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SMALL RURAL SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

Creating opportunity through collaboration

Karen Starr

Introduction

Leading a small rural school presents specific challenges for principals: there are fewer people to perform as many tasks as exist in larger schools; teaching consumes a greater percentage of leaders’ time in multigrade, mixed-ability classes; there is often limited or no access to resources that are taken for granted elsewhere; and there is no dilution of stakeholder expectations regarding school improvement, policy accountability or student achievement outcomes. Small rural school leadership is complex, diverse and labour-intensive and the exigencies of life in small rural communities create unconventional leadership circumstances. Daunting as this may sound, many principals revel in small rural school settings, achieving success and professional enjoyment due in large part to the ways in which they address these particular challenges. They have recast contextual challenges as opportunities, which is the focus of this chapter.

Definitions

There are contested views about what constitutes a small school and what constitutes rurality, with various agencies and levels of the Australian government using differing definitions and criteria (Coladarci, 2007; HREOC, 2000). For the purposes of this chapter, definitions from the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development in Victoria, Australia, have been adopted. ‘Rural’ schools are those 70 kilometres or more from Melbourne, the state capital, or 25 kilometres from a regional centre with a population of 10,000 or more. ‘Small’ schools have an enrolment of no more than 100 students.

There are also contested views and perceptions about ‘leadership’ (Starr, 2014). Here, it is acknowledged that school leadership is distributed and enacted by many
people and at all levels within and outside small rural schools. However, the study reported in this chapter focused specifically on the principalship.

The research

The findings discussed in this chapter arose from a three-year professional learning and research programme for principals of small rural schools funded by the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development in Victoria, Australia. The programme focused on the development of teamwork, leadership capacity-building, and cross-school, school-community alliances to bring about change for the benefit of schools, students and school leadership. Up to 90 principals participated each year in a series of residential forums, supported by recently retired small rural school principals who acted as ‘critical friends’ or mentors, collaborating with tertiary personnel and an advocacy team for rural education, with financial, collegial and professional support and assistance from the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (Starr, 2009a, 2009b). A dearth of information on the subject of small rural school leadership in Victoria in the context of globalisation provided a compelling research void that required redress.

The research was an exercise in grounded theory building (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). In this approach, theory is not derived deductively but emerges from the data through an inductive process whereby emerging research insights are analysed and continually tested, producing further evidence and new theoretical insights. The research is data-driven rather than theory-driven. This iterative process of developing claims and interpretations determines its own end point when new data does not reveal any further insights but confirms theoretical elements that have already been identified (Punch, 1998).

Grounded theory is responsive to research situations and the people in it, supporting examination of individual standpoint, complex contexts, while considering the inextricability of macro, meso and micro connections, influences and consequences simultaneously (Corbin and Strauss, 2008). Real-life experience is taken as a starting point that connects individual agents to the structural, the social and the historical. In other words, large-scale social structures affect tangible realities that are inseparable from contextualised practice or from the historicity of the period (Ball, 1994). In this case, micro-level experience in the small rural school is where the effects of local, systemic, national and global, political, economic and social decisions and events have an impact in ways that differ from effects in other contexts. N-Vivo qualitative data software aggregated emergent themes, with initial data informing subsequent questions and forum discussions. Research data were shared with participants to confirm key findings and interpretations (Starr and White, 2009).

The context: globalisation and education policy

For more than three decades Australian educational provision and administration have changed continually through economic structural reforms at state and federal
levels in response to globalisation. Resultant reforms have altered the purposes, nature and scope of government departments/agencies, as public policy and government procedures align more closely with the free market and neoliberal policy foundations (Apple, 2006). Education is bound up with the nation state’s economic exigencies emanating from capitalist modes of production, and their maintenance and protection in globalising deregulated markets. Valorised are the precepts of individualism, consumer choice, competition, deregulation, local autonomy, the devolution of authority and the rolled-back state (small government), and individualised responsibility for risk and life chances, especially through health and education (Levin and Belfield, 2006). In collusion with these dominant discourses are those supporting a new public administration based on corporate management: centralised regulation, compliance, accountability and risk aversion, fiscal constraint and the imperative of value-for-money, with emphases on quality assurance, continuous improvement and outcomes gauged via performance indicators, professional standards, standardised testing and benchmarking (Ball, 2006; Duignan, 2006; Starr, 2012). Waves of restructuring and reform have fundamentally reconfigured the dominant discourses and philosophical, organisational or budgetary bases of public sector agencies, including schools. In Australian education these have focused on strengthened national productivity, international economic competitiveness in trade, workforce capacity and innovation, and internationally recognised educational achievement.

Like many other places in the world, Australia’s neoliberal and neoconservative education policy agenda has been justified and legitimised through political discourses highlighting educational ‘crises’, inefficiency in the public sector, and the need for parental choice and voice in education to drive school improvement and innovation (Dale, 1989; Shapiro, 1990; Pusey, 1991). Crises within the political economy have been parried downwards through the state to the institutional level. Hence as Bottery (2004, p. 34) claims, globalisation encompasses the ‘processes which affect nation states and produce policy mediations, which in turn have a direct impact on the management and principalship of educational institutions’.

Educational leadership has, therefore, become the focal point for educational policy reforms. It is the means by and through which governments and schooling jurisdictions aim to implement educational reforms, school improvement, higher student learning outcomes and improved ‘standards’. To enhance leaders’ capacity to deliver on macro- (national) and meso- (state) policy agendas in education, the Commonwealth and the Australian states have introduced leadership standards and capability statements to guide the work, professional learning and development of school leaders. These documents emphasise school improvement through the attainment of superior student achievement results and leadership capacity building with a focus on distributed leadership and shared-responsibility in schools (Starr, 2014). Comparative league tables based on standardised student testing and public examination results are published nationally on the My School website, providing institutional competitive incentive, consumer transparency for the exercise of choice and ensuring principals’ accountability in instructional leadership.
**Globalisation and small rural communities**

Small rural communities are experiencing various forms of social and economic decline, especially with deregulated markets and Australia’s northern neighbours supplying abundant low-cost labour and production. Global economic competition has encouraged long-standing rural industries to relocate commercial activities offshore or close altogether. Many small rural communities have been divested of private enterprises and public services, including the closure of institutions such as banks, commercial enterprises, industries and schools. Adding to this, climatic events such as drought, bushfires and floods have been widespread and are occurring more regularly (Flannery, 2005), taking a toll on economic activity and livelihoods, especially in agricultural communities. These phenomena have exacerbated rural unemployment and population migration to cities and mining areas for work, with concomitant effects on the viability and survival of local rural businesses and public services, including schools. Meanwhile, many small rural schools located closer to larger regional centres or the outer metropolitan suburbs have noticed a shift in enrolment trends as lower income or welfare-dependent families relocate to acquire affordable accommodation. Against this background, the following is a discussion of the major themes that emerged from the research programme about leading small rural schools in Victoria.

**Major leadership challenges in small rural schools**

Many leadership challenges were common to all principals in small rural schools. These challenges were manifest in diverse ways but are recursively linked and interconnected (Starr and White, 2008, 2009).

**The changing nature of the principalship**

Recent policy reforms exhort that educational institutions must become more autonomous, self-reliant and responsible; raise standards and improve student outcomes, especially measurable outcomes, while adapting to greater cost efficiencies/cutbacks and market competition. ‘Doing more with less’ is the new ‘bottom line’, but demands go beyond the ‘core business’ of teaching and learning to include numerous elements that were once alien to the educational environment (Gard, 2013). In a dynamic policy environment, principals have to be agile, adaptable and flexible to cope with continual change and uncertainty. The ability to save time and labour through technology and governmental pressures for economic growth, increased productivity and continuous improvement through education policy have resulted in the intensification and unremitting nature of educational work, a major feature of which is ‘function creep’, in order to ensure that a rising number of requirements are met.

All principals commented on the increasing amount of mandatory accountability, compliance and administrative work arriving from district, state and federal
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governments, and the negative impact this ‘administrivia’ was having on teaching, learning and the social life of schools. Principals explained that the situation was continually getting worse and described their working lives in terms of being ‘always busy’, ‘never stopping’, ‘running the whole day’ with work that is ‘never-ending’. These administrative burdens are unrelated to school-based priorities, take considerable time to execute and are professionally ‘invisible’ and unrewarding, with principals referring to such increasing external impositions as the ‘bane of my life’, ‘the worst part of the job’ and ‘soul destroying’ in a context of cost-cutting and resource ‘efficiencies’. Ironically, they say, this means they cannot perform all tasks to the best of their ability due to time constraints, despite widespread policy discourses promoting ‘excellence’. The only way they can cope is to put in increasingly longer hours on the job. Principals in all schools might have similar complaints (Buckingham, 2003; Gronn, 2003; Wildy and Louden, 2000), but the problem is exacerbated in small rural schools where principals’ work involves activities conducted by other professionals in metropolitan schools. Work intensification also steals time from family life.

Given pressures to ‘perform’ and being compared with other schools add to concerns about spending quality time with students and teachers. One principal said: ‘I think it’s a really big task to have quality results in both areas [teaching and administration]... Something has to give at some point.’ Unwanted policy and procedural interventions were seen as isolating and adding to stress, while also detracting potential aspirants to the principalship. Also, new tasks such as having to formally apply for competitive funding for specific needs were mentioned. Resources are declining so they are now competitive. Previously, schools received resources for specific needs and purposes as a matter of course, but they are now dependent on the preparation of successful funding submissions. One area of competitive funding concerns additional resources for students with special needs. ‘Special needs’ are now more tightly defined, so fewer students qualify for extra assistance. ‘Targeted’ funding is a controversial change, while securing resources for addressing educational needs is viewed as being totally dependent on a principal’s ability to prepare strong, convincing funding submissions.

A surprising perception was that principals felt their work in schools was supported insufficiently by the education bureaucracy at state and/or district level. ‘The system’ was reported as being ‘a nuisance’ and of having ‘no idea what we do because they’ve never done it’, with these sentiments being intertwined with principals’ concerns about incessant waves of policy reforms. Principals’ comments indicated a sense of being dislocated and marginalised from debates about education policy and direction. The majority view was that a division exists – with policy makers ‘on the inside’ having very little understanding about small rural school life and their leadership challenges.

Revealing comments included: ‘the lack of understanding from the hierarchy... would be from my Deputy Regional director upwards’; ‘It’s no good taking problems to the District Office... if you complain or ask for help, you’re considered to be a nuisance or ineffective’; ‘Everything they want us to do just
gets in the way of what you’re really here for – the kids.’ Added to the view that no one really knows what small rural school principals do is the perception that systemic praise, acknowledgement or reward for their work is rare. On this, one principal said: ‘You’re doing a fantastic job and you never stop, but you have no point of reference and no one’s telling you you’re doing a great job, so you always feel inadequate.’

Small rural school principals are concerned about having to implement policy they perceive to be irrelevant or inappropriate to the needs of their schools. Overlaying all this is not only physical isolation, but also a sense of psychological alienation from the new policy hegemony. Principals of small rural schools believe that their working conditions have deteriorated and that they have subsequently been relegated to a lower positioning within the education employment hierarchy.

**Governance**

School governance was commonly raised as an important issue in small rural locations. School councils oversee the work of all schools, yet it can be difficult to generate sufficient interest for involvement in small communities. Not only is it difficult to attract the interest of parent and community volunteers in the first place, but small rural schools often have difficulty in maintaining the required number of school councillors. School councils are drawn from the immediate community, which in rural areas does not leave much room for choice. In some cases, principals reported having councils that renewed their membership too infrequently, which hindered school change and fresh ideas. School councils have to oversee a very tight global budget that usually requires top-up through fundraising or sponsorship efforts, but shortfalls are reported as being difficult to avoid in some hard-strapped rural contexts. Principals also reported problems when micro-political local gossip that spilled over into school governance agendas. In the words of one principal, ‘Local issues spill over into the school all the time. Everyone knows everyone else and if there’s any local conflict, it will be evident in the school as well.’

**School closures**

Small rural school viability is an issue of negative economies of scale, with a far greater cost per student for schooling provision in small rural locations (Picard, 2003). Schools receive recurrent funding and staffing levels based on per capita formulae, meaning that annual budgets, the number of teachers employed and the educational programme may change noticeably as enrolments fluctuate even slightly. Cash flow problems were reported to occur regularly, with government grants sometimes arriving too late to cover many operational costs. There are widespread concerns about budget shortfalls, with necessary maintenance work being put off and expenditure on resources or new initiatives being delayed. Higher poverty rates and lower incomes limit community fundraising possibilities.
School enrolment viability was a constant source of stress for many respondents, a situation also reported elsewhere (Eastley, 2004; Goode, 2007). If schools become too small, they will be closed. Accordingly, several respondents worried that their school’s longevity was under threat. Viability is about meeting enrolment targets and attracting students, although many schools faced continual enrolment decline with population growth trends showing no immediate solution to this problem.

There have been more school closures over the past three decades than ever before in Australia, and communities that lose their schools struggle to survive (Eastley, 2004). If a rural school closes, children are forced to travel long distances to alternative schools. A significant complication in closures and amalgamations is that a school principal loses his/her job, adding a personal dimension to the issue of diminishing community assets.

**Educational equity**

Allied with the above-mentioned concerns were associated worries about equal opportunities, social justice and equity policies for students of small rural schools. Principals say that previously overt policy goals for educational equity have slipped off the policy agenda or have become too bureaucractised in their execution (such as the new competitive special needs funding arrangements and tightened eligibility criteria mentioned above). They perceive discourses concerning competitive individualism and efficiency have overturned the previous social democratic, welfarist consensus about equality in educational provision and outcomes. There is a prevailing sense that policy morality has disappeared along with previous policy and resourcing measures, with deleterious effects at the micro-school level. Underlying this is the view that fundamental, incontrovertible values about equity should underpin education policy and the work of schools, yet these have been abandoned, disadvantaging students in small rural schools.

The principals’ comments suggested a struggle between school-based crusaders for better social outcomes and ‘making a difference’ against negative macro policy forces that generate resource reductions, feelings of loss through the diminution of social principles and values, and a devaluing of education as a fundamental right for all. Parodying Orwell (1965), there was a strong sense that ‘all schools are equal but some are more equal than others’. One principal summed up many of the above dilemmas in this way:

> You have to constantly be on the front foot. ... You try and keep up with what the Department wants, you have to watch your numbers [enrolments], you have to keep an ear to the ground to know what’s happening in the community that might spill over into the school, and you have to watch how staff in the school are faring with pressures to do as much as a large school does. It’s a juggling act that’s a lot about survival.

Such key challenges are affecting how small rural principals operate, but several significant and effective school leadership trends are emerging in response.
Emerging trends and responses

Even though principals may feel marginalised systemically, the research revealed the opposite effects in local contexts. Numerous creative initiatives to leadership challenges emerged, with many common themes running among them. In response to rural challenges, school communities are moving beyond traditional pathways to deliver educational benefits.

There is a trend towards collaborative governing councils that oversee education and other social services within a whole district. These volunteers are concerned about developing and preserving broad coverage of educational provision from preschool to post-school education, alongside other social service provisions within their geographical location. The groups have not replaced individual school councils but are evolving as an adjunct to them, and may, in time, replace them. These larger, combined governance structures assist in overcoming the usual limitations of smallness, rurality and resource scarcity. Collaborations with other professionals such as health workers were reported. School principals are pivotal players in these groups, with their involvement taking school leadership into the realms of community leadership.

There is an inextricable link between regional economic development and education provision in rural locations. Some councils and principals are highly entrepreneurial, bringing in involvement of local government and businesses. The support resulting from such efforts includes educational collaborations across districts, sponsorships and donations, capital works and maintenance projects, facilities sharing and usage, short-term resource exchanges, the sharing of expertise, and lobbying for greater state and federal government support, a topic returned to later in this chapter. The school’s educational capacity is built alongside community development and governing councils can be very instrumental and helpful in this regard.

Combined leadership among principals, school councils and education department officers facilitates future scenario planning, the sharing of expertise and strategic plans to affect community educational provision, including making decisions about what is educationally viable and what is not. Combined governance is about enhancing the services and provisions of entire regions by taking a prospective view of educational and other human services needs across whole districts (Country Education Project, 2007), with school planning spanning all school years and beyond, including co-located preschooling and health provisions. These emergent rural community development plans require the services of community builders and ‘boundary-crossers’ (Centre for Research and Learning in Regional Australia, 2001). One principal explained as follows:

Small places like ours need people who put in, otherwise small towns die. . . . It’s surprising how much a group can do – and if you can’t do it, someone will know someone who can and rope them in. . . . We’ve looked at
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education from birth right through so no kid loses out from living out here — that’s the main goal... and it’s the same for health services.

School leaders reported collaborations across schools to deliver teaching, learning, leadership and management requirements, with such partnerships expanding and being viewed as increasingly essential. Collective activities prompted by the requirements of structural reforms and problems of limited resources are aided by new technologies and a sense of community ‘self-help’. Collaborations included sharing the costs of peripatetic specialist teachers, arranging collaborative professional development activities for teachers, and organising cross-school drama and arts events, school camps, excursions and field trips. There are student and teacher exchanges, volunteers are used and new flexible configurations of school timetables are implemented to enable all these activities. Combined regional planning occurs to ensure consistency in curriculum provision, especially in LOTE (languages other than English). Small rural schools share expertise, ideas and resources, including equipment and instructional materials.

Although schools are one of the few sources of employment in small rural locations, when availability becomes an issue, schools cooperate to attract recruits to multi-school positions from elsewhere in the state. Retirees with all manner of skills and experiences are used to mentor, train and fill in. Pragmatism is at the basis of collaborative arrangements.

Principals work closely with teachers to form leadership teams in planning learning activities and in implementing new curricula, enacting pastoral care duties and other programme coordination exercises. They work with parents on extracurricular provision, on teacher aide assistance, and to maintain schools and their grounds, among many other things. Principals work with municipal councils to develop strategy, to maintain budgets and expenditure, to attract funds, to marshal community support and to solve higher order management problems in schools and broader educational issues across the district. Principals work with members of their local rural communities who are more engaged with the school as a community hub. The small rural principal has no option but to collaborate with many stakeholders to execute their jobs effectively. Working together is vital as schools determine how they can cover the range of teaching, leadership, administration and professional learning programmes collectively, thereby reducing the workload and resources outlaid by any single school. The same can be said of school councils.

These sorts of activities strike a chord with the levels of clustering identified by VicHealth, the state’s government health department, that identifies ‘levels of clustering’ thus: Networking: exchanging information for mutual benefit, requiring little time or trust between participants. Coordination: which goes beyond networking to include transformative practices towards a common purpose, such as coordinating a district event. Cooperation: which goes further still to include the sharing of resources, requiring more time, and a higher level of trust and sharing. Collaboration (highest level of clustering): extends all the above and includes enhancing the capacity of other partners for mutual benefit and towards a common
purpose. This requires partners to give up a part of their ‘turf’ to another partner to create an improved or more seamless approach. In the schooling context, giving up a part of one’s turf may mean relinquishing an activity being done well and passing control to another school in order to focus on a leadership strength within and on behalf of the cluster.

The research project reported here identified all the levels of clustering described above, with many examples of the higher level collaborative clustering and collaboration. High-level collaborations include non-school players: government (municipal, state and Commonwealth); business (chambers of commerce, local businesses); community services (such as youth, sporting, health, community groups, service clubs and neighbourhood centres); as well as other education providers (from preschool, vocational education, tertiary institutions). School involvement in community-building activities also accentuates a two-way dependency, with schools being consumers of goods and services while providing local employment and the provision of physical resources such as meeting places, sports venues for the integration of many community activities.

Also evidenced were a large number of cross-disciplinary cultural, community-building or environmental projects in the curriculum of small rural schools. For example, a common goal is for schools to engage with an emerging ecological and tourism economy, harnessing human and natural capital. In these ways, there is a recursive positive relationship between small rural schools, their communities, local cultures and the environment.

One cluster of schools established a combined administrative bureau, hiring multi-skilled personnel to manage communications, finances, maintenance works, co-operative purchasing, and to service co-operating governing councils, and this led to the systemic roll-out of LABs (Local Administrative Bureaus). The LABs also co-ordinate funding grant applications, sponsorships and donations, hire out school facilities and facilitate equipment exchanges, saving costs and time.

Several clusters of principals participating in the leadership professional development programme made use of university expertise to devise, collate and analyse their own statistical and qualitative research data. Principals are using evidence-based information to attract funds and resources, or as the basis for collaborative curriculum developments. Many rural schools made special arrangements to attract university student teachers during their compulsory trainee teaching rounds. Also evidenced were teacher exchanges (with the flexible school timetabling arrangements enabling such exercises) and collaborative efforts to attract enrolments through promotions and public relations exercises.

Educational capacity is being built alongside community development so that sustainability replaces fear about school closures. Local people already feel their communities are under-serviced, and are the hardest hit by climatic events and the retreat of social institutions and local industries, but they still want excellent education provision. The collective resistance of rural communities, fighting to keep their local services including resistance against efficiencies and economies of scale, is viewed as a necessity.
Concluding remarks

Much was learned through the research programme being reported here about the very particular experience of small rural school leaders, especially about how they lead, learn and work when remoteness and the shortcomings of multifunctional, demanding and boundary-crossing jobs have to be negotiated constantly. The main concerns of school leaders in small rural schools are:

- Their ability to cope with the leadership and management aspects of their jobs, which are continually changing and expanding, while having responsibility for their own teaching, student welfare and community involvement.
- Constraints due to the multiple nature of their role.
- Making time and mustering support to create significant school change.
- Overcoming feelings of isolation and removal from usual avenues of support.
- Catering for students with special learning needs.
- Equity and social justice policies remaining overt in rural education.
- Perceptions of being marginalised from major educational decision making.
- The viability and survival of their small rural schools.

(Starr and White, 2008)

The most obvious conclusion to be derived from the research is that context matters. Principals of small rural schools face distinctive challenges such that what works in large cities does not necessarily work in small rural schools. Principals highlighted how ‘one-size-fits-all’ education policies and practices often disadvantage them, while there is also a general lack of policy or provision relating specifically to small rural schools. Resultant challenges generate new distinctive rural leadership responses and collaboratively derived outcomes. The tenacity, ingenuity, supreme commitment and unlikely but critical relationships derived from small rural school leadership lead to an understanding of why such contexts yield different leadership responses than may be witnessed in other educational settings.

Rural decline, alongside structural reforms and connective technologies, is creating innovative school leadership practices with the involvement of community players. So as to best service their schools and help themselves, small rural principals are turning to each other and their communities for support and collaboration in conducting various necessary and innovative activities to effect positive results. There are many activities afoot for overcoming the problems of smallness and rurality.

Small rural schools are enhanced by strong community linkages and attendant shared school-community, boundary-crossing leadership practices. These have arisen through informal, locally derived and pragmatic means. For more than a decade official policy rhetoric and research suggests that distributed leadership forms
are endorsed as the most appropriate for schools (Department of Education, 2007; Hay Group, 2006; Starr, 2014). In the small rural communities in this research, however, leadership distribution was seen to go beyond the boundaries of the school. Many people play an important part in running small rural schools in which leadership is increasingly viewed as a collective community responsibility in the context of diminishing and more tightly controlled resources. Para-professionals and willing contributors assume greater significance by assisting with all manner of necessary activities to get things done. School leadership is not only distributed within and across schools, but within and across communities. Also witnessed were a variety of formal and informal leaders and leadership styles that contributed to the effectiveness of collaborations within and across schools. Small rural principals, however, must have the ability to communicate ideas and goals to provide links between people, organisations and projects to create change and renewal towards collective goals. These individuals enhance school-community programmes and collaborations. Without community support and cooperation, many fruitful projects, programmes and activities would not happen in small rural schools.

Quite simply, collaborative enterprises across small rural schools make significant sense in addressing the pressing challenges confronting their principals. In order for education and other social services to survive and thrive, local rural people are making the best of their new circumstances and the challenges they bring. The principals involved in this research are adamant that essential collaborative arrangements should be supported actively and systemically with formal recognition and funding. These fruitful partnerships are proving to be of benefit for communities, schools, students and small rural principals. Small rural principals understand that performing in their jobs is not just about what they do, but how they do it (Barley and Beesley, 2007).

Finally, small rural school principals had many suggestions for positive change for small rural schools, including the need for:

- research into the needs of small rural schools;
- policy specifically relating to the needs of small rural schools;
- contextualised resourcing;
- research into alternative governance models for clusters of schools;
- teacher education and educational leadership courses focusing specifically on small rural schools;
- schemes to attract new recruits such as compulsory teaching practice for student teachers in small and rural schools;
- professional learning on meeting the needs of multi-age and diverse classes, cross-disciplinary teaching, team teaching, multi-skilling, special education and community liaison skills.

These suggestions are helpful starting points for policy makers, educational researchers and teacher educators.
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