Introduction

A major argument in Visible Learning is that the impact of educators is most powerful when principals lead schools to have debates and engage in critique about what "impact" means across the school, to help develop multiple ways to evaluate the magnitude of this impact, and to search for ways to ensure that all students gain the benefit of attaining this magnitude of impact. This highlights the "instructional" or "impact" power of school leaders but, most important, it also shows the power of the collective nature of our enterprise. Teachers can and should not engage in this debate alone—otherwise it becomes random each time a student meets a new teacher whether the student will make appropriate yearly gain or not.

Recently, Rachel Eells completed a dissertation on teacher collective efficacy (Eells, 2011). This concept relates to ways to empower teachers so that they can determine what changes can be made within their particular context by enhancing their confidence to overcome any limitations and truly make a difference to the learning outcomes of their students. This screams for leadership in the school to develop an organization climate, produce school norms, and create the time and direction to enhance all teachers in the school to share in this sense of confidence to make the difference.

Her work brings together two powerful disciplines. First, social-cognitive theory is based on Bandura's (1997, p. 3) notion that "perceived self-efficacy refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments," leading to a powerful sense of agency: "to be an agent is to intentionally make things happen by one's actions" (Bandura, 2001, p. 2). When teachers have efficacy expectations that they can positively influence the outcomes of student learning, then the likelihood of these outcomes increases (Rubie-Davis, 2015).

Second, she explores the notions of collective efficacy. This relates to "a group's shared belief in the conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required producing given levels of attainment" (Bandura, 1997, p. 477). In schools this is less related to the addition or aggregation of individual beliefs about personal efficacies to accomplish group goals, but more to the aggregation of members' beliefs about the collective's ability to accomplish group goals (Bandura, 1997, 2000). Eells provides a powerful example: "If the collective activity consists of the sum of independent successes, as it does for a track and field team, then it is preferable to measure and aggregate the personal efficacies of the actors. When an entire group must interact, like a basketball team would, and collective activity is the product of cooperative work, then it makes more sense to measure group members' beliefs about what the team can accomplish" (2011, p. 66). In schools, collective efficacy is influenced by school organizational features, such as responsiveness of administrators, teacher collaboration, encouragement of innovation, orderly student behavior leaders' attributes (Newmann, Rutter, & Smith, 1989), and the narrative developed by school leaders (in schools where teachers' conversations dwell on the insurmountable difficulties of educating students that are likely to undermine teachers' sense of efficacy but in schools where teachers work together to find ways to address the learning, motivation, and behavior problems of their students that are likely to enhance teachers' feelings of efficacy; Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).

Eells located 26 studies of the relation between teacher collective efficacy and student outcomes. The average correlation was 0.60, which translates to an effect size of 1.23—making it among the most powerful influences that we know on student achievement (Hattie, 2009, 2015a). This effect was high across all school subjects and at all levels of schooling (elementary, middle, and high). The message is clear: How teachers collectively think about their impact is most relevant to success for their students. But how to develop leaders to engender their group positive think—and then ensure it is operationalized in the classrooms, is shared and esteemed in the staff room, and

that lessons are learned in safe, high trust environments about what worked best and what did not—for whom and about what.

This collective efficacy flies in the face of the fundamental assumption that too many educators have about their profession—the right to teach and think as they want. Hence the importance of this book by Lyn Sharratt and Beate Planche. They not only highlight the power of collaboration, they go further to identify the key narratives to which this collective needs to attend. Their notion of Collaborative Learning involves systems and school leaders building collective capacity, energizing knowledge together, and moving schools from being places of "plans and good intentions" to centers of "purposeful practice" on the part of all teachers who then empower students to do the same. Who does not want to be a part of such a school? It is unfortunate that the answer too often is "many" who prefer to be left alone, supported to do it "their way." And this is not saying that "their way" is good or bad, but when it is good, what a powerful addition to the collective, what a wonderful role model, what a potentially excellent critique. We have to stop building models where we address one teacher, one school, and one system at a time; stop talking about my students, my class, my school, my system. It is time to learn from each other about what works best, to critique our notions of what impact and learning look like, to build a coalition of the successful to enable all to then make the difference, and to convince each other through evidence of student growth that it *is* possible to make major differences in the learning lives of students. There are so many examples of excellence in this happening throughout the world and so many identified in this book—if only we had greater courage to identify successful schools all around us. And from such success, scale it up to others. It is the collective and Collaborative Learning that needs capturing. This is the power of this book—to provide signposts to collaborative effectiveness, to provide many examples of this in action, and to indicate the underpinnings of Collaborative Learning.

It takes deliberate action by school leaders to build collective efficacy and work together. Sharratt and Planche see this as co-laboring—we are responsible to and accountable for our own learning while supporting the learning of other co-laborers (collaborators). Co-laboring fosters

interdependence as we negotiate meaning and relevance together. This leads to a sense of joint-ownership of the success or not of what we do. They show examples of how they have implemented these notions in schools, and thence the powerful and consequential impact on student learning. They note the critical ways to build leaders who have the courage to create narratives about collective impact, how leaders can best work collaboratively with teachers, and teachers with other teachers, and teachers with students. It never loses the key focus of this collaboration (hint: it is a precise, focused daily devotion to learning linked to results).

What a wonderful contribution this book makes to the current debates about how to move the basic premise for most educators away from "my class/school is my kingdom" and away from "I need to be supported and left alone by my leaders"—to a basic premise that my major mission is to work collaboratively with other educators and students to collectively maximize our impact on students. As Jim Knight says in the Foreword, this book is rich in examples, it is timely, and the authors write what they truly believe and have experienced as researchers and practitioners. Michael Fullan in the Afterword notes that there are many crystal clear concepts, co-learning galore, guided by research, grounded in practice—all devoted to deep learning by students and adults alike. I endorse Michael's noting how this book complements his own recent book *Coherence: Putting the Right Drivers in Action* (Fullan & Quinn, 2015). Similarly, it provides the flesh, the examples, and the drivers of the major messages underlying the Visible Learning research— how educators can work together to understand and critique what they mean by impact, what acceptable levels of magnitude are, and how to ensure that *all* in the system gain acceptable levels of impact.

John Hattie
Laureate Professor, Director, Melbourne Education
Research Institute at the University of Melbourne