



School Development Framework

*Matrices for school evaluation and
goal-posts for school developments,
inspired by Islamic values,
Pakistani and international
educational frameworks.*

Collated and Developed by
EdWise

June 2023

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

In the name of Allah, the most Compassionate, the ever-Merciful

EdWise

School Development Framework

Introduction:

A school is the microcosm of the society that we envisage for our upcoming generations. It is not just a place where subject-specific content is disseminated, but rather a space where human relationships, personalities, dispositions and communities are cultivated. These processes of cultivation cannot be arbitrary, they have to be underpinned by certain values and guided by well thought-out principles. Similarly, the pathway for a school's development has to be derived from the philosophy of its founders and subsequently mapped on a grid of educational standards and benchmarks. Such a pathway has to address the variety of strands considered essential for creating the right ecosystem for the holistic development of our young learners.

To these ends, this document outlines the School Development Framework (SDF) which can provide a typical school its goal posts towards self-development. Taking a whole-school-approach this framework comprises different performance standards, indicators and descriptors. It is also pertinent to mention that this framework builds on other Pakistani and international frameworks, specifically embedding Islamic perspectives wherever deemed appropriate.

Organization of the Framework:

The SDF is structured around seven Performance Standards which have been titled as follows:

1. Teaching-Learning Procedures
2. Curriculum
3. Assessment
4. Learners' Achievements
5. Holistic Students' Development
6. School Leadership and Management
7. School Community Engagement.

Each of these seven Performance Standards are further supported by Performance Indicators, Elements and Descriptors.

Performance Standards

Performance Indicators

Elements

Descriptors

Understanding the framework

As mentioned above, the SDF takes a whole-school-approach, in concept and in practice, to school development. The performance standards and the corresponding focus areas are constituents of a complete school improvement/enhancement program. The graphic below illustrates just that:



Each of these focus areas are further supported by performance indicators and elements which will be dwelt upon separately below.

Key Themes of the framework

In its totality, the SDF constitutes 58 performance indicators. However, none of them are disparate elements, but rather weaved in a neat framework ascribing certain notions greater significance in explicit and implicit ways. The framework lays strong emphasis on:

1. Robust processes of academic supervision
2. Interdisciplinary learning
3. Intellectual development of learners
4. Character-Building
5. Inclusive Education and
6. Meaningful integration of technology.

Language Guide to the Framework

Educational frameworks rely heavily on normative ideas and hence, can be interpreted differently. For purposes of consistency and reliability it would be helpful to refer to the language guide at the end of this document. Numerous concepts which have been put to use in this framework have been unambiguously defined over there.

Self-Evaluation Exercise:

While this framework provides the normative ideals and benchmarks for schools, it is imperative for the development process to be pegged with rigorous self-evaluation cycles. Without a holistic appraisal of the school's strengths and limitations, adopting this framework would be a non-starter. The annexures complementing this document include a set of templates and Means of Verification (MoVs) to guide that exercise and the subsequent planning for improvement.

Self-Evaluation refers to a systematic and sustained inquiry into how effectively a school delivers vis-a-vis its own mission and vision. It is aimed to collect concrete and actionable information where improvements need to be made to accomplish educational goals more effectively and to enhance student outcomes. It also aims to strengthen the school's capacity to make and sustain further improvements. To that end, Self-Evaluation Exercise is a recurring exercise as the school improvement journey is always a work in progress. At the heart of this exercise rests the caliber and competence of the school leadership. Since, the school's evaluation process and subsequent steps for improvement will have to be led by the leadership, therefore, they must be well-equipped with the skills and knowledge required for school evaluation.






















Ranking System

The framework then uses a four tier-based system to rank a school vis-a-vis each of the Performance Standards of the SDF. This will help the evaluators and school leaders to arrive upon a ranking for the respective school.





Tier 4	The school attains the most desirable level in terms of quantity and/or quality of performance with respect to the performance indicator.
Tier 3	The school attains the desired level in terms of quantity and/or quality of performance with respect to the performance indicator.
Tier 2	The school barely meets the criteria in terms of quantity and/or quality of performance with respect to the performance indicator.
Tier 1	The school does not meet the criteria in terms of quantity and/or quality of performance with respect to the performance indicator.

Means of Verification

The Self-Evaluation Exercise would comprise of different ways to evaluate the school vis-a-vis each Performance Standard. Collectively these MoVs would make for a holistic judgement on the school. Some of the MoVs pertain to the internal processes and records of the school, whereas others are connected to the usage of specific monitoring tools. The following page illustrates just that for each standard.

Performance Standards	Means of Verification			
1. Teaching – Learning Procedures				
2. Curriculum				
3. Assessment Practices				
4. Learners' Achievements				
5. Learners' Holistic Development				
6. School Community Engagement				
7. Educational Leadership and Management				

Legend

	Policy Drafts		Curriculum Records/Documents
	Plans and Working Documents		Assessment Data
	Parental and Student Surveys		Lesson Observations
	Student Outputs/Notebooks		

Standard 1: Teaching – Learning Procedures

	Tier 4	Tier 3	Tier 2	Tier 1
<i>1.1 Subject Knowledge of Teachers</i>	Teachers consistently demonstrate excellent content knowledge of their subject and its constituent topics during the sessions. The knowledge is relevant, accurate and stage/age-appropriate.	Teachers demonstrate decent content knowledge of their subject and its constituent topics during the sessions. The knowledge is relevant, accurate and stage/age-appropriate (fulfilling 2 out of the 3 conditions).	Teachers' demonstration of content knowledge of their subject and its constituent topics is at the bare minimum standard. The knowledge is still accurate.	There are factual errors in the knowledge/information being shared.
<i>1.2 Pedagogical Expertise</i>	Teachers possess a wide repertoire of pedagogical tools/approaches pertaining to that subject. They can effectively execute those pedagogical tools in an age-appropriate manner.	Teachers possess a limited repertoire of pedagogical tools/approaches pertaining to that subject, yet the execution of those pedagogical tools is effective and age-appropriate.	Teachers primarily rely on one or two pedagogical tools/approaches pertaining to that subject, yet the execution of those pedagogical tools is effective and age-appropriate.	Teachers primarily rely on one or two pedagogical tools/approaches pertaining to that subject, however, the execution of those pedagogical tools is ineffective and/or age-inappropriate.
<i>1.3 Lesson Planning</i>	Lesson plans are consistently purposeful and methodical in nature. Each plan intelligently moves towards pre-defined learning outcomes and logically outlines the components for the session(s) with time divisions followed by self-evaluation.	Lesson plans are mostly purposeful and methodical in nature. Most plans have pre-defined learning outcomes and logically outline the components for the session(s) with time divisions followed by self-evaluation.	Lesson plans are weak in terms of purpose and/or inadequate in terms of structure. Time allocation is not well-judged and self-evaluation is weak. Lesson Plans are barely connected to the bigger scheme of studies for the subject.	Lesson plans are incomplete and/or lacking purpose and connection to the pre-defined learning outcomes. They are also not sequenced well or poor in terms of time management. They are barely connected to the bigger scheme of studies for the subject.