: Project Participants

Supervisory Officers:

Joy Badder (Lambton Kent District School Board)

Peggy Blair (Avon Maitland District School Board)

Michelle Deman (Thames Valley District School Board)

Silvia Peterson (Durham District School Board)

Jo-Anne Plaunt (District School Board Ontario North East)

Michael Prendergast (Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board)

Other Participants:

Lisa Dack (Aporia Consulting Ltd.)

Sue Greer (Aporia Consulting Ltd.)

Steven Katz (Aporia Consulting Ltd.)

Bruce Shaw (Ministry of Education)