立法會
Legislative Council

Panel on Education

Background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat for the meeting on 11 June 2007

The School Development and Accountability Framework

Purpose

This paper summarises the deliberations of the Panel on Education (the Panel) concerning the implementation of the School Development and Accountability (SDA) Framework.

Background

2.   In 1991, the then Education Department (ED) introduced the School Management Initiative Scheme under which schools were required to conduct self-evaluation and report their performance in a school profile annually. The performance data in the profile served as a reference basis for schools to identify areas for further development and make action plans for improvement. In September 1997, ED introduced a quality assurance (QA) framework to give impetus to the school improvement process and to accentuate accountability in the school system. In this framework, QA inspection served as an external QA mechanism while schools were required to conduct self-evaluation as an internal QA process.

3.   In 2000, all schools in Hong Kong started to implement school-based management under which schools were devolved with more responsibilities and enjoyed greater flexibility and autonomy in operation and resource management. Schools were required to develop formal procedures for setting school goals and evaluating progress towards achieving the goals, and to provide documents including a school profile, an annual development plan and an annual report for information of parents and the Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB).

4. In May 2003, EMB introduced the SDA Framework. The SDA policy comprised two key elements, namely, school self-evaluations (SSE) and external school reviews (ESR). SSE was based on strategic planning and included an annual action plan and a performance report based on evidence and data. ESR conducted by EMB aimed to validate SSE of all public sector schools within an anticipated four-year period. Both the SSE and the ESR processes adopted the Performance Indicators for Hong Kong Schools (2002) as a common platform for school performance assessment.

Deliberations of the Panel

5. The Panel discussed the implementation of the SDA Framework at its meetings on 28 April 2003 and 13 December 2004. The issues of concern raised by members about the SDA Framework are set out in the following paragraphs.

Implementation

6. Members sought information on the measures taken by EMB to facilitate smooth implementation of the SDA Framework. The Administration explained that to facilitate SSE, EMB would provide schools with the necessary tools, including a common set of key performance measures (KPM) and standard stakeholder survey questionnaires. A total of 21 pilot schools had started to practise a KPM-based performance management system since the 2002-2003 school year. EMB worked closely with the 21 schools to develop KPM and identify effective practices for schools to conduct self-evaluations. The effective practices in strategic planning and reporting identified by the 21 pilot schools would be disseminated to other schools for reference. EMB would assist schools in establishing a close network to facilitate dissemination of information in this regard. In addition, a set of guidelines and sample school plans and reports were available on the EMB website for schools' reference.

7. Members appreciated that schools and teachers had already been overloaded with the implementation of various education reform initiatives. They were concerned about the additional workload generated by the implementation of the SDA Framework. Members also noted the concern of some schools about the possible impact of ESR on school reputation and student enrolment. Members urged the Administration to review the implementation of the SDA Framework in the light of experience.

8. The Administration recognized that the concept of data management and evidence-based assessment was relatively new to schools, and pointed out that schools tended to over-prepare and over-document in preparing for ESR. In June 2004, the Administration reviewed the implementation strategy and deferred the implementation of ESR for 2004-2005 to January 2005 with a view to refining the SDA practices in the light of experience. In parallel, the Administration introduced a number of measures to reduce teachers' workload, relax the

requirements on reporting of KPMs, and enhance better understanding and development of a culture in the use of data to facilitate school improvement and development. In addition, the Administration commissioned Professor John MacBeath and Mr Bill Clark, two quality assurance and school improvement specialists, to conduct a systematic impact study to evaluate the Phase 1 implementation of SSE and ESR from February to July 2004, as well as a post-ESR survey to solicit feedback from the teachers in the 99 schools involved in the Phase 1 implementation. The results of the impact study confirmed that many of the key objectives of SSE and ESR had been realized, and that feedbacks from teachers were positive. Following the impact study and the survey, the Administration had introduced additional measures to facilitate the implementation of the SDA Framework at the school level.

Transparency of school data

9.	Members noted that under the SDA Framework, schools were required to upload their annual plans and reports in their websites, and release information on KPM to their management committees and key stakeholders including parents and teachers. While schools with impressive performance might be inclined to publicize their achievements, schools with less impressive performance might wish to maintain confidentiality of their KPM data. Members asked how EMB would monitor the publication of KPM data.

10.	The Administration explained that to address the concern of schools about increased transparency at a time of declining student population, it had relaxed the requirements for the first phase of SDA. Since June 2004, schools were no longer required to include any KPM items in the uploaded school reports for the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 school years. Schools would need to report only about 10 KPM items to the school management committees and key stakeholders up to the 2004-2005 school year. The Administration pointed out that the prime objective of SDA was to enable parents and other key stakeholders of a school to have access to KPM data and be aware of the strengths of the school and areas for improvement. EMB would continue to encourage schools to publicise their KPM to enhance transparency and accountability in school management. To avoid unnecessary publication of KPM data, EMB would establish protocols on the use of KPM data for schools to follow.

Assessment and evaluation

11.	Members were concerned about the objectivity and consistency of assessing performance improvements on the basis of KPM as schools might set performance targets at different levels for self-evaluation purpose.

12.	The Administration responded that a full set of performance indicators and reference data on KPM had been issued to schools in 2002 and 2004 respectively. As the school data size became sufficiently large, the benchmark process should provide a set of more objective and consistent standards for different levels of

outcome and schools' performance achievements. The annual plans and performance reports of schools would be validated by the ESR Team.

13. On the provision of flexibility for schools to include other KPM such as participation in social services for the purpose of self-evaluation, the Administration pointed out that the strategy was to develop KPM gradually as a common platform for the balanced assessment of school performance in the four domains, i.e., management and organization, learning and teaching, student support and school ethos, and student performance. EMB aimed to develop territory-wide norms against which school performance could be compared and assessed.

Measures to assist under-performing schools

14. Members noted that EMB might take actions against under-performing schools identified by the ESR Team on the basis of a set of KPM. Members enquired about the actions taken by EMB to assist schools to improve their performance in the light of the findings of SSE and ESR.

15. The Administration explained the support services provided to schools in need. The Administration pointed out that $550 million had been set aside for the provision of a range of school-based professional support programmes to support schools in implementing various reform initiatives. This included the establishment of school-based professional support teams to collaborate with universities in the provision of quality support programmes to schools. EMB would provide appropriate support to schools focusing on the areas that required improvement as identified through ESR. Should a school fail to improve as expected, EMB would consider changing the senior management of the school or appointing Government officials and suitable persons to participate in its management. Under the Education Ordinance (Cap. 279), EMB was empowered to participate in or take over the management of an under-performing school as appropriate. However, the Administration rarely exercised such power and would consider involving independent persons in deciding the need to take over an under-performing school.

Relevant papers

16. A list of the relevant papers on the Legislative Council website is in the **Appendix**.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
7 June 2007

**Relevant papers on
the School Development and Accountability Framework**

Meeting	Date of meeting	Paper
Panel on Education	28.4.2003 (Item IV)	Minutes Agenda
Legislative Council	11.6.2003	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 86 - 87 (Question)
Bills Committee on Education (Amendment) Bill 2002	3.3.2004	CB(2)1549/03-04(01)
Panel on Education	13.12.2004 (Item V)	Minutes Agenda
Legislative Council	9.3.2005	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 104 - 107 (Question)

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
7 June 2007