

By Beatriz Pont, Deborah Nusche, Hunter Moorman

An abstract graphic featuring overlapping circles in shades of blue and green. The background is a light blue gradient. Overlaid on this are several overlapping circles in various shades of blue and green. Diagonally across the image, the text 'PRINCIPAL DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP TEAM HEAD TEACHER LEADERSHIP TEAM PRINCIPAL DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP TEAM HEAD TEACHER LEADERSHIP TEAM' is repeated multiple times in a light blue, sans-serif font, creating a sense of motion and depth.

Improving School Leadership

VOLUME 1: POLICY AND PRACTICE

By Beatriz Pont, Deborah Nusche, Hunter Moorman



ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The OECD is a unique forum where the governments of 30 democracies work together to address the economic, social and environmental challenges of globalisation. The OECD is also at the forefront of efforts to understand and to help governments respond to new developments and concerns, such as corporate governance, the information economy and the challenges of an ageing population. The Organisation provides a setting where governments can compare policy experiences, seek answers to common problems, identify good practice and work to co-ordinate domestic and international policies.

The OECD member countries are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. The Commission of the European Communities takes part in the work of the OECD.

OECD Publishing disseminates widely the results of the Organisation's statistics gathering and research on economic, social and environmental issues, as well as the conventions, guidelines and standards agreed by its members.

This work is published on the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Organisation or of the governments of its member countries.

Also available in French under the title:

Améliorer la direction des établissements scolaires

VOLUME 1 : POLITIQUES ET PRATIQUES

Corrigenda to OECD publications may be found on line at: www.oecd.org/publishing/corrigenda.

© OECD 2008

OECD freely authorises the use, including the photocopy, of this material for private, non-commercial purposes. Permission to photocopy portions of this material for any public use or commercial purpose may be obtained from the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) at info@copyright.com or the Centre français d'exploitation du droit de copie (CFC) contact@cfcopies.com. All copies must retain the copyright and other proprietary notices in their original forms. All requests for other public or commercial uses of this material or for translation rights should be submitted to rights@oecd.org.

Foreword

School leadership is now an education policy priority around the world. Increased school autonomy and a greater focus on schooling and school results have made it essential to reconsider the role of school leaders. There is much room for improvement to professionalise school leadership, to support current school leaders and to make school leadership an attractive career for future candidates. The ageing of current principals and the widespread shortage of qualified candidates to replace them after retirement make it imperative to take action.

Improving School Leadership, Volume 1: Policy and Practice explains why school leadership has become a key policy priority and sets out four policy levers which, taken together, can contribute to improve school leadership and school outcomes. The book is based on an OECD study of school leadership around the world, with the participation of Australia, Austria, Belgium (Flemish and French Community), Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Korea, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom (England, Northern Ireland and Scotland).

Each of these 22 education systems prepared a detailed background report analysing national approaches to school leadership. In addition, five case studies on school leadership focusing on system improvement and training and development complement the comparative work by providing examples of innovative practice (published in a companion volume, *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*). In this way, we were able to collect the information necessary to compare country developments and adopt an innovative and forward-looking approach to policy making.

The *Improving School Leadership* activity produced a significant body of knowledge on this issue in the form of country background reports and innovative case study reports, all of which are available on the OECD website at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership. Many people shared their expertise and knowledge to make this a successful activity and there have been many opportunities for exchange. Three international conferences and three workshops brought together national coordinators, representatives of international organisations and a network of research experts.

The authors are indebted to the countries who took part in the study, to the extremely engaged national coordinators, to the expert teams who participated in the country visits and provided valuable comments on the report and to the countries that hosted conferences and workshops. We are grateful to HSBC Education Trust and David Hopkins for supporting the case studies and to Judith Chapman, Andrew Hargreaves, Tony Mackay, Robert Schwartz and Fani Stylianidou for their expert contributions to the activity.

This activity was carried out by the Education and Training Policy Division of OECD's Directorate for Education under the leadership of Abrar Hasan (until his retirement) and Deborah Roseveare (since June 2007). Peter Chambers and Susan Copeland edited the report and Judith Corcoran, Jennifer Gouby and Ross Wilkins provided administrative support.

Table of contents

<i>Executive summary</i>	9
<i>Chapter 1. School leadership matters</i>	15
1.1 Introduction	16
1.2 The concept of school leadership	18
1.3 School leadership is a policy priority	19
1.4 School leadership responds to changing policy environments	22
1.5 The current reality of school leadership	27
1.6 Summary: why school leadership matters	32
<i>Annex 1.A1. Research concerning factors influencing student learning</i>	33
<i>Annex 1.A2. Levels of school policy decision making</i>	35
References	36
<i>Chapter 2. (Re)Defining school leadership responsibilities</i>	41
2.1 Supporting school leadership autonomy	42
2.2 Core responsibilities of school leadership	44
2.3 Improving the definition of school leadership responsibilities	61
2.4 Summary conclusions and recommendations	64
<i>Annex 2.A1. Evaluation of public schools in lower secondary education</i>	67
References	68
<i>Chapter 3. Distributing school leadership</i>	73
3.1 Who participates in school leadership?	74
3.2 Distributed leadership at work	81
3.3 School boards play an important role	87
3.4 Summary conclusions and recommendations	93
<i>Annex 3.A1. Distribution of leadership and the role of school boards</i>	96
References	102
<i>Chapter 4. Developing skills for effective school leadership</i>	107
4.1 Professionalisation of leadership development varies across countries	108
4.2 The different stages of leadership development	113
4.3 Institutions focused on leadership development	125
4.4 Methodology and content	131
4.5 Summary conclusions and recommendations	136
<i>Annex 4.A1. Preparatory training for school leadership</i>	139
<i>Annex 4.A2. Formal induction programmes for beginning school leadership</i>	143
<i>Annex 4.A3. In-service professional development for school leadership</i>	146
References	150

Chapter 5. Making school leadership an attractive profession.....	157
5.1 The supply of school leaders	158
5.2 Recruiting an effective workforce	161
5.3 Providing adequate remuneration.....	170
5.4 Professional organisations for school leaders.....	175
5.5 Supporting school leaders' career development.....	177
5.6 Summary conclusions and recommendations	180
<i>Annex 5.A1. Recruitment of principals.....</i>	<i>183</i>
<i>Annex 5.A2. Professional associations for school leaders</i>	<i>187</i>
<i>Annex 5.A3. Employment status and duration</i>	<i>188</i>
<i>Annex 5.A4. Performance appraisal of school leaders.....</i>	<i>189</i>
References	192

Boxes

1.1 The OECD Improving School Leadership activity	17
1.2 OECD scenarios: what might schooling look like in the future?	21
2.1 Leading learning organisations in Sweden.....	50
2.2 England: using evaluation information for improving performance	52
2.3 “Communities of schools” in Belgium (Flanders)	58
2.4 School-municipality co-operation in Finland.....	59
2.5 System leadership in England	61
2.6 School leadership frameworks across countries.....	63
3.1 Teachers also exercise leadership roles.....	79
3.2 Distributed leadership in Finland	80
3.3 A set of principles for distributed leadership	83
3.4 Characterisation of different models of school leadership in England.....	85
3.5 Leadership distribution and rewards in New Zealand and Northern Ireland.....	86
3.6 Training opportunities for school boards	92
4.1 Coherent leadership training and development provision in Victoria, Australia	114
4.2 Scottish education leadership development.....	115
4.3 Selected leadership qualifications	118
4.4 Leadership “taster” courses in the Netherlands.....	120
4.5 The Swedish national head teachers training programme	121
4.6 Some induction programmes and their impact.....	122
4.7 Chile’s head teacher training for school leadership	124
4.8 The Austrian Leadership Academy	125
4.9 Teaming up with the private sector for school leadership development	130
4.10 Some features of school leadership development programmes in the United States	134
5.1 Bringing business leaders into schools: experience from the Netherlands	163
5.2 Recruitment and selection criteria of school leaders in Victoria (Australia)	164
5.3 Identifying and developing future leaders	167
5.4 Professionalising recruitment procedures in Austria.....	168
5.5 Responding to principals’ salary concerns in selected countries	172
5.6 Individualised salaries in Sweden	174

Figures

1.1 Number of principals in primary and secondary schools	28
1.2 Percentage of principals aged 50 and over	29
1.3 Percentage of female principals	30
2.1 Average involvement of schools in decision making across OECD countries	43
2.2 School leadership autonomy in curricular decisions	46
2.3 Observation of lessons by principals or senior staff.....	48
2.4 School leadership autonomy in resources	53
2.5 School leadership autonomy in teacher remuneration.....	54
2.6 School leadership autonomy in teacher hiring and firing.....	55
3.1 Who is involved in different school level responsibilities across OECD countries	75
3.2 School board participation in school resource decisions.....	89
4.1 Leadership development approaches across countries	109
5.1 Secondary school principal salaries in relation to GDP per capita.....	171
5.2 Secondary school principal salaries in relation to teacher salaries.....	173

Executive summary

Why school leadership matters

School leadership has become a priority in education policy agendas internationally. It plays a key role in improving school outcomes by influencing the motivations and capacities of teachers, as well as the school climate and environment. Effective school leadership is essential to improve the efficiency and equity of schooling.

As countries are seeking to adapt their education systems to the needs of contemporary society, expectations for schools and school leaders are changing. Many countries have moved towards decentralisation, making schools more autonomous in their decision making and holding them more accountable for results. At the same time, the requirement to improve overall student performance while serving more diverse student populations is putting schools under pressure to use more evidence-based teaching practices.

As a result of these trends, the function of school leadership across OECD countries is now increasingly defined by a demanding set of roles which include financial and human resource management and leadership for learning.

There are concerns across countries that the role of principal as conceived for needs of the past is no longer appropriate. In many countries, principals have heavy workloads; many are reaching retirement and it is getting harder to replace them. Potential candidates often hesitate to apply, because of overburdened roles, insufficient preparation and training, limited career prospects and inadequate support and rewards.

These developments have made school leadership a priority in education systems across the world. Policy makers need to enhance the quality of school leadership and make it sustainable.

The OECD has identified four main policy levers which, taken together, can improve school leadership practice:

1. (Re)define school leadership responsibilities

Research has shown that school leaders can make a difference in school and student performance if they are granted autonomy to make important decisions. However autonomy alone does not automatically lead to improvements unless it is well supported. In addition, it is important that the core responsibilities of school leaders be clearly defined and delimited. School leadership responsibilities should be defined through an understanding of the practices most likely to improve teaching and learning. Policy makers need to:

- **Provide higher degrees of autonomy with appropriate support**

School leaders need time, capacity and support to focus on the practices most likely to improve student learning. Greater degrees of autonomy should be coupled with new models of distributed leadership, new types of accountability and training and development for school leadership.

- **Redefine school leadership responsibilities for improved student learning**

Policy makers and practitioners need to ensure that the roles and responsibilities associated with improved learning outcomes are at the core of school leadership practice. This study identifies four major domains of responsibility as key for school leadership to improve student outcomes:

- *Supporting, evaluating and developing teacher quality:* School leaders have to be able to adapt the teaching programme to local needs, promote teamwork among teachers and engage in teacher monitoring, evaluation and professional development.
- *Goal-setting, assessment and accountability:* Policy makers need to ensure that school leaders have discretion in setting strategic direction and optimise their capacity to develop school plans and goals and monitor progress, using data to improve practice.
- *Strategic financial and human resource management:* Policy makers can enhance the financial management skills of school leadership teams by providing training to school leaders, establishing the role of a financial manager within the leadership team, or providing financial support services to schools. In addition, school leaders should be able to influence teacher recruitment decisions to improve the match between candidates and their school's needs.
- *Collaborating with other schools:* This new leadership dimension needs to be recognised as a specific role for school leaders. It can bring benefits to school systems as a whole rather than just the students of a single school. But school leaders need to develop their skills to become involved in matters beyond their school borders.

- **Develop school leadership frameworks for improved policy and practice**

School leadership frameworks can help provide guidance on the main characteristics, tasks and responsibilities of effective school leaders and signal the essential character of school leadership as leadership for learning. They can be a basis for consistent recruitment, training and appraisal of school leaders. Frameworks should clearly define the major domains of responsibility for school leaders and allow for contextualisation of local and school-level criteria. They should be developed with involvement by the profession.

2. Distribute school leadership

The increased responsibilities and accountability of school leadership are creating the need for distribution of leadership, both within schools and across schools. School boards also face many new tasks. While practitioners consider middle-management responsibilities vital for effective school leadership, these practices remain rare and often

unclear; and those involved are not always recognized for their tasks. Policy makers need to broaden the concept of school leadership and adjust policy and working conditions accordingly.

- **Encourage distribution of leadership**

Distribution of leadership can strengthen management and succession planning. Distributing leadership across different people and organisational structures can help to meet the challenges facing contemporary schools and improve school effectiveness. This can be done in formal ways through team structures and other bodies or more informally by developing *ad hoc* groups based on expertise and current needs.

- **Support distribution of leadership**

There is a need to reinforce the concept of leadership teams in national frameworks, to develop incentive mechanisms to reward participation and performance in these teams and to extend leadership training and development to middle-level management and potential future leaders in the school. Finally, policy makers need to reflect on modifying accountability mechanisms to match distributed leadership structures.

- **Support school boards in their tasks**

Evidence shows that effective school boards may contribute to the success of their schools. For this to happen, it is crucial to clarify the roles and responsibilities of school boards and ensure consistency between their objectives and the skills and experience of board members. Policy makers can help by providing guidelines for improved recruitment and selection processes and by developing support structures to ensure active participation in school boards, including opportunities for skills development.

3. Develop skills for effective school leadership

Country practices and evidence from different sources show that school leaders need specific training to respond to broadened roles and responsibilities. Strategies need to focus on developing and strengthening skills related to improving school outcomes (as listed above) and provide room for contextualisation.

- **Treat leadership development as a continuum**

Leadership development is broader than specific programmes of activity or intervention. It requires a combination of formal and informal processes throughout all stages and contexts of leadership practice. This implies coherently supporting the school leadership career through these stages:

- *Encourage initial leadership training:* Whether initial training is voluntary or mandatory can depend on national governance structures. Governments can define national programmes, collaborate with local level governments and develop incentives to ensure that school leaders participate. In countries where the position is not tenured, a trade-off must be found to make it worthwhile for principals to invest time in professional development. Efforts also need to be made to find the right candidates.

- *Organise induction programmes:* Induction programmes are particularly valuable to prepare and shape initial school leadership practices and they provide vital networks for principals to share concerns and explore challenges. These programmes should provide a combination of theoretical and practical knowledge and self-study.
 - *Ensure in-service training to cover need and context:* In-service programmes need to be seen in the context of prior learning opportunities for school leadership. Where there are no other initial requirements, basic in-service programmes should encourage development of leadership skills. In-service training should be also offered periodically to principals and leadership teams so they can update their skills and keep up with new developments. Networks (virtual or real) also provide informal development for principals and leadership teams.
- **Ensure consistency of provision by different institutions**

A broad range of providers cater to school leadership training needs, but the training they offer must be more consistent. In some countries, national school leadership institutions have raised awareness and improved provision of leadership development opportunities. In other countries, where there are many providers but no national orientations, it is important to have clear standards and ensure a focus on quality. Many governments have standards, evaluations and other mechanisms to monitor and regulate programme quality.
 - **Ensure appropriate variety for effective training**

A broad body of knowledge supported by practice has identified the content, design and methods of effective programmes. It points to the following key factors: curricular coherence, experience in real contexts, cohort grouping, mentoring, coaching, peer learning and structures for collaborative activity between the programme and schools.

4. Make school leadership an attractive profession

The challenge is to improve the quality of current leadership and build sustainable leadership for the future. Evidence indicates that potential applicants are deterred by the heavy workload of principals and the fact that the job does not seem to be adequately remunerated or supported. Uncertain recruitment procedures and career development prospects for principals may also deter potential candidates. Strategies to attract, recruit and support high-performing school leaders include the following:

- **Professionalise recruitment**

Recruitment processes can have a strong impact on school leadership quality. While school-level involvement is essential to contextualise recruitment practices, action is necessary at the system level to ensure that recruitment procedures and criteria are effective, transparent and consistent. Succession planning – proactively identifying and developing potential leaders – can boost the quantity and quality of future school leaders. Eligibility criteria should be broadened to reduce the weight accorded to seniority and attract younger dynamic candidates with different backgrounds. Recruitment procedures should go beyond traditional job interviews to include an expanded set of tools and procedures to assess candidates. Finally, those who are on the hiring side of recruitment panels also need guidelines and training.

- **Focus on the relative attractiveness of school leaders' salaries**

The relative attractiveness of salaries for school leaders can influence the supply of high quality candidates. Policy makers need to monitor remuneration compared to similar grades in the public and private sectors and make school leadership more competitive. Establishing separate salary scales for teachers and principals can attract more candidates from among the teaching staff. At the same time, salary scales should reflect leadership structures and school-level factors in order to attract high performing leaders to all schools.

- **Acknowledge the role of professional organisations of school leaders**

Professional organisations of school leaders provide a forum for dialogue, knowledge sharing and dissemination of best practices among professionals and between professionals and policy makers. Workforce reform is unlikely to succeed unless school leaders are actively involved in its development and implementation through their representative organisations.

- **Provide options and support for career development**

Providing career development prospects for school leaders can help avoid principal burnout and make school leadership a more attractive career option. There are many ways to make the profession more flexible and mobile, allowing school leaders to move between schools as well as between leadership and teaching and other professions. Current country practice provides some examples to draw from, including alternatives to lifetime contracts through renewable fixed-term contracts and options for principals to step up to new opportunities such as jobs in the educational administration, leadership of groups or federations of schools and consultant leadership roles.

Chapter 1

School leadership matters

This chapter provides the rationale for policy makers to invest in school leadership policy. It describes the focus of this study, the importance of school leadership and the major challenges countries face in school leadership policy. Effective school leadership is essential to improve teaching and learning within each school and to connect the individual school to the outside world. But school leaders across OECD and partner countries are facing challenges which policy makers need to address. In recent years, the workload of school leaders has expanded and intensified as a result of increased school autonomy and accountability for learning outcomes. As the expectations of what schools should achieve have changed dramatically, countries are seeking to develop new forms of leadership better suited to respond to the needs of rapidly evolving societies. This involves enhancing the capacity of current leaders and preparing and training future leaders.

1.1 Introduction

As the key intermediary between the classroom, the individual school and the education system as a whole, effective school leadership is essential to improve the efficiency and equity of schooling. Within each individual school, leadership can contribute to improve student learning by shaping the conditions and climate in which teaching and learning occur. Beyond the school borders, school leaders can connect and adapt schools to changing external environments. And at the school-systems interface, school leadership provides a bridge between internal school improvement processes and externally initiated reform.

But school leadership does not operate in static educational environments. As countries are seeking to adapt their education systems to the needs of contemporary society, the expectations for schools and school leaders have changed profoundly. Many countries have made schools more autonomous in their decision making while centralising standards and accountability requirements and demanding that schools adopt new research-based approaches to teaching and learning. In line with these changes, the roles and responsibilities of school leaders have expanded and intensified. Given the increased autonomy and accountability of schools, leadership at the school level is more important than ever.

Policy makers need to adapt school leadership policy to new environments by addressing the major challenges which have arisen over the past decades. There is a growing concern that the role of school principal designed for the industrial age has not changed enough to deal with the complex challenges schools are facing in the 21st century. Countries are seeking to develop new conditions for school leadership better suited to respond to current and future educational environments. As expectations of what school leaders should achieve have changed, so must the definition and distribution of tasks, as well as the levels of training, support and incentives.

Ensuring *future* quality leadership is also vital for school improvement. In most countries, the leadership workforce is ageing and large numbers of school leaders will retire over the next five to ten years. At a time of high demographic turnover in school leaders, education systems need to focus on fostering future leaders and making leadership an attractive profession. The contemporary challenge of leadership, in systemic terms, is not only to improve the quality of current leaders but also to develop clear plans for future leadership and effective processes for leadership succession.

The above developments and challenges have made school leadership a priority in education policy agendas across OECD and partner countries. In their 2001 and 2004 meetings, OECD education ministers emphasised the key role of school leadership in helping OECD education systems respond to the needs of rapidly changing societies. In response, the OECD proposed to conduct an international activity to help policy makers compare their approaches to school leadership policy, identify innovative practices and provide policy options for action.

Twenty-two education systems in nineteen countries participated actively in the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity (Box 1.1) by providing individual country background reports and sharing knowledge to look for viable alternatives.¹ The high level

¹ All activity documents can be found on the OECD Improving School Leadership webpages at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.

of interest and participation shows that developing and sustaining effective school leadership is of great importance for OECD education systems and is likely to become even more so in the future.

The present comparative report draws on materials and events from the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity to present a broad analytic overview and set of policy recommendations for improving school leadership. It identifies four policy levers for action: redefining the roles and responsibilities of school leadership; distributing school leadership tasks; developing skills for effective school leadership; and making school leadership an attractive profession. A parallel report *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership* focuses on approaches that have encouraged and developed school leaders to work together for system-wide school improvement (Pont, Nusche and Hopkins, 2008).

Box 1.1 The OECD Improving School Leadership activity

The purpose of the OECD activity was to give policy makers information and analysis to help them formulate and implement school leadership policies leading to improved teaching and learning. The objectives were: *i*) to synthesise research on issues related to improving leadership in schools; *ii*) to identify innovative and successful policy initiatives and practices; *iii*) to facilitate exchanges of lessons and policy options among countries; and *iv*) to identify policy options for governments to consider.

Methodology: Parallel complementary approaches were developed to achieve these objectives more effectively. Participating countries provided a country background report following a common framework (analytical strand). Additionally, a small number of case studies in *a*) school leadership for system-wide improvement and *b*) training and development of school leaders complement the work by providing examples of innovative practice (innovative case study strand). This approach made it possible to collect the information necessary to compare country developments while adopting a more innovative and forward looking approach to policy making.

Outputs: In addition to this report, a companion volume, *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, explores five case studies of innovative practices in system leadership and provides some recommendations. A set of practical materials on school leadership complements this work with the aim of helping translate the recommendations into practice. All reports can be found on the OECD Improving School Leadership web pages at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.

Participating countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium (Flanders and French Community), Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Korea, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom (England, Northern Ireland and Scotland). The French and Flemish Communities of Belgium as well as England, Northern Ireland and Scotland participated as independent units, because their education policies are decentralised. Throughout the report, whenever data is available, they are cited separately.

The **definition of school leaders** guiding the OECD activity suggests that effective school leadership may not reside exclusively in formal positions but may instead be distributed across a number of individuals in the school. Principals, deputy and assistant principals, leadership teams, school governing boards and other school-level professional personnel can contribute as leaders to the goal of learning-centred schooling. The precise distribution of these leadership contributions can vary depending on factors such as governance and management structure, levels of autonomy and accountability, school size and complexity and levels of student performance.

1.2 The concept of school leadership

Before moving on to the analysis of school leadership policy, it is important to understand the concept of leadership that this report supports. There is a vast amount of literature exploring generic leadership issues. This report concentrates on school leadership, accepting that there are common elements and trends in leadership practice across sectors and lessons can be learned from non-educational environments as well.

A central element of most definitions of leadership is that it involves a *process of influence* (OECD, 2001a). As Yukl has phrased it, “most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a social influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person [or group] over other people [or groups] to structure the activities and relationships in a group or organisation” (Yukl, 2002). The term *intentional* is important, as leadership is based on articulated goals or outcomes to which the process of influence is expected to lead.

Depending on country contexts, the term school leadership is often used interchangeably with school management and school administration. Although the three concepts overlap, we use them with a difference in emphasis. An often-quoted phrase is “managers do things right, while leaders do the right thing” (Bennis and Nanus, 1997). While leadership involves steering organisations by shaping other people’s attitudes, motivations and behaviours, management is more closely associated with maintenance of current operations (Bush and Glover, 2003). Dimmock (1999) provides a distinction between school leadership, management and administration while also recognising that the responsibilities of school leaders often encompass all three:

Irrespective of how these terms are defined, school leaders experience difficulty in deciding the balance between higher order tasks designed to improve staff, student and school performance (leadership), routine maintenance of present operations (management) and lower order duties (administration).

This report considers that successful schools need effective leadership, management and administration. While the report’s focus is on leadership, this term may encompass managerial and administrative tasks as well. The three elements are so closely intertwined that it is unlikely for one of them to succeed without the others.

The emphasis of this report is on school leaders, including but not confined to school principals.² The concept of *principalship* is rooted in the industrial model of schooling, where one individual bears the prime responsibility for the entire organisation. *Leadership* is a broader concept where authority to lead does not reside only in one person, but can be distributed among different people within and beyond the school. School leadership can encompass people occupying various roles and functions such as principals, deputy and assistant principals, leadership teams, school governing boards and school-level staff involved in leadership tasks.

²

The terms principal, director, headmaster, head teacher and head will be used interchangeably, except when some special connotation requires the use of one term in particular, in which case the reason for that designation will be clear in context.

1.3 School leadership is a policy priority

School leadership has become a priority in education policy agendas across OECD and partner countries because it plays a key role in improving classroom practice, school policies and connections between individual schools and the outside world.

It contributes to improved student learning

There is increasing evidence that within each individual school, school leaders can contribute to improved student learning by shaping the conditions and climate in which teaching and learning occur. A large body of research on school effectiveness and improvement from a wide range of countries and school contexts has consistently highlighted the pivotal role of school leadership in making schools more effective (Scheerens and Bosker, 1997; Teddlie and Reynolds, 2000; Townsend, 2007).

An important finding emerging from the research is that the relationship between school leadership and student learning is mostly indirect. As school leaders work mainly outside the classroom, their impact on student learning is largely mediated through other people, events and organisational factors such as teachers, classroom practices and school climate (Hallinger and Heck, 1998). The finding that the relationship between leadership and student learning is mediated through such factors underscores the powerful role of the school leader in helping to create the conditions for effective teaching and learning. School leaders influence the motivations, capacities and working conditions of teachers who in turn shape classroom practice and student learning.³

Moving a step further, the research on school leadership effects has revealed a number of leadership roles and responsibilities that are particularly conducive to enhancing student learning. Findings of the research on leadership effects have recently been consolidated in a number of reviews and meta-analyses. These show that certain leadership practices are associated with measurable improvements in student learning (Hallinger and Heck, 1998; Marzano *et al.*, 2005; Robinson, 2007; Waters *et al.*, 2003). This report identifies four major domains of responsibility as key tasks for school leadership to improve teaching and learning within their schools: supporting and developing teacher quality, defining goals and measuring progress, strategic resource management and collaboration with external partners (Chapter 2).

It bridges educational policy and practice

School leadership also plays a major role in education reform. Much has been written about top-down versus bottom-up strategies for school improvement and there is widespread agreement that the two need to be combined and synchronised (Fullan, 2001; Hopkins, 2008; Moos and Huber, 2007). While higher levels of the educational system can provide policy directions for schools, their success often depends on the motivations and actions of leaders at the school level.

For centrally initiated reforms to become meaningful to all school-level stakeholders, they need to be associated with internal school improvement activities in a coherent way (Stoll *et al.*, 2002). Successful implementation and institutionalisation of reform requires

³ See Annex 1.A1 for further background information on research concerning factors influencing student learning and conceptual and methodological challenges related to the impact of school leadership.

leadership at the school level to promote adaptations of school processes and systems, as well as cultures, attitudes and behaviours.

Therefore, unless school leaders feel a sense of ownership of reform and agree with its purposes it is unlikely that they will engage their staff and students in externally defined reform objectives. School reform is more likely to be successful if school leaders are actively involved in policy development and formulation. Continuous dialogue and consultation between policy makers and those who lead schools at the front line are thus essential for successful large scale reform.

It links schools to their environments

In addition, school leaders are in charge of connecting and adapting schools to their surrounding environments. According to Hargreaves *et al.* (2008), school leaders will increasingly need to lead “out there” beyond the school, as well as within it, in order to influence the environment that influences their own work with students. In small towns and rural areas, school leaders have traditionally stood among the most important leaders in their communities. While it may be argued that urbanisation, immigration and school size have weakened school-community ties, these and other pressures on family structures have at the same time contributed to make the community responsibilities of school leaders even more important today.

School leaders play an important role in strengthening the ties between school personnel and the communities that surround them (Fullan, 2001). Leaders of the most successful schools in challenging circumstances are typically highly engaged with and trusted by the schools’ parents and wider community (Hargreaves *et al.*, 2008). They also try to improve achievement and well-being for children by becoming more involved with other partners such as local businesses, sports clubs, faith-based groups and community organisations and by integrating the work of the school with welfare, law enforcement and other agencies (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2007).

Moreover, in rapidly changing societies, the goals and objectives to be achieved by schools and the ways to get there are not always clear and static. In increasingly globalised and knowledge-based economies, schools must lay the foundations for lifelong learning while at the same time dealing with new challenges such as changing demographic patterns, increased immigration, changing labour markets, new technologies and rapidly developing fields of knowledge.

As a result of these developments, schools are under enormous pressure to change and it is the role of school leadership to deal effectively with the processes of change. A great variety of scenarios for the future of schooling could be imagined from current societal trends and different contexts. While the future cannot be predicted, the OECD *Schooling for Tomorrow* project (OECD, 2001c) reflected on possible developments that will shape schools in the future and proposed six hypothetical scenarios for school systems over the next 10 to 20 years (Box 1.2). The scenarios are not intended to be totally realistic but can help clarify possible schooling developments and how policy makers, stakeholders and school-level actors might influence and adapt to them. The roles and responsibilities of school leadership in each of these scenarios would vary widely.

Box 1.2 OECD scenarios: what might schooling look like in the future? From “stable bureaucratic systems” to “system meltdown”			
BUREAUCRATIC SYSTEM	1	Schools in Back to the Future Bureaucratic Systems	This scenario shows schools in powerful bureaucratic systems that are resistant to change. Schools continue mostly with “business as usual”, defined by isolated units – schools, classes, teachers – in top-down administrations. The system reacts little to the wider environment and operates to its own conventions and regulations.
	2	Schools as Focused Learning Organisations	In this scenario, schools function as focal learning organisations, revitalised around a knowledge agenda in cultures of experimentation, diversity and innovation. The system enjoys substantial investment, especially to benefit disadvantaged communities and maintain high teacher working conditions.
RE – SCHOOLING	3	Schools as Core Social Centres	In this scenario, the walls around schools come down but they remain strong organisations, sharing responsibilities with other community bodies such as health or social services. Much emphasis is given to non-formal learning, collective tasks and intergenerational activities. High public support ensures quality environments and teachers enjoy high esteem.
	4	The Extended Market Model	This scenario depicts the widespread extension of market approaches – in who provides education, how it is delivered, how choices are made and resources distributed. Governments withdraw from running schooling, pushed by dissatisfaction of “consumers”. This future might bring innovation and dynamism and it might mean exclusion and inequality.
DE – SCHOOLING	5	Learning in Networks replacing schools	This scenario imagines the disappearance of schools per se, replaced by learning networks operating within a highly developed “network society”. Networks based on diverse cultural, religious and community interests lead to a multitude of diverse formal, non-formal and informal learning settings, with intensive use of ICTs.
	6	Teacher Exodus and System Meltdown	This scenario depicts a meltdown of the school system. It results mainly from a major shortage of teachers triggered by retirement, unsatisfactory working conditions, more attractive job opportunities elsewhere.
CRISIS			

Source: OECD (2001), *What Schools for the Future?* OECD, Paris.

According to the OECD (2005a), as countries “move rapidly towards becoming knowledge societies with new demands for learning and new expectations of citizenship, strategic choices must be made not just to reform but to reinvent education systems so that the youth of today can meet the challenges of tomorrow”. At the school level, leadership is increasingly in charge of leading teachers to respond to uncertain futures and new challenges. They must continuously adapt their school to the demands of the outside world and redefine its tasks in response to a changing environment (Stoll *et al.*, 2002). An essential role of school leadership therefore is to ensure that both students and teachers can continuously learn, develop and adapt to changing environments.

1.4 School leadership responds to changing policy environments

The organisational arrangements for schools have changed significantly over time due to profound changes within the societies they serve. While school context and system-level differences have differential implications for the exercise of school leadership across countries, a number of global trends have impacted on schools across OECD countries. Very broadly, over the past decades, school leaders in OECD countries have evolved from practising teachers with added responsibilities, to head teachers and bureaucratic administrators, to professional managers and, in some countries, to leaders of learning. This section gives a short overview of the major trends in educational governance which have shaped school leadership over time.

The industrial model of schooling: bureaucratic administration

Before the advent of mass primary and secondary education, schools had most commonly been run by a teacher with added supervisory responsibilities for buildings, students and staff (OECD, 2001b). The position of principal emerged with the development of public schooling as an essential social service in industrialising economies in the second half of the 19th century. Increased industrialisation and the accelerated need for workers with basic education required more systematic school organisation, which resulted in the appointment of a part-time or full-time administrator at the school level.

In the early 20th century, schools were designed to fit industrial models of efficient production. According to OECD (2001b) “the organisation and content of schooling in many ways reflected industrial development. Just as factories were organised as branches of a larger enterprise conforming to predetermined common standards, so public education came to follow a supervisory style with anticipated outcomes and the principal in the role of branch manager.”

In the bureaucratic management systems predominant throughout most of the 20th century, the principal held overall responsibility for the operation of an individual school within a wider system run by the central bureaucracy (Aalst, 2002). The roles within the school were quite clearly delimited. Teachers operated in relative isolation from each other and the principal’s role was most commonly conceived of in terms of bureaucratic administrator or head teacher, or some combination of the two.

The *bureaucratic administrator* was seen as responsible for the overall operation of the school or implementation of the school project. This individual was responsible for overseeing compliance with national, state, or municipal legislation, regulations and guidelines and was accountable for the use of resources.

The *head teacher* was seen as *primus inter pares*, first among equals. This person retained a greater or lesser degree of teaching responsibilities and handled the non-teaching tasks of managing resources and communicating with parents and other elements of the education system. Collegial relationships were prized, in the sense that teachers were considered the instructional experts and left to their own, rarely disturbed in their classrooms.

New public management: towards decentralisation, autonomy and accountability

As countries strive to transform their education systems to prepare students with the knowledge and skills needed to function in rapidly changing societies, most OECD countries are adopting a number of similar policy trends. Since the early 1980s, “new public management” structures stressing decentralisation, school autonomy, parental and community control, shared decision making, outcomes-based assessment and school choice have become the predominant school governance approach in many countries and have significantly altered education systems (Mulford, 2003). The rationale behind these governance approaches is that autonomy and accountability can respond more efficiently to local needs. This section briefly describes the impact of these changes on the roles and responsibilities of school leaders (see also Chapter 2).

Decentralisation and school autonomy

Many countries have increased decision making authority at lower levels of the educational system. Decentralisation of educational decision making can be implemented in a variety of forms and the implications for school leaders vary accordingly. Decentralisation may involve delegating responsibilities to the school level, or to intermediate levels such as states, provinces and local educational authorities (OECD, 2004a). Among the recent decentralisation movements having an impact on school leadership, Glatter *et al.* (2003) distinguish two models of decentralisation which have important implications for the role of school leaders.

Local empowerment refers to the transfer of responsibilities to an intermediate authority between central (or state) governments and schools, such as school districts in the United States. In such contexts, schools are generally viewed as part of a local educational system or a broader network of schools, with reciprocal rights and obligations (Glatter *et al.*, 2003). The municipal or local education authority may play a role in connecting schools to other public services and community development as well as in encouraging schools to collaborate with each other. School leaders may thus be asked to play a greater role in leadership “beyond the school borders” (Chapter 2).

School empowerment (or school autonomy) refers to the devolution of responsibilities to the school level. Transferring decision making powers to schools has been a major objective of the decentralising and restructuring reform movements since the 1980s. In contexts of increased school autonomy, school leaders are asked to fulfil responsibilities that call for expertise which many do not have through formal training. New responsibilities include establishing budgeting and accounting systems, choosing and ordering materials, setting up relationships with contractors and vendors, designing recruitment schemes for hiring teachers, to name just a few. In many cases, school autonomy makes the job of school leaders more time-consuming by increasing their administrative and managerial workload. As financial and personnel responsibilities are sharply increasing, school autonomy is sometimes associated with less time and attention for providing leadership for improved teaching and learning.

Decentralisation often also requires school leaders to engage more in communication, co-operation and coalition building. Where local empowerment is predominant, school leaders are required to develop strong networking and collaboration skills and to engage with their peers and with intermediate bodies throughout the local education system. Where school empowerment prevails, the teaching staff, parents and community

representatives are often formally or informally brought into the school-level decision making process (OECD, 2001b). School leaders thus need to continuously negotiate between top-down demands from central regulations and standards, internal demands from teachers and students and external expectations from parents and the local community.

While most countries are moving to more decentralised models of governance, important differences remain between different countries (Annex 1.A2.). In highly centralised systems where most decisions are still made at the national or state level, the school leader's job remains quite narrowly confined to translating policies decided at higher administrative levels into a reality for teachers and students. At the other end of the continuum, in systems that have decentralised authority over curriculum, personnel and budgets to the school level, the school leader's job is very different, with much more responsibility in areas such as human and financial resource management or instructional leadership. In most countries, however, school governance is closer to the middle of the continuum, with some functions centralised, others decentralised and substantial interplay among leaders at the different levels of the education system.

Accountability for outcomes

While there is a clear trend towards decentralising responsibilities for budget, personnel and instructional delivery in most OECD countries, many have simultaneously centralised curriculum control and/or accountability regimes to the state or central government as a way to measure and promote school progress (OECD, 2007b). Accountability frameworks and reporting of performance results create new obligations for schools and school leaders to perform according to centrally defined standards and expectations.

As requirements for regular standardised testing are increasing, the role of the school leader has changed in many countries, from being accountable for inputs to being accountable for the performance outcomes of teachers and students. Increasing accountability requirements put pressure on school leaders to produce documented evidence of successful school performance. This may substantially add to the paperwork and time constraints for school leaders because they are required to carefully record, document and communicate school-level and student-level developments.

In their planning processes, school leaders are increasingly expected to align local curricula with centrally mandated standards. According to Leithwood (2001), school leaders are expected to become “more strategic in their choices of goals and more planful and data-driven about the means to accomplish these goals”. This involves interpretation of test results for school improvement and mastery of skills associated with data-wise management.

School choice and competition

Another observed trend across OECD countries is a move towards increasing school choice. One-third of OECD countries make information on school evaluation available to parents for the purpose of informing school choice (OECD, 2007b). In some cases, school choice is deliberately used as a mechanism to enhance competition between autonomous schools. In systems where funding follows the student, parents are treated as clients who choose the school providing the best quality.

Even if not all school choice settings actually put pressure on schools and school leaders to compete, in some environments school leaders are more and more expected to market their schools efficiently, know what competing schools offer, develop niches for their schools and maintain good customer relations with students and parents (Leithwood, 2001). Therefore they are required to lead strategically and discern a wide range of local, national and international developments, threats and opportunities that may affect their schools (Barnett, undated).

A renewed focus on teaching and learning

The policy directions reviewed above have been part of a broader trend to strengthen education systems and improve student performance. For most countries, this has meant some or all of the following: raising levels of overall student performance, closing the gap in achievement between student populations, providing inclusive education services for such populations as students with special needs and immigrant children, reducing dropout rates and achieving greater efficiency. The combination of mandates and programmes developed to reach these goals has one common denominator: to increase the focus of schools on teaching and learning.

Schools in several countries are in particular being asked to increase *individualisation and personalisation of learning and instruction* and to provide more *inclusive and multicultural instruction*. As the key intermediary between central policy and classroom practice and as the primary agent setting the conditions in school for effective teaching and learning, the school leader bears much of the responsibility for translating policy into improved teaching and learning.

Scholars (Elmore, 2008; Mulford, 2003) are now suggesting that an essential function of school leadership is to foster “organisational learning”, that is to build the capacity of the school for high performance and continuous improvement through the development of staff, creating the climate and conditions for collective learning and thoughtful use of data to improve curriculum and instruction.

Catering to the needs of increasingly diverse student populations

Schools in almost all countries are serving a more heterogeneous population and are under pressure to provide more inclusive and multiculturally sensitive programmes. Countries as diverse as Austria, Chile and Finland report facing challenges of increasingly heterogeneous populations for whom teachers may need to adopt more sensitive teaching methods and to invest extra effort in overcoming skills and language obstacles. Many countries are setting policy goals to address these issues.

In Austria for example, every school must develop a programme to ensure that each student who failed to reach the objectives of the curriculum receives a suitably individualised education. Similarly, municipal primary and lower secondary schools in Denmark must develop a study plan for each student. Schools in several countries such as England, Ireland and Spain face the challenge of ensuring effective education for considerable numbers of traveller and migrant students. Personalisation strategies in countries like Sweden and England are driving schools to embed assessment, data analysis and the design of learning experiences into the routine of teaching, to adopt a broader range of teaching techniques, to offer a more responsive curriculum, to adapt the organisation of the school and to establish links with service providers beyond the school.

New understanding and approaches to teaching and learning

Research has added to and in some cases radically altered, conceptions of student learning and cognition and of teaching and instruction, so schools must adopt new approaches to teaching and learning and to the organisation of instruction. School programmes in many countries have traditionally emphasised passive rote learning and didactic teacher-centred instruction. Assessments have measured fact-based memorisation and recall rather than deep understanding, ability to synthesise with other knowledge and applications in real-world situations outside the classroom.

The requirements brought about by the development of knowledge societies and the higher comparability of student outcomes across countries due to international assessments such as PISA are leading some countries to modify their modes of instruction and student work (OECD, 2007a). Many countries strive to exploit the possibilities of more powerful forms of active, constructivist learning and “teaching for understanding”. Ireland, for example, has revised the primary school curriculum to encourage the use of active teaching and learning methodologies and the post-primary syllabi to emphasise more independent, active learning.

Teaching has traditionally been practised as a solo art by individual teachers alone in their classrooms. Autonomy was highly prized and intrusions into solitary practice were resisted. But a large body of convincing research in the last two decades has developed new views of effective teaching that are based on the development of professional learning communities (Louis *et al.*, 1996; Stoll and Louis, 2007).

School leaders must master the new forms of pedagogy themselves and they must learn how to monitor and improve their teachers’ new practice. Moreover, instead of serving as head teacher *primus inter pares*, they have to become leaders of learning responsible for building communities of professional practice. Methods of evaluation and professional development take more sophisticated application and principals must embed them into the fabric of the work day.

While practices vary across countries, it is clear that school leadership is generally expected to play a more active role in instructional leadership: monitoring and evaluating teacher performance, conducting and arranging for mentoring and coaching, planning teacher professional development and orchestrating teamwork and cooperative instruction. Countries also note a shift in emphasis from more administration- and management-type functions to leadership functions of providing academic vision, strategic planning, developing deeper layers of leadership and building a culture and community of learning.

As a result of the increasing central mandates and programmes, changing student populations and growing knowledge about effective practice, schools are under enormous pressure to change and it is the school leader’s role to manage the processes of change. The transformation of policy into results occurs most critically through the adaptation of practice in the school and classroom. This process is complex and must be led intentionally and skilfully. In some cases, resistance to change needs to be overcome with carefully structured support, relevant information, a clear sense of purpose and goals and opportunities to learn requisite skills (Hall and Hord, 2005). While some changes are purely technical and can be readily accomplished, more significant change calls for deeper adjustment of values and beliefs about the work (Heifetz, 1998). Sophisticated skills of “adaptive” (Heifetz and Linsky, 2002) and “transformational” leadership (Burns, 1978; Leithwood, 1992; Leithwood and Jantzi, 1990; Leithwood and Jantzi, 2000) are needed here.

1.5 The current reality of school leadership

We need to contrast these trends with the current practice and shape of school leadership in OECD countries. Traditionally in many countries there has been only one individual – the principal – holding a formal leadership position in schools. While the roles and responsibilities of principals have varied in different contexts and over time, the existence of principals remains a common feature of OECD education systems.


In many countries there is growing concern that the role of principal designed for the needs of a different time may not be appropriate to deal with the leadership challenges schools are facing in the 21st century. Even as countries are adopting more distributed and collaborative approaches to leadership, on average across OECD countries, it is the principal who carries the largest bulk of school-level leadership responsibilities (OECD, 2004b). This section gives a brief overview of the characteristics of the principal workforce and the major challenges facing the profession.

Principals work in a variety of contexts

Depending on the school contexts in which they work, principals face very different sets of challenges. School-level differences or contextual factors have important implications for their leadership practice. Leithwood (2005), in a review of the findings of case studies in seven countries, found features of the “organisational or wider social context in which principals work” that impact on their practices. These features include: student background factors, school location (*e.g.* urban, rural), school size, government or public versus non-government designation of schools, school type and school level (elementary, middle, secondary).

In other studies, the level of schooling has been found to influence the type of leadership practices required. Primary schools tend to be smaller and involve different leadership challenges than large secondary schools. Small primary schools provide more opportunities for principals to spend time in the classroom and closely monitor teachers, whereas leaders in large secondary schools tend to influence teaching more indirectly and may rely on teacher leaders or department heads to engage in curricular issues (Leithwood *et al.*, 2004). In many primary schools, principals are also classroom teachers, which may lead them to envisage their leadership in a more collegial and participative way. Heck for example, found that principals in effective primary schools are more directly involved in instructional issues than principals in effective secondary schools (Heck, 1992).

Figure 1.1 indicates that in all countries except Belgium (French Community) and Sweden, the majority of school leaders work in primary schools. Countries like Australia, Ireland, Norway, New Zealand, Denmark and Northern Ireland have traditionally large numbers of small, rural primary schools. As Southworth (2002) has pointed out, failure to analyse school sector differences may lead to imprecise discussions and development of leadership. When designing school leadership policy, it is important for governments to take account of contextual factors to respond more effectively to the different needs of principals in different types of schools.

Figure 1.1 Number of principals in primary and secondary schools, 2006/07, public schools

Note: Principal refers to the school headmaster, director or administrator who holds the highest leadership position within an individual school. Primary school generally refers to ISCED level 1. Secondary school generally refers to ISCED level 2 and 3 (lower and upper secondary level).

1. For France, the number of secondary school principals includes both the principals and deputy principals.
2. For Denmark, primary school refers to the *Folkeskole* which is the municipal primary and lower secondary school and comprises ISCED 1 and 2 (one year of pre-school, nine years of primary and lower secondary education and a one-year 10th form).

Source: OECD *Improving School Leadership* Country Questionnaires.

A small workforce with high responsibility

The size of the principal workforce varies widely, with between 250 and 55 000 individuals in school principal positions in particular countries. In most of the countries participating in the *Improving School Leadership* activity, there are fewer than 5 000 principals (Figure 1.1).

The small number of individuals in principal positions in most countries makes it feasible to provide training, support and incentives to large proportions of a principal workforce – maybe even to every single principal. Developing the workforce of principals promises to be a highly cost-effective human capital investment, as quality leadership can directly influence the motivations, attitudes and behaviours of teachers and indirectly contribute to improved learning of their students. The fact that such a small group of people can potentially have an impact on every student and teacher in the country makes principals a key policy lever for educational improvements.

But the limited size of the principal workforce also raises concerns. As discussed above, the school leadership workload has expanded and intensified over the past few decades. Once limited to functions of bureaucratic administrator and/or head teacher, the job is now increasingly defined by a new, far larger and more demanding set of roles. Among other things, principals are expected to take on enhanced administrative and


managerial tasks, handle financial and human resources, manage public relations and build coalitions, engage in quality management and public reporting processes and provide leadership for learning. This workload goes beyond what one single individual can possibly achieve successfully.

An ageing profession

In most OECD countries, the principal workforce is ageing and large numbers of school leaders will retire over the next five to ten years. The average age of school principals has been rising over the past two decades. Across the participating countries for which data was available (Figure 1.2), the average school leader was 51 years old in 2006-07. A significant majority of principals in many countries are now over 50, especially in Korea (99%), Belgium (French Community) (81%) and Denmark (76%). The age profile is particularly alarming in secondary education in most countries. As school leaders from the baby-boom generation retire, a much larger number of new school leaders will have to enter the profession in the next decade than in equivalent periods in the past.

The imminent retirement of the majority of principals brings both challenges and new opportunities for OECD education systems. While it means a major loss of experience, it also provides an unprecedented opportunity to recruit and develop a new generation of school leaders with the knowledge, skills and disposition best suited to meet the current and future needs of education systems.

Figure 1.2 Percentage of principals aged 50 and over, 2006/07, public schools



Note: Principal refers to the school headmaster, director or administrator who holds the highest leadership position within an individual school.

1. Data for Chile is from 2005.


2. Data for Australia refers to principals and their immediate deputies.

Source: OECD *Improving School Leadership* Country Background Reports and Country Questionnaires, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.

An unequal gender distribution across levels of education

While in most countries women comprise the majority of teachers, they are a minority of principals and their career advancement is in many cases concentrated in small primary schools. In all countries except Australia, Israel and Sweden, women are under-represented in secondary school leadership positions (Figure 1.3). In Austria, Belgium, Denmark, England, Finland, Ireland, New Zealand and Northern Ireland, the percentage of women in secondary school principal positions remains below the 40% level. At the same time, women principals are over-represented in primary education in about half of the countries for which information is available.

Figure 1.3 Percentage of female principals, 2006/07, public schools



Note: Principal refers to the school headmaster, director or administrator who holds the highest leadership position within an individual school.

1. Data for Australia refers to principals and their immediate deputies.

2. Data for Norway is from 2005.

Source: OECD *Improving School Leadership* Country Background Reports and Country Questionnaires, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.

An increasingly unattractive job

While the average age of principals is increasing across OECD countries, many countries are simultaneously facing decreasing numbers of applications for principal positions. Of the 22 countries and regions participating in the activity, 15 reported difficulties in finding enough suitable candidates for principalship. In many countries, principal posts had to be re-advertised for lengthy periods of time because no suitable candidate came forward. In some cases, the number of applicants per post has drastically declined over the past decades.

Research evidence indicates that negative images attached to the job, overburdened roles and working conditions, lack of preparation and training, as well as inadequate salaries and rewards are among the top factors discouraging potential candidates from

applying. Studies from several countries show that most teachers and deputy principals are not interested in moving up to principalship because the small additional reward provided does not adequately reflect the large increase in workload and responsibility (Chapter 5). In some countries, another disincentive to younger generations in taking on the principalship is being locked into the post with not many further career options.

According to a number of studies, many frustrations experienced by principals are related to role overload and the fact that principals constantly feel unable to achieve all their tasks and responsibilities. Several countries report that principals are under increased stress. Stress results from the expansion and intensification of roles and responsibilities, from ambiguity and conflict raised in the new functions, from the pace of change and demands of managing others in change, from heightened accountability for results and public scrutiny and sometimes from the reduction of student enrolments and the need to compete for students and from reductions in funding. Such stress may diminish principals' ability to do their best work and over time it can erode their commitment to the job.

From principalship to leadership

The position of principal remains an essential feature of schools in all participating countries, but it is facing a number of challenges. As the expectations of what schools should achieve have changed dramatically over recent years, countries need to develop new forms of school leadership better suited to respond to current and future educational environments. In order to do so, they need to address two sets of challenges simultaneously.

First, they need to support and retrain the school principals who are currently on the job. Most of them were hired into schools in educational environments that were fundamentally different from today. Over time the rules of engagement for principalship/leadership have changed. As the roles and responsibilities of principals have evolved, the terms and conditions of service also need to be revised. Today's principals need to learn to adopt new forms of more distributed leadership. They need in-service training to develop and update their skills and they need more adequate rewards and incentive structures to stay motivated on the job and provide high quality leadership.

Second, countries need to prepare and train the next generation of school leaders. Especially at a time of high demographic turnover in leadership, thinking about and caring for the future is an essential aspect of system leadership. Lasting improvement depends on a clear definition and better distribution of leadership tasks within schools, planned succession mechanisms, professionalised recruitment processes, preparatory training, mentoring of new leaders, working conditions that attract high quality graduates to educational leadership and a commitment to greater leadership density and capacity within schools from which future high level leaders can emerge.

At the same time, it is important to contextualise school leadership policies. There is no single model of leadership that could be easily transferred across different school-level and system-level contexts. The specific contexts in which schools operate may limit school leaders' room for manoeuvre, or provide opportunities for different types of leadership. Depending on the school contexts in which they work, school leaders face very different sets of challenges. Approaches to school leadership policy need to be based on careful consideration of the context in which schools operate and their particular challenges.

1.6 Summary: why school leadership matters

School leadership has become a priority in education policy agendas across OECD and partner countries. It plays a key role in improving school outcomes by influencing the motivations and capacities of teachers, as well as the environment and climate within which they work. Effective school leadership is essential to improve the efficiency and equity of schooling.

School leadership practice has been greatly influenced by changes in educational governance and school contexts. On the one hand there are moves towards decentralisation and autonomy coupled with greater accountability; on the other, new approaches to teaching and learning processes and increasingly varied student populations are changing leadership roles and responsibilities.

As a result of these trends and factors, school leadership has changed dramatically across OECD countries. It is now increasingly defined by a demanding set of roles including administrative and managerial tasks, financial and human resources, public relations, quality assurance and leadership for improved teaching and learning.

In many countries the current generation of principals is reaching retirement age and it is getting harder to replace them. Potential candidates are discouraged from applying mainly because of overburdened roles, lack of preparation and training, lack of career prospects and inadequate support and rewards.

These developments have made school leadership a priority in education systems among OECD and partner countries. The quality of school leadership needs to be enhanced and it needs to be made sustainable. In the following chapters, this report identifies four main policy levers which, taken together, can improve school leadership practice. These should help governments to decide how to prepare and build high quality leadership:

1. (Re)defining school leadership responsibilities
2. Distributing school leadership
3. Developing skills for effective school leadership
4. Making school leadership an attractive profession

Annex 1.A1

Research concerning factors influencing student learning

Three broad conclusions seem to emerge from the research analysing the factors influencing student learning (OECD, 2005b). First, student background characteristics – especially social, economic and cultural background – frequently emerge as the most important source of variation in student achievement. Such student background characteristics cannot be easily influenced by educational policy in the short term. Second, school-related factors, which are more open to policy influence, explain a smaller part of the variations in student learning than student characteristics (Hallinger and Heck, 1996; Leithwood *et al.*, 2006; OECD, 2005b). Third, among school-level variables, the factors that are closest to student learning, such as teacher quality and classroom practices, tend to have the strongest impact on student achievement (Leithwood and Riehl, 2003; OECD, 2005b).

At the same time, findings from the school effectiveness and improvement literature of the past three decades have consistently highlighted the pivotal role of school leaders (Scheerens and Bosker, 1997; Teddlie and Reynolds, 2000; Townsend, 2007). A more recent body of literature on leadership effects provides further evidence that school leadership makes a difference in student learning (Leithwood *et al.*, 2006). Research on the relationship between school leadership and student learning is traditionally based on two types of empirical evidence: case study evidence or large-scale quantitative studies (Leithwood and Riehl, 2003).

The case study literature consistently highlights the key role of school leadership in school effectiveness and improvement. Case study evidence from a wide range of countries and school contexts shows that successful schools have leaders who make a significant contribution to the effectiveness of their schools. Most school leadership case studies start by identifying schools that are successful by their outcomes, including student academic learning and social goals and then move to analyse the characteristics of successful leadership in these schools. However, the results of such studies are difficult to generalise.

The empirical evidence emerging from large-scale quantitative studies aiming to measure the impact of principals on student learning outcomes appears to be more ambiguous and inconsistent, with effect sizes ranging from non-existent to very significant. Reviews of this type of study (Hallinger and Heck, 1996; Hallinger and Heck, 1998; Witziers *et al.*, 2003) concluded that the discrepancies in research results can be explained by conceptual and methodological differences in research design.

The overall conclusion emerging from the more than 40 studies considered in these reviews is that school leaders have a *measurable, mostly indirect influence* on learning outcomes. This means that the impact of school leaders on student learning is generally mediated by other people, events and organisational factors such as teachers, classroom practices and school climate (Hallinger and Heck, 1998). The finding that the relationship between leadership and student learning is mediated through such factors underscores the powerful role of the school leader in helping to create the conditions for effective

teaching and learning. School leaders influence the motivations, capacities and working conditions of teachers who in turn shape classroom practice and student learning.

It should be noted that empirical research on the factors influencing student learning is conceptually and methodologically challenging. Student learning is shaped by a range of extra- and intra- organisational factors including student socio-economic background, abilities and attitudes, organisation and delivery of teaching and school policies and practices. Studies measuring the impact of different factors on student achievement tend to use data sets and methodologies providing limited measures of learning and partial indicators of the range of factors influencing it. The consequences and policy implications of such research may be questioned, especially when studies tend to generalise results across different contexts.

Some conceptual and methodological issues remain to be addressed in the future conduct of research on school leadership impact. In the review of learning-centred leadership across OECD countries prepared for the *Improving School Leadership* activity, Chapman (2008) has identified a number of areas of concern, unresolved conceptual debates with important implications for policy makers:

- What are accepted as significant outcomes of schooling?
- What learning outcomes can schools reasonably be expected to achieve, given factors such as student background, socio-economic status and family commitment to education?
- What school outcomes can be reasonably expected given different levels of resources, school mission focus and type of school (public or private)?
- What learning is most valued?
- Whose learning is valued – that of students, teachers, the school community?
- How might national and state policy frameworks (including curriculum and assessment, school quality and improvement) successfully engage and interact with key activities and characteristics of the school (including learning focus, structure, culture, decision making capacity) and the classroom (including class size, teaching approaches, learning resources) in ways that optimize the capacity and work of school leaders to influence and promote effective learning?

Leithwood and Levin (2005) conclude that any attempt to design and carry out a comprehensive analysis of the ways in which activities of leadership influence and promote successful outcomes will require a large number of decisions to be made about methods and procedures, any of which could reasonably be called into question. A review of the OECD *Improving School Leadership* country background reports and a review of the existing research found no large-scale study providing results of a direct link between leadership, student learning and school outcomes that was accepted by policy makers as nationally representative and generalisable. However, the increasing importance attached to this field of enquiry is generating a body of knowledge that is becoming progressively more sophisticated in the depth and breadth of understanding that it promotes and provides. Policy makers and researchers can use it to build useful frameworks that can help shape educational policy and practice.

Annex 1.A2

Levels of school policy decision making

Percentage of decisions relating to public sector lower secondary education
taken at each level of government, 2003

	Central	State	Provincial / regional	Sub- regional	Local	School	Total
Australia		76				24	100
Austria	27	22			23	29	100
Belgium (Fr.) ¹		32	25			43	100
Czech Republic	7		1		32	60	100
Denmark	19				38	44	100
England	11				4	85	100
Finland	2				71	27	100
France	24		10	35		31	100
Germany	4	30	17		17	32	100
Greece	80		4		3	13	100
Hungary	4				29	68	100
Iceland	25				50	25	100
Italy	23		16		15	46	100
Japan	13		21		44	23	100
Korea	9		34		8	48	100
Luxembourg	66					34	100
Mexico	30	45	2			22	100
Netherlands						100	100
New Zealand	25					75	100
Norway	32				32	37	100
Portugal	50		8			41	100
Slovak Republic	33		2		15	50	100
Spain		57	15			28	100
Sweden	18				36	47	100
Turkey ²	49		27			24	100

Note: Blanks indicate that the level of government does not have primary responsibility for decisions.

1. For Belgium (French Community) the level provincial/regional means state level for 61% of the schools, provincial level for 21% and local level for 18%.

2. Data refer to primary education.

Source: OECD (2004), *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2004*, OECD, Paris, available at www.oecd.org/edu/eag2004.

References

- Aalst, H.F. v. (2002), “Education in Europe in the 21st Century: Trends and Challenges”, working paper for the First International Academic Workshop: Educational Systems in East Asia and Western Europe: A Comparative Approach, organised by Shenyang Normal University, China and Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium.
- Barnett, B.G. (undated), *The Changing External Policy Context and the Role of the School Principal*, National College for School Leadership, Nottingham, England.
- Bennis, W. and B. Nanus (1997), *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge*, Harper Business, New York, NY.
- Burns, J. (1978), *Leadership*, Harper and Row Publishers, New York, NY.
- Bush, T. and D. Glover (2003), *School Leadership: Concepts and Evidence*, NCSL, Nottingham.
- Chapman, J. (2008), “Learning-centred Leadership, Policies and Strategies across OECD Countries Targeting the Relationship between Leadership, Learning and School Outcomes”, paper prepared for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity.
- Dimmock, C. (1999), “Principals and school restructuring: conceptualising challenges as dilemmas”, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37 (5), 441-462.
- Elmore, R. (2008), “Leadership as the Practice of Improvement”, in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Fullan, M. (2001), *The New Meaning of Educational Change* (third edition), Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY.
- Glatter, R., W. Mulford and D. Shuttlework (2003), “Governance, Management and Leadership”, in OECD (2003) *Networks of Innovation: Towards New Models of Managing Schools and Systems*, OECD, Paris.
- Hall, G. and S. Hord (2005), *Implementing Change: Patterns, Principles and Potholes* (second edition), Pearson Education, Boston, MA.
- Hallinger, P. and R. Heck (1996), “Reassessing the Principal’s Role in School Effectiveness: A Review of Empirical Research, 1998-1995”, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32 (1), 5-44.
- Hallinger, P. and R. Heck (1998), “Exploring the Principal’s Contribution to School Effectiveness: 1980-1995”, *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9 (2), 157-191.
- Hargreaves, A. G. Halász and B. Pont (2008), “The Finnish Approach to System Leadership”, a case study report for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership and in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.

- Heck, R. (1992), “Principal Instructional Leadership and the Identification of High- and Low- Achieving Schools: The Application of Discriminant Techniques”, *Administrator’s Notebook*, 34 (1-4).
- Heifetz, R. (1998), *Leadership Without Easy Answers*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Heifetz, R.A. and M. Linsky (2002), *Leadership on the Line*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- Hopkins, D. (2008), “Realising the Potential of System Leadership”, in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Leithwood, K. (1992), “The Move Towards Transformational Leadership”, *Educational Leadership*, 49 (5), 8-12.
- Leithwood, K. (2001), “School Leadership in the Context of Accountability Policies”, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4 (3).
- Leithwood, K. (2005), “Understanding Successful Principalship: Progress on a Broken Front”, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43 (6), 619.
- Leithwood, K., C. Day, P. Sammons, A. Harris and D. Hopkins (2006), *Successful School Leadership: What It Is and How It Influences Pupil Learning* (Report Number 800), NCSL/Department for Education and Skills, Nottingham.
- Leithwood, K. and D. Jantzi (1990), “Transformational Leadership: How Principals Can Help Reform School Cultures”, *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 1 (4), 249-280.
- Leithwood, K. and D. Jantzi (2000), “The Effects of Transformational Leadership on Organisational Conditions and Student Engagement with School”, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38.
- Leithwood, K. and B. Levin (2005), “Understanding Leadership Effects on Pupil Learning”, paper prepared for the UK Department for Education and Skills.
- Leithwood, K., K.S. Louis, S. Anderson, S. and K. Wahlstrom (2004), *Review of Research, How Leadership Influences Student Learning*, Learning from Leadership Project, Wallace Foundation, New York, NY.
- Leithwood, K. and C. Riehl (2003), *What We Know About Successful Leadership*, Laboratory for Student Success, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Louis, K. S., H. Marks and S. Kruse (1996), “Teachers’ Professional Community in Restructuring Schools”, *American Journal of Education*, 104 (2), 103-147.
- Marzano, R., T. Waters and B. McNulty (2005), *School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results*, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Virginia.
- Moos, L. and S. Huber (2007), “School Leadership, School Effectiveness and School Improvement: Democratic and Integrative Leadership” in Townsend, T. (ed.) (2007) *International Handbook of School Effectiveness and Improvement*, Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.

- Mulford, W. (2003), “School Leaders: Challenging Roles and Impact on Teacher and School Effectiveness”, a paper prepared for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity.
- OECD (2001a), *Public Sector Leadership for the 21st Century*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2001b), *New School Management Approaches*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2001c), *What Schools for the Future?*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2004a), *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2004*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2004b), *Learning for Tomorrow’s World: First Results from PISA 2003*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2005a), *The Starterpack: Futures Thinking in Action*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2005b), *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2007a), *PISA 2006: Science Competencies for Tomorrow’s World, Volume 1: Analysis*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2007b), *Education at a Glance 2007: OECD Indicators*, OECD, Paris.
- Pont, B, D Nusche and D Hopkins (eds.) (2008), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- PricewaterhouseCoopers (2007), *Independent Study into School Leadership: Main Report*, Department for Education and Skills, London.
- Robinson, V.M.J. (2007), *School Leadership and Student Outcomes: Identifying What Works and Why*, Australian Council for Educational Leaders, Winmalee, NSW, Australia.
- Scheerens, J. and R. Bosker (1997), *The Foundations of Educational Effectiveness*, Elsevier Science Ltd., Oxford.
- Southworth, G. (2002), “Instructional Leadership in Schools: Reflections and Empirical Evidence”, *School Leadership and Management*, 22 (1), 73-91.
- Stoll, L., R. Bolam and P. Collarbone (2002), “Leading for Change: Building Capacity for Learning”, in *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration* (Leithwood, K. and P. Hallinger, eds.), pp. 41-73, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Netherlands.
- Stoll, L. and K.S. Louis (2007), *Professional Learning Communities: Divergence, Depth and Dilemmas*, Open University Press, Maidenhead.
- Teddlie, C. and D. Reynolds (2000), *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research*, Falmer Press, London.
- Townsend, T., (ed.) (2007), *International Handbook of School Effectiveness and Improvement*, Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.
- Waters, T., R. Marzano and B. McNulty (2003), *Balanced Leadership: What 30 Years of Research Tells Us about the Effect of Leadership on Student Achievement*, Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning, Denver, CO.

Witziers, B., R. Bosker and M. Krüger (2003), “Educational Leadership and Student Achievement: The Elusive Search for an Association”, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39 (3), 389-425.

Yukl, G. A. (2002), *Leadership in Organizations*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Chapter 2

(Re)Defining school leadership responsibilities

This chapter brings together theory and practice to provide recommendations for countries to clarify the core responsibilities of school leadership. This (re)definition of responsibilities is one of the key policy strategies to improve school leadership. School leaders can only make a difference if they have autonomy and support to make significant decisions and if their responsibilities are well defined. This chapter presents evidence on the specific leadership roles that can positively influence teaching and learning and argues that school leadership responsibilities should be redefined to focus on teaching quality, goal setting and implementing intelligent assessment systems, strategic resource management and collaboration with external partners. It also looks at ways in which leadership definitions or frameworks can be designed and improved to support recruitment, training and evaluation of school leaders.

School leadership can make a difference in student outcomes by creating the right environment for teachers to improve classroom practice and student learning, as highlighted in Chapter 1. Research evidence shows that there are specific leadership roles that have greater influence on teaching and learning than others. In practice, however, school leaders can only have an impact on student outcomes if they have enough autonomy and support to make important decisions and if their major responsibilities are well-defined and focused on teaching and learning.

The definition of core leadership responsibilities needs to be guided by research on the leadership practices most likely to improve teaching and learning as well as by specific country needs and challenges. In many countries, there is a lack of clarity about the core tasks school leaders should dedicate their time to. Improved definitions of core leadership responsibilities can provide a firm foundation for the profession and constitute a key point of reference both for those who consider entering the profession and for those who are in charge of recruiting, training and evaluating them.

2.1 Supporting school leadership autonomy

Much current and emerging national education policy rests on the assumption that increased school autonomy can play a positive role in the implementation of education reform and provision of leadership for improved learning. According to reports by their principals, a substantial proportion of students in OECD and partner countries attend schools in which school leaders have a high degree autonomy in different areas of decision making (OECD, 2007a).


Figure 2.1 shows that on average across OECD countries, schools have high levels of autonomy in resource and curricular decisions and lower levels of autonomy in staffing decisions such as teacher salary levels and teacher recruitment. On OECD average, around 90% or more 15-year-old students are in schools with considerable responsibility in disciplinary policies, student admission, choice of textbooks and budget allocations within the school and around 70% or more of these students are enrolled in schools with considerable responsibility for formulating the school budget, establishing student assessment policies, deciding which courses are offered and determining course content.

Of course, the OECD average masks important differences between countries. While in countries such as the Czech Republic, Hungary, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States, school leaders' responsibility tends to be high in most domains, it was much more limited in countries such as Greece, Poland, Portugal and Turkey (OECD, 2007a). Moreover, in some countries, there are high variations between the different domains of decision making.

Looking at cross-country relationships, analysis from OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) indicates that school autonomy in the areas surveyed is positively correlated with student performance. The data suggests that in those countries in which principals reported, on average, higher degrees of autonomy in most of the aspects of decision making surveyed, the average performance of students tended to be higher (OECD, 2007a).

Figure 2.1 Average involvement of schools in decision making across OECD countries, 2006

OECD average percentage of 15-year-old students in schools where the principal reported considerable responsibility of the school (principal, teachers and/or school boards) in decision making



Source: OECD (2007a), *PISA 2006: Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World*, OECD, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/141887160188>.

However, school autonomy alone does not automatically lead to improved leadership. On one hand, in increasingly autonomous schools, it is important that the core responsibilities of school leaders are clearly defined and delimited. School leaders should have an explicit mandate to focus on those domains that are most conducive to improved school and student outcomes. Otherwise, school autonomy may lead to role overload, by making the job more time-consuming, increasing administrative and managerial workloads and deflecting time and attention away from instructional leadership.

On the other hand, effective school autonomy requires support. School leaders need time and capacity to engage in the core practices of leadership that contribute to improved teaching and learning. It is therefore important that the devolution of responsibilities comes with provisions for new models of more distributed leadership, new types of training and development for school leadership and appropriate support and incentives (Chapters 3 to 5).

There seems to be ample evidence from research and country practice on which to encourage country, provincial and local policy to use new understandings of core leadership dimensions as a basis for designing the core domains of responsibility of their future leaders. Recent research employing meta-analyses of data has broadened and strengthened the knowledge base to guide policy reform targeting leadership and student learning (Leithwood *et al.*, 2006; Marzano *et al.*, 2005; Robinson, 2007). This chapter focuses on four broad groups of interrelated leadership responsibilities that have consistently been identified as associated with improved student outcomes.

First, *leadership focused on supporting, evaluating and developing teacher quality* is widely recognised as a core component of effective leadership. Teacher quality is perhaps the most important school-level determinant of student performance (OECD, 2005). The leadership responsibilities associated with improved teacher quality include coordinating the curriculum and teaching programme, monitoring and evaluating teacher practice, promoting teacher professional development and supporting collaborative work cultures.

Second, school leadership that concentrates on *setting learning objectives and implementing intelligent assessment systems* has been found to help students develop their full potential. Aligning instruction with national standards, setting school goals for student performance, measuring progress against those goals and making adjustments in the school programme to improve individual and overall performance are the dynamic aspects of managing curriculum and instruction. School leaders' purposeful use of data is essential to ensure that attention is being paid to the progress of every student.

Third, with increased school autonomy policies, school leaders have more and more discretion over human and financial resource management. The *strategic use of resources and their alignment with pedagogical purposes* are key to focusing all operational activities within the school on the objective of improving teaching and learning.

Fourth, recent research (Pont, Nusche and Hopkins, 2008) has highlighted the benefits of *school leadership beyond the school borders*. Various leadership engagements beyond the school, in partnerships with other schools, communities, social agencies, universities and policy makers can increase professional learning, enhance improvement through mutual assistance and create greater cohesion among all those concerned with the achievement and well-being of every child.

While these domains have proved to be important leadership domains in many settings, there should be room for individualisation by size and type of school and by local, regional and country context. Complaints about “designer leaders” produced by highly uniform or central development programmes should be taken seriously (Ingvarson *et al.*, 2006), especially because much of the research on effective leadership stems from a few countries only and is not always easily transferable across contexts.

2.2 Core responsibilities of school leadership

This section explores the four core responsibilities of school leadership presented above. It analyses the degree of autonomy school leaders have in these domains across participating countries and it provides evidence on the impact of each area of responsibility on school and student outcomes.

Part of the picture becomes evident by looking at the latest available data from the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA 2006), which asked lower secondary school principals to report whether schools had considerable responsibility in different areas of school decisions (OECD, 2007a). The PISA data is complemented by more qualitative information from *Improving School Leadership* country background reports on school leadership in both primary and secondary schools. School leadership, as discussed in this chapter does not refer only to the principal, but may be shared by several school-level professionals (Chapter 3).

Supporting, evaluating and developing teacher quality

All countries are seeking to close achievement gaps between low-performing and high-performing schools as well as to enhance the performance of all students. In this context, scholars (Elmore, 2008; Mulford, 2003) are suggesting that an essential function of school leadership is to foster “organisational learning”, that is to build the capacity of the school for high performance and continuous improvement through management of the curriculum and teaching programme, development of staff and creating the climate and conditions for collective learning.

Managing the curriculum and teaching programme

Schools have a high degree of responsibility in decisions related to curricular issues. There are differences within the three domains measured by PISA (2006): determining course content, deciding which courses are offered and choosing textbooks. On average across OECD countries, 80% of 15-year-olds are enrolled in schools where the school alone has considerable responsibility for choosing textbooks. By contrast, only 51% of students are in schools where only school-level stakeholders have considerable responsibility to decide which courses are offered and 43% of students are in schools that have autonomy in determining course content.


As shown in Figure 2.2 there are important differences between countries. In Japan and New Zealand, over 90% of students are in schools where the school has considerable responsibility in deciding on course offer, compared to less than 16% in Greece, Luxembourg, Switzerland and Mexico. Concerning course content, in Japan, Poland and Korea, over 90% of students are in schools where the course content is set by school-level professionals, whereas in Greece, Luxembourg, Turkey, Canada, Slovenia and Switzerland, it is 16% or less.

PISA data also show that the determination of course offerings and course content is often a joint endeavour between regional and/or national authorities and the school – on average across the OECD, 27% of students are enrolled in schools where this is the case. Most countries participating in the *Improving School Leadership* activity establish a core curriculum or curriculum framework at the national level. Where this is not the case, some form of national curricula direction is often evolving. National policy is often further specified at the regional or municipal level. It is the school leader’s job to implement school curriculum and instruction within these policy boundaries in a manner that achieves the policy makers’ intent effectively and efficiently.

School leaders generally have a range of discretion in how they design curriculum content and sequencing, organise teaching and instructional resources and monitor quality. Since the curriculum core or framework does not usually specify the entire curriculum, local leaders usually have flexibility to add or give additional emphasis to content. However, in some countries including Luxembourg, Greece, Switzerland, Mexico, Slovenia and Turkey, a large proportion of curricular decisions are being taken by various levels of government.

Figure 2.2 School leadership autonomy in curricular decisions, 2006

Percentage of 15-year-old students enrolled in schools where principals reported that only schools (i.e. principals, teachers and school boards) had considerable responsibility in determining course content and deciding which courses are offered.



Source: OECD (2007a), *PISA 2006: Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World*, OECD, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/141887160188>.

Giving schools a greater say in curricular decision making seems to be positively related to student performance. The data suggest that in countries where principals reported higher degrees of responsibility, performance in science tended to be higher (a statistically significant positive correlation). According to findings from the PISA study (OECD, 2007a), the percentage of schools that reported having considerable responsibility for decision on course content accounts for 27% of cross-country performance differences; for decisions on choice of textbooks it is 26%. Of course these cross-country relationships can be affected by many factors.

Much of the research literature on effective leadership has emphasised curricular decision making as a key dimension of leadership for improved student learning. As Goldring and colleagues put it, “effective leaders understand the importance of rigorous curriculum offered by teachers and experienced by students and the effects of a rigorous curriculum on gains in student achievement” (Goldring *et al.*, 2007). According to their reviews of research, teaching focused on ambitious academic content leads to increases in student performance (Teddle and Springfield, 1993; Wong *et al.*, 1996) and the performance of low-achieving students can be improved by providing them with better content (Biancarosa and Snow, 2004; McKnight *et al.*, 1987; Peterson, 1988).

In her meta-analysis of research, Robinson (2007) shows that “direct oversight of curriculum through school-wide coordination across classes and year levels and alignment to school goals” has a small-to-moderate positive impact on student achievement. She also shows that school-level professionals in higher performing schools spend more time on managing or coordinating the curriculum with their teaching staff

than leaders in otherwise similar lower performing schools, a finding that is supported by research on instructional leadership (Heck *et al.*, 1990; Heck *et al.*, 1991; Marks and Printy, 2003). Marzano *et al.* (2005) also list school leaders' direct involvement in design and implementation of the curriculum as one of the leadership practices that had a statistically significant correlation with student achievement as measured by standardised assessments in the United States.

Teacher monitoring and evaluation

The country background reports prepared for this study indicate that across participating countries teacher monitoring and evaluation is an important responsibility carried out by school leaders. While the nature and consequences of teacher evaluation vary widely across the participating countries, there are formal provisions for teacher evaluation in 14 countries and no such provisions in 4 countries (of 18 countries reporting specifically on this issue). The form, rigour, content and consequences of evaluation vary greatly across countries and sometimes within them. In most countries where teacher evaluation is carried out, it is conducted as a part of a larger quality review or school improvement process. Purposes of evaluation distribute rather evenly over formative, performance appraisal, professional development planning and support for promotion.

In general, regular teacher evaluations involve the school principal and other senior school staff, but in some countries such as France and Belgium (French Community), they also involve a panel with external members (OECD, 2005). Different criteria for evaluation may involve assessment of teaching performance, in-service training and in some cases measures of student performance. Classroom observation, interviews and documentation prepared by the teacher are the typical methods used in the evaluations.


Weight placed on principal observation or monitoring varies from considerable (Slovenia) to slight (Chile, where the principal's input counts for only 10% of the total). Principals can rely almost exclusively on their observations (Slovenia) or on a wide range of other data, such as reviewing teachers' plans, observing in teacher meetings, reviewing teacher communications with parents, pupil performance data, peer review and teacher self-evaluations, among others (for example, Denmark, England, Korea, Scotland and New Zealand). Frequency of observations ranges from as often as three to six times per year in England to once every four years in Chile, with several countries seeming to settle on annual observations. Where teacher evaluation is conducted it almost always entails some form of annual formal meeting between leader and teacher.

Data from the 2003 PISA study gives an indication of the extent to which school leaders engage in the monitoring of lessons (Figure 2.3). The graph below shows that on average across the OECD, 61% of 15-year-olds are enrolled in schools whose principals report that the practices of mathematics teachers were monitored over the preceding year through principal or senior staff observations (OECD, 2004).

Several research studies indicate that school leader involvement in classroom observation and feedback seems to be associated with better student performance. Robinson (2007) cites four studies showing that setting teaching performance standards and regular classroom observation helped to improve teaching (Andrews and Soder, 1987; Bamburg and Andrews, 1991; Heck, 1992; Heck *et al.*, 1990). Woessmann *et al.* (2007) using econometric analysis of PISA data showed that student achievement seems to be higher when teachers are held accountable through the involvement of principals and external inspectors in monitoring lessons.

Figure 2.3 Observation of lessons by principals or senior staff, 2003

Percentage of 15-year-old students enrolled in schools where principals reported that they monitored the practice of mathematics teachers in the preceding year through observation of lessons by the principal or senior staff



Note. 1. Response rate too low to ensure comparability.

Source: OECD (2004), *Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003*, OECD, Paris.

In practice, however, school leaders do not always have enough time and capacity to focus on this important responsibility. Although teacher evaluation is becoming more common, in many OECD countries, principals and other senior staff often lack the time, tools or training to perform teacher evaluations satisfactorily. According to OECD (2005), there appeared to be little observation of classroom teaching by principals in secondary schools and teachers often expressed concerns about whether principals and other senior staff were adequately equipped for evaluation and about the criteria used. In a number of countries there did not seem to be coherent and well-resourced systems of teacher performance appraisal. As a result, teachers did not receive appropriate recognition for their work and there was little systematic information to guide professional development priorities (OECD, 2005).

Supporting teacher professional development

School leadership also plays a vital role in promoting and participating in professional learning and development for teachers. OECD (2005) gave an overview of the extent of responsibilities schools have in establishing and funding professional development opportunities. Countries where there is more autonomy at the school level also have greater funding capacities to develop more individualised training programmes for teachers.

Different types of professional development activities exist simultaneously but their relative weight has changed over the years. OECD (2005) notes that school-based professional development activities involving the entire staff or significant groups of teachers are becoming more common and teacher-initiated personal development probably less so, at least in terms of programmes supported through public funds. Most countries now link professional development to the developmental priorities of the school

and co-ordinate in-service education in the school accordingly. School management and in some cases local school authorities, play an important role in planning professional development activities. Some countries, including England, are also ensuring that teachers identify their own professional development needs.

In her analysis of the research on learning-centred leadership, Robinson (2007) identified the promotion of and participation in teacher learning and development as the leadership dimension most strongly associated with improved student outcomes. Robinson calculated 17 effect sizes derived from six studies yielding an average effect size of 0.84, which she interpreted as a large and educationally significant effect. She emphasises that this dimension goes beyond just providing opportunities for staff development; it includes the participation of leaders as the “leading learner” in staff development.

Leithwood *et al.* (2006) also emphasise the importance of “developing people” to improve teaching and learning. They underline the need to complement professional development programmes with less formal support such as individual consideration and intellectual stimulation. Several studies show that the role of school leadership in professional development is especially important in low-performing schools in challenging circumstances (Day, 1999; Gray, 2000; Harris and Chapman, 2002). In their meta-analysis on “school leadership that works”, Marzano *et al.* (2005) identify leadership practices that recognise and reward individual accomplishments and demonstrate awareness of personal aspects of staff as core practices of successful leadership.

Another recent study on leadership for organisational learning and student outcomes (LOLSO) also showed the importance of ongoing, relevant professional learning opportunities (Mulford *et al.*, 2004). It emphasised not only organisational learning, but a trusting and collaborative climate, a shared and monitored mission, the capacity to take initiatives and risks and ongoing relevant professional learning opportunities. Yet another study, in three European countries, shows that schools with effective leadership were also found to be schools where teachers were motivated to participate in training, showing connections between school leadership, school climate and willingness to participate in professional development (Rajala *et al.*, 2007).

However, the OECD (2005) activity on teacher policy revealed that professional development is often fragmented, unrelated to teaching practice and lacking in intensity and follow-up. Evidence from that study shows that in several countries there is a lack of coordination between teacher preliminary training and in-service training and often there are concerns about the quality of teacher induction and professional development opportunities. Although in most countries there are many possibilities of in-service training programmes, such training is often patchy and not sufficiently sequenced and aligned.

School leaders can play a key role in providing and promoting in-service professional development programmes for teachers. It is essential that school leaders understand this aspect of leadership as one of their key responsibilities. They can ensure that teacher professional development is relevant to the local school context and aligned with overall school improvement goals and with teachers’ needs. To enhance school leaders’ capacity to promote staff development, policy makers should emphasise the core responsibility of teacher professional development and consider devolving discretion over training and development budgets to the school level so that school leaders can offer and coordinate meaningful professional learning opportunities for all their teachers.

Supporting collaborative work cultures

Although little internationally comparable data is available, the country background reports indicate that supporting collaborative work cultures is an increasingly important and recognised responsibility of school leaders in several countries. This involves fostering teamwork among teachers and creating environments in which student learning is the central focus. Some OECD countries like Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden (Box 2.1) have more of a history of teamwork and co-operation among their teaching staff, especially in primary schools. Others such as Ireland are shifting to encourage such practice. Denmark reports that content reform is leading to the need for more multidisciplinary teamwork among teachers.

Box 2.1 Leading learning organisations in Sweden

In a recent study from Sweden, Scherp and Scherp (2006) illuminate the relationship between the work of the school leader and the way in which the school acts as an organisation. Eleven schools that aimed at working in ways that could be characterised as learning organisations were followed over five years. The more successful school leaders in this context used more of their time giving feedback to the teachers about their work. They also challenged the thoughts of the staff more frequently. By asking questions such as “How do we know that?”, “Could we test another way of doing it?” and “What do we know about how people in other schools do it?” the school leaders contributed to a learning atmosphere. School leaders in more learning-oriented schools stimulated the teachers to organise time during which learning-directed discussions could take place. Working teams among teachers were accepted and the school leaders communicated with the staff a great deal *via* the team leaders.

Source: Scherp and Scherp (2006).

School leaders are increasingly being asked to promote organisational learning that enhances schools’ ability to pursue intelligent learning processes in a way that increases the organisation’s effectiveness and capacity for continuous improvement (Mulford, 2003). While teaching has traditionally been practised as a solo art behind closed classroom doors, a large body of convincing research in the last two decades favours teaching that is collegial and transparent, cooperative and collaborative and conducted in teams and larger professional learning communities (Little, 1982; Louis and Kruse, 1995; Louis *et al.*, 1996; Stoll and Louis, 2007).

Research has shown that school leaders supporting teacher professional learning communities use norms of collegiality, collective responsibility and shared goals (Louis and Kruse, 1995), professional development, reflective practice and quality improvement processes. They promote trust among teachers by helping to develop clarity about common purposes and roles for collaboration and they foster continuous dialogue among school staff and provide adequate resources to support collaboration (Leithwood *et al.*, 2006).

Policy makers can promote and encourage teamwork among school staff by explicitly recognising the core role of school leaders in building collaborative cultures and by sharing and disseminating best practice in this domain.

Goal-setting, assessment and accountability

School leadership focused on goal-setting, assessment and evaluation can positively influence teacher and student performance. Aligning instruction with external standards, setting school goals for student performance, measuring progress against those goals and making adjustments in the school programme to improve performance are the dynamic aspects of managing curriculum and instruction. School leaders play a key role in integrating external and internal accountability systems by supporting their teaching staff in aligning instruction with agreed learning goals and performance standards.

Annex 2.A1. provides an overview of the types of accountability frameworks countries are engaged in. In most countries, there is a long tradition of school inspections where leaders have been held accountable for their use of public funding and for the structures and processes they establish. While inspections remain important in most educational jurisdictions, many countries have developed additional means to measure school success, such as school self-evaluations and measurements of student performance (OECD, 2007b).

The majority of OECD countries report that they have or are developing some form of national goals, objectives, or standards of student performance. To assess these, accountability frameworks in most jurisdictions rely on both school information and student information. To evaluate *school performance*, two-thirds of OECD countries have regulations that require lower secondary schools to be inspected regularly and slightly fewer countries have regulatory requirements for schools to conduct periodic school self-evaluations. One-half of OECD countries have both of these regulatory requirements. To obtain information on *student performance*, periodic standardised assessments of students in compulsory education occur in two-thirds of OECD countries and just over half of the OECD countries have national examinations that have a civil effect on lower secondary school students (such as proceeding to a higher level of education).

Recent empirical research emphasises high learning standards and strong accountability systems as key to improving student learning. Hanushek and Raymond (2004) reported a positive relationship between strong accountability systems and student achievement. West and colleagues argue that the purposeful use of data is a key explanation for effective leadership in schools in challenging circumstances (West *et al.*, 2005). According to Woessmann *et al.* (2007), accountability measures aimed at students, teachers and schools combine to lift student achievement scores. Using PISA data, Woessmann *et al.* (2007) indicate that student achievement seemed to be somewhat higher when standardised exit exams exist. These might have an effect on student promotion to incentivise high performance. They also found some evidence that students seemed to perform better if their schools were held accountable for reaching performance standards.

However, just producing data is obviously not enough for accountability systems to have a positive impact on student learning. According to O'Day (2002), accountability systems will only lead to improvement if they “focus attention on information relevant to teaching and learning, motivate individuals and schools to use that information and expend effort to improve practice, build the knowledge necessary for interpreting and applying the new information to improve practice and allocate resources for all the above.” Several authors have argued that bureaucratic accountability needs to be complemented by “professional accountability” (Adams and Kirst, 1999; Darling-Hammond and Ascher, 1991; O'Day, 2002; O'Reilly, 1996), *i.e.* the collaboration among

professionals, both teachers and school leaders, to address student needs and to continuously improve their own practice.

According to OECD (2007b), 19 OECD countries use information from student assessment and school evaluation to motivate decisions on school improvement, while only a few countries including Korea and the United States, reported using accountability information to provide financial rewards or sanctions to schools. According to *Improving School Leadership* country background reports, in England, Northern Ireland and Scotland performance data are used to track and monitor student progress and guide ongoing improvement, although Northern Ireland notes that internal assessment data are not used enough to check student progress over time or to modify classroom practice and improve standards of students' work.

To make external accountability beneficial for student learning, “data-wise” school leadership is needed. This involves school leaders developing skills in interpreting test results and using data as a central tool to plan and design appropriate strategies for improvement (Box 2.2). School leaders also need to involve their staff in the use of accountability data. Participatory evaluation and data analysis can strengthen professional learning communities within schools and engage those who need to change their practice to improve results (Earl and Katz, 2002).

Box 2.2 England: using evaluation information for improving performance

During an OECD case study visit to England, the study team identified outstanding and effective practices of school leadership for improved learning outcomes. Both case study schools had improved their school performance and results in recent years and presented positive similarities. For example, they used data as a key vehicle to engage the leadership team and teaching body in school improvement and student outcome information to develop strategies for learning with individual students and classrooms. In both schools, information was revisited every six weeks. Data was analysed at the individual level and at the classroom level, providing an overview of where problems lay. Intervention teams could then step in to look into potential underperformance and respond to challenges. This good use of data allows the adoption of personalised learning processes. These schools had the following to be able to respond quickly:

- **The development and use of distributed leadership:** leadership teams are well developed and have clear roles and tasks defined.
- **The creation of intervention teams:** they are able to react quickly and intervene to help and support students or teachers who might be underperforming.
- **A culture of constant assessment:** In both schools classrooms are open and all are ready for evaluation, assessment and action.
- **The adoption of a systemic approach to leadership,** taking opportunities to expand and benefit from external sources.

Source: Huber *et al.* (2008).

Strategic resource management


In increasingly autonomous school systems, school leaders have more and more discretion over human and financial resource management. The strategic use of resources and their alignment with pedagogical purposes can help to focus all operational activities within the school on the objective of improving teaching and learning.

Financial resources

Figure 2.4 shows that school leaders exercise a considerable amount of discretion over decision making involving financial resources. On average across OECD countries, 84% of 15-year-old students are enrolled in schools that have full autonomy in deciding how their budgets are spent and 57% are in schools that are fully autonomous in formulating their budgets. However, across countries there are important differences in the extent of budgetary autonomy. In Poland, Austria and Italy, fewer than 20% of students are enrolled in schools where the principal reported that only the school has considerable responsibility for formulating the budget, whereas in the Netherlands and New Zealand it is more than 90%. Overall, responsibility for deciding how money is spent within the school is higher than responsibility for budget formulation in all countries except Greece and Portugal.

Figure 2.4 School leadership autonomy in resources, 2006

Percentage of 15-year-old students enrolled in schools where the principal reported that only the school (i.e. principals, teachers and school boards) has considerable responsibility in formulating the school budget and deciding on budget allocations within the school.




Source: OECD (2007a), *PISA 2006: Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World*, OECD, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/141887160188>.

In addition, within the budget, regulations in most countries allocate responsibility for property and facilities management to the principal. The value of school assets is considerable. Where devolution has put even greater decision making discretion for maintenance and repair and even more substantial capital projects in the hands of school leaders, their workload for managing these assets is correspondingly greater and they are asked to fulfil responsibilities that call for expertise many do not have through formal training. Where this is the purview of the governing board, it is often formally or informally delegated to the school leader.

While school leaders across OECD countries have considerable budgetary autonomy, they have a modest role in setting teachers' starting salaries or awarding salary increases in general (Figure 2.5). The OECD country average number of 15-year-old pupils enrolled in schools reporting autonomy in setting starting salaries and awarding salary increases is 22% and 21%, respectively. There are exceptions to this norm: in the United States, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic, Sweden, the United Kingdom and Hungary, schools play an important role in teacher wage issues.

Figure 2.5 School leadership autonomy in teacher remuneration, 2006

Percentage of 15-year-old students enrolled in schools where the principal reported that only the school (i.e. principals, teachers and school boards) has considerable responsibility in establishing teachers' starting salaries and determining teachers' salary levels



Source: OECD (2007a), *PISA 2006: Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World*, OECD, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/141887160188>.

The limited degree of autonomy in teacher salaries somewhat reduces the first impression of large budgetary autonomy across countries. In fact, teacher salaries, over which most school authorities have no control, comprise a great share of local school resources in nearly all, if not all, participating countries. The share of resources over which there is discretion is thus in fact rather small. Moreover, some countries (e.g. Hungary) report that national economic constriction has reduced the amount of funding allocated to the school level, thus further diminishing principals' discretion over financial resources.


Human resources

Another vital decision in the school's strategic resourcing is the appointment and dismissal of teachers (Figure 2.6). On average, 59% of student enrolments are found in schools reporting discretion in teacher hiring and 50% in schools reporting discretion in teacher dismissal. This is another reflection of devolution of responsibilities to the schools but there are still variations across countries. There is a group of countries

(Netherlands, New Zealand, the Slovak Republic, the Czech Republic, United States and Hungary) which have almost full responsibility for both hiring and dismissing teachers, while in countries like Turkey, Greece, Italy, Austria, Portugal, Germany and Luxemburg, school leaders have a very limited role. It is worth noting that the responsibilities for hiring teachers are wider than those for dismissal. In some countries, for example Denmark or Sweden, there is a large difference between the two, with 95% and 98% of students in schools with responsibilities for hiring as opposed to 50% and 58% respectively with responsibilities for dismissing teachers.

Figure 2.6 School leadership autonomy in teacher hiring and firing, 2006

Percentage of 15-year-old students enrolled in schools where the principal reported that only the school (i.e. principals, teachers and school boards) has considerable responsibility in selecting teachers for hire and dismissing teachers



Source: OECD (2007a), *PISA 2006: Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World*, OECD, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/141887160188>.

While this data includes the responsibilities of both school-level professionals and school boards, a closer look at qualitative information provided in country background reports breaks this down. In a number of countries, even where the board or council retains the responsibility for teacher selection and dismissal, it is customary for the principal to be involved in those processes, thus creating a greater degree of principal influence than is officially recognised. Among the countries participating in this study, principals are involved in selection and dismissal or are delegated those responsibilities in Chile, Denmark, New Zealand and Norway. On the other hand, principals in other countries, such as the French Community of Belgium, France and Portugal, are as a rule not involved at all.

Although the level of responsibility in teacher recruitment seems rather high, the degree of discretion of school leaders is often limited by complex sets of rules that might reduce their room for manoeuvre in choosing suitable candidates. In some countries, such

as Belgium (Flanders), priority has to be given to the candidate with the highest level of seniority and teachers with permanent status have priority over temporary teachers. Other rules may require that priority be given to those who have worked for a certain number of years and, where two candidates are equal in this regard, priority is given to those who have worked in the same network of schools, or been employed by the same organising authority (OECD, 2005).

Moreover, dismissals may not be possible because of status, or they may be due to redundancies, enrolment decline or subjects no longer offered. In fact, while many countries report that teachers can be dismissed, it appears that public school teachers are rarely dismissed on performance grounds (OECD, 2005). The lack of simple, transparent and accepted procedures for dealing with ineffective teachers means that the problem is often not tackled. This has adverse consequences for the reputation of schools and the teaching profession (OECD, 2005).

School leaders' ability to select their teaching staff is central to their ability to establish a school culture and capacity conducive to better student performance. Lack of school leader involvement in recruiting and dismissing teachers may reduce their capacity to respond and it is difficult to hold school leaders accountable for learning outcomes when they have no say in selecting their staff. The effect of lack of involvement in such a critical area is illustrated by the words of one school director in Austria who compared leading a school to managing a football team: "If I cannot choose the members of my team, I cannot be responsible for winning on the field." (Stoll *et al.*, 2008)

A number of studies support the view that budgeting is a central element of leadership for improved school outcomes. Strategic resource management refers to a leadership dimension that involves securing resources and ensuring that their use is aligned to pedagogical purposes (Robinson, 2007). Especially when resources are used for staffing and teaching purposes, their strategic use has been found to be associated with improved student achievement (Bamburg and Andrews, 1991; Brewer, 1993; Heck and Marcoulides, 1996; Heck *et al.*, 1990; Heck *et al.*, 1991; Hoy *et al.*, 1990; Wellisch *et al.*, 1978).

While strategic resource management is likely to be beneficial for schools, there are widespread concerns about the ability of school leaders to fulfil this responsibility effectively. The capacity of school leaders in shifting financial and human resources strategically may be limited due to lack of training and lack of focus in the field. Often principals report having to engage in operational delivery issues and put aside the strategic planning that is necessary to provide a strategic vision and choice of resources. While hiring may be a possibility, dismissing rarely is and establishing the whole school budget is often limited to a formula depending on the number of students enrolled in the schools.

Leadership beyond the school borders

Yet another role that has grown in recent times to add to the repertoire of tasks to be handled by school leaders is that of collaborating with other schools or communities around them. Schools and their leaders are strengthening collaboration, forming networks, sharing resources, or working together. Moreover, school leaders are becoming more broadly engaged in activities beyond their schools, reaching out to their immediate environment and articulating connections between the school and the outside world.

These wider engagements focus leadership beyond the people in the school leaders' own buildings to the welfare of all young people in the city, town or region. They also focus on the improvement of the profession and its work as a whole – but in ways that access learning and support from others in order to provide reciprocal benefits for leaders' own communities. This articulation and coordination of effort and energy across individuals and institutions and amid common purposes and improvement goals is what Hopkins (2008) defines as *system leadership*, “a systemic approach that integrates the classroom, school and system levels in the pursuit of enhancing student achievement” (Hopkins, 2008) It refers to thinking about the system as a whole as the basis of change management and requires interrelationships and interdependence between different levels of the system.

Table 2.1 School collaboration in different countries

Country	Characteristics
Belgium (Fl.)	School communities have been created as voluntary collaborative partnerships between schools. They aim to have common staffing, ICT and welfare resources management.
Denmark	Co-operation in post-compulsory education has been promoted by way of the creation of administrative groups that can be set up locally or regionally between self-governing institutions to optimise their joint resources.
England	A variety of approaches to co-operation are stimulated by the government – federations of schools, national leaders of education, school improvement partners, etc.
Finland	2003 legislative reform has enhanced school co-operation aiming to ensure integrity of students' study paths.
France	“School basins” have been implemented to ensure collaborative partnerships between schools to work together in student orientation, educational coherence between different types of schools, common management of shared material and human resources.
Hungary	Micro-regional partnerships based on economic and professional rationalisation were created in 2004 and have resulted in the spreading of common school maintenance in almost all Hungarian micro regions. These networks for co-operation are the scenes of professional and organisational learning in a way that can function as new forms of education governance and efficient frames of innovation.
Korea	Small schools cooperate to overcome problems of size in teacher exchange, curriculum organisation, joint development activities and integrated use of facilities.
Netherlands	In primary education, “upper management” takes management responsibility for several schools. About 80% of the primary school boards have an upper school management bureau for central management, policy staff and support staff.
New Zealand	School clusters based around geographical communities and communities of interest have been facilitated.
Northern Ireland	Post-primary schools share provision of courses with other schools and further education colleges. “School Collaboration Programme” focuses on school co-operation for increased curricular access on the local level. “Specialist Schools” model requires post-primary specialist schools to partner with primary schools and at least one other post-primary.
Norway	Tendency to merge several schools to form an administrative unit governed by a school principal. It is quite common for principals to network in the municipalities.
Portugal	Common patterns of school governance are that schools are grouped together with a collective management structure. Executive, pedagogical and administrative councils are responsible for their areas.
Scotland	Important political promotion of collaboration. “Heads Together” is a nationwide online community for sharing leadership experience. Integrated community schools.
Sweden	Municipal directors of education steer principals. Most of them are members of directors of education steering groups where strategy, development and results are discussed.

Source: *Improving School Leadership Country Background Reports*, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.

Inter-school co-operation ranges from light approaches of networking to formalised approaches of co-operation that change management structures, such as the Portuguese or the Dutch approach, in which schools have management structures above the school level to share management issues. In all countries participating in this study there are some arrangements for co-operation between schools (Table 2.1) and it is school leaders who both have to manage the different arrangements and are also strongly influenced by the new co-operation arrangements. There may be different purposes and reasons for these collaborations, among which are resource rationalisation and greater coherence in educational supply. The Belgian (Flanders) communities of schools demonstrate different degrees of co-operation, in a continuum from no or hardly any co-operation to those school communities which have developed strong networks and upper management structures providing support for principals (Box 2.3).

Box 2.3 “Communities of schools” in Belgium (Flanders)

In Flanders, communities of schools for primary and secondary education have been promoted by the government, starting in 1999. The objective was to make schools work in collaboration by sharing resources, to rationalise supply of courses and to promote cost savings across schools. The government’s aspirations were that this new system would enable the enhancement of student guidance systems, particularly in relation to their educational career trajectories; the lessening of the managerial-administrative burden on principals so that they become pedagogical leaders; the increased use of ICT; and the rationalisation of resourcing both in relation to staff recruitment, functioning and evaluation and in relation to co-operation in curriculum. The government incentivises participation by allocating additional staffing and other resources (*e.g.* “envelopes” of teaching hours) specifically to be used through collective decision making processes to be established freely by the communities of schools.

While they have had uneven developments, overall, they have been successful in strengthening co-operation in an environment based on school choice and competition. The evaluation undertaken for secondary school communities shows that communities have strengthened co-operation in developing common personnel policies and policies to allocate human resources across the schools involved and that there seems to be informal co-operation with other school levels such as primary schools and special education. Yet there is still scope for co-operation in rationalising education supply and infrastructures across schools and in providing effective guidance for students.

An example of a successful community can provide a better understanding of their function: it appointed a former head teacher of one of the prestigious, respected and high achieving schools as its full-time coordinating director. Under her leadership, the head teachers from the schools began to meet monthly and, though they still described themselves as “scanning”, “getting to know each other” and “building trust”, they established a clear agenda for improving the individual guidance and counselling services for students, agreeing on a common process for selection, thus reducing competition within the community, negotiating common working conditions for teachers and creating curricula for students with special educational needs. Teachers themselves were described as being, as yet, “barely aware” of changes and despite a collective “vision for integration”, different schools still had “distinct visions and interests”. The community had recently agreed to provide targeted support (from the envelope of hours provided to the communities) for one of its members which was finding difficulty in recruitment and staffing.

Source: Day et al. (2008).

School leaders increasingly engage in *collaboration with their surrounding environments*. In England and Northern Ireland, for example, a lot has been done around the “Extended Schools” agenda which aims at ensuring that all students and families have access to a range of services and other agencies such as social welfare and health outside of curricular time. In Northern Ireland, the Extended School model now involves over 500 schools, *i.e.* 40% of all schools in Northern Ireland. Socio-economic conditions such as residential mobility, parent educational background, family health and living conditions are likely to influence the degree to which students can perform well in school. Leaders thus need to reach out to the community to influence the conditions which influence their own work with students (Hargreaves *et al.*, 2008). These engagements can also contribute to the development of the community’s social capital as a whole (Kilpatrick *et al.*, 2001).

In a Swedish case study, Hoog *et al.* found that leaders in schools with successful outputs in terms of academic learning and social goals were engaged in changing school structures and cultures in order to open them to their local communities (Hoog *et al.*, 2005). The surrounding community was seen as a necessary resource in the improvement of the schools.

Finally, in some countries school leaders are also becoming *more connected with local or municipal education authorities* to achieve better connectedness to other public services and community development, as well as to improve student outcomes for all students in the local educational system. The approach adopted in Finland (Box 2.4) can provide some evidence on the practicalities of system leadership at the municipal level.

Box 2.4 School-municipality co-operation in Finland

A Finnish city visited by an OECD case study team had implemented a pilot programme in which five principals are also working as district principals, with one-third of their time devoted to the district and two-thirds to their own schools. The purpose of this reform was to improve schooling for the municipality children by ensuring that principals are responsible for their own schools but also for their districts and that there is shared management and supervision as well as evaluation and development of education planning.

The Finnish pilot programme aimed to align school and municipality to think systemically with the key objective of promoting a common schooling vision and a united school system. The reform had provided some positive results, but one of the key conclusions is that for individual school leaders to be able to take on this larger system role, there needs to be distributed leadership at the school level, with more involved deputy heads and leadership teams who can take on some of the tasks of principals when they are taking on larger roles.

Source: Hargreaves *et al.* (2008).

Overall, the research has highlighted benefits from co-operation (Pont, Nusche and Hopkins, 2008). First, many types of inter-school co-operation concentrate on managerial and administrative issues and thus can lessen the school leaders’ administrative workload. Co-operation of schools can be coordinated by an overarching upper management structure such as in Portugal and Netherlands, or schools can pool and share human and financial resources to reach administrative increases of scale. As a result, school leaders can be relieved of some of their most tedious administrative tasks and can devote more time and attention to leadership focused on improved learning outcomes.

Second, beyond these more operational issues, leaders' collaboration with other schools and with the local environment may contribute to improving problem-solving through intensified processes of interaction, communication and collective learning. It may also contribute to developing leadership capacity and attending to succession and stability by increasing the density of and opportunities for local leadership in the school and at the local level.

Leadership engagements beyond the school can include partnerships with other schools, communities, businesses, social agencies, universities and policy makers on a local, national and international basis. They can increase professional learning, enhance improvement through mutual assistance and create greater cohesion among all those concerned with the achievement and well-being of every child.

While it seems that many school leaders are expanding their scope to larger networks, some are struggling to respond. When having to make decisions on whether to focus on the school programme or having to work outside, most principals will choose the first, as it is their key concern and the focus of their performance evaluation. System roles come after school issues have been taken care of and may not be prioritised, although there may be long term benefits for the principals and the schools. In addition, leadership may not be well prepared to take on the challenges of leading collaboration with the outside world.

In England, for example, where the system leadership agenda has been moving forward quite quickly (Box 2.5), teachers identified the need for better skills for the management of extended services as their most important future training requirement. Other problems or challenges have been highlighted such as the sheer lack of time for engagement in co-operation, lack of capacity and problems in decision making powers of different bodies.

If collaboration activities are perceived as being imposed from above rather than being pursued out of real commitment, their effectiveness will be limited. In Korea for example, cooperative structure remains a rather ineffective compulsory obligation; there may be divergent interests of the groups involved and collaboration may remain superficial unless change is pushed. The move towards establishing "communities of schools" in Flemish Belgium is understood by some schools as a sort of "contrived collegiality" (Hargreaves and Dawe, 1990) where school leaders are obliged to work together in order to receive increased resources (in the form of staffing points) from the government.

Box 2.5 System leadership in England

In England, various ways for schools to collaborate have developed recently with the view that collaboration can contribute to make “every school a good school”. Under the concept of system leadership, system leaders are those principals willing to contribute and care about and work for the success of other schools and communities as well as their own. Different approaches have been promoted to this end:

- Developing and *leading a successful educational improvement partnership* between several schools, often focused on a set of specific themes that have significant and clear outcomes reaching beyond the capacity of any one single institution. These include partnerships on curriculum design and specialisms, including sharing curricular innovation. While many partnerships remain at a collaboration level, some have moved to “harder” more formalised arrangements in the form of (con)federations (to develop stronger mechanisms for joint governance and accountability) or Education Improvement Partnerships (to formalise the devolution of certain defined delivery responsibilities and resources from their local authority).
- Acting as a *community leader* to broker and shape partnerships and/or networks of wider relationships across local communities to support children’s welfare and potential, often through multi-agency work. Such system leadership responds to, as Osbourne (2000) puts it, “the acceptance [that] some ... issues are so complex and interconnected that they require the energy of a number of organisations to resolve and hence can only be tackled through organisations working together (p.1). ... The concept of [a] full-service school where a range of public and private sector services is located at or near the school is one manifestation” (p.188).
- Working as a *change agent or expert leader* within the system, identifying best classroom practice and transferring it to support improvement in other schools. This is the widest category and includes: heads working as mentor leaders within networks of schools, combining an aspiration and motivation for other schools to improve with the practical knowledge and guidance for them to do so; heads who are active and effective leaders within more centrally organised system leadership programmes, for instance within the Consultant Leader Programme, School Improvement Partners (SIP) and National Leaders of Education (NLE); and heads who with their staff purposely develop exemplary curricula and teaching programmes either for particular groups of students or to develop specific learning outcomes in a form that is transferable to other schools and settings.

Source: Hopkins (2008).

2.3 Improving the definition of school leadership responsibilities

The analysis of practice has shown that in increasingly decentralised and accountability-driven environments school leaders take on a much broader set of tasks than a decade ago. In many countries, school leaders report high levels of stress, role overload and uncertainty because many of these new responsibilities of school leadership are not explicitly accounted for in their job descriptions. In many settings, definitions or frameworks for school leadership are not explicitly focused on practices to improve teaching and learning but rather on the traditional tasks of head teacher or bureaucratic administrator.

For school leaders to perform at high levels, it seems essential that their responsibilities be well defined and expectations be clearly spelled out. Some countries have therefore engaged in the development of leadership frameworks, or standards, for the profession (Box 2.6). Such frameworks serve to define the nature and scope of school leadership and the types of responsibilities leaders are expected to fulfil. According to the review of research on leadership standards by Ingvarson *et al.* (2006), school leadership frameworks are important for at least three reasons.

First, such frameworks are a way of setting boundaries and making it clear what school leadership does *not* include. Leadership frameworks provide a firm foundation for the profession and they can constitute a key point of reference both for those who consider entering the profession and for those who are in charge of recruiting them.

Second, frameworks defining the wide range of leadership tasks at school level make it clear that certain conditions need to be in place for school leaders to be able to perform effectively. For example, frameworks can be a crucial basis to improve the relevance and effectiveness of professional training and development provided to school leaders. They can be a starting point for the design of improved and consistent professional preparation and development.

Third, frameworks for school leadership provide a reference to evaluate its effectiveness. Unless responsibilities are defined in a clearly confined and feasible way, it is impossible to evaluate leadership quality. Frameworks can serve leaders themselves in guiding their learning and evaluating their progress and/or they can help employing authorities in managing performance and assessing whether school leaders fulfil their contractual duties.

Leadership frameworks or standards can be developed with varying involvement of the profession. In the Netherlands, for example, Professional Standards for Educational Leaders in Primary Education (2005) were established by an independent professional body initiated by the Minister of Education, while in England the government commissioned the responsibility of developing and implementing National Standards for Headteachers (2004) to two non-departmental public agencies (the Training and Development Agency and the National College for School Leadership) and in Scotland it was the devolved government (Scottish Executive) that had responsibility for the development and review of their Standards for Headship (Ingvarson *et al.*, 2006).

While standards provide common ground by which people can perform and evaluate performance, they do give rise to some concerns. If too prescriptive and detailed, they can contribute to increasing “intensification” of the school leader’s role and discourage practitioners (Gronn, 2002, in Ingvarson *et al.*, 2006). Critics in the United States fault them for perpetuating dominant conceptions of power (English, 2000). Still, it is vital that they provide definitions of school leadership roles that contribute to improve school outcomes as set out above in Section 2.2.

Box 2.6 School leadership frameworks across countries

In **New Zealand**, Professional Standards for Principals form part of the regulatory framework. These were developed by the Ministry of Education in conjunction with principals' professional associations and with other education sector input as part of collective agreements. The professional standards reflect the government's interest in ensuring that students have opportunities to learn from high quality professional teachers and that schools are led and managed by high quality professionals. Additional regulations complete the framework, with National Administration Guidelines (NAGS) – including broad regulations about teaching and assessment, staff, finance and property, health and safety that the board must observe in governing the school.

In **Chile**, the Ministry of Education adopted a practical approach in 2005. They defined the Good School Leadership Framework, organised around 4 areas of professional competency that group Chile's 18 performance and professional development standards: leadership, curricular management, management of the school atmosphere and coexistence and resource management. This framework provides Chile with a common benchmark to begin implementing performance assessment of head teachers, other school leaders and technical-pedagogical teachers. It is aimed at increasing professionalisation processes and thereby having an impact on the quality of institutional management and learning for all students. It provides guidance to everyone in the education system as to what is to be expected of school leaders.

In **Denmark**, the Ministry of Education worked in co-operation with head teacher organisations and in 2003 presented the booklet (*Ledelse af uddannelsesinstitutioner – overordnede visioner for ledelse og ledelsesudvikling*) in which general and collective requirements, conditions and criteria for leadership of the institutions are formulated. Ambitions and basic/specific requirements are in five areas: overall leadership, education policy leadership, pedagogical and academic leadership, administrative and financial leadership and personnel policy leadership.

In **Northern Ireland**, National Standards for Headteachers were developed in 2005. The six key areas defined are meant not only for school leaders but also for the professional development of senior and middle managers who may aspire to headship. The standards inform objectives, provide guidance to school stakeholders in what should be expected from the role of the head teacher and are also used to identify threshold levels of performance for assessment within the Professional Qualification for Headship in Northern Ireland. The standards are increasingly used by the employing authorities to provide job descriptions for school leaders. They have provided a framework for self-evaluation by principals and other school leaders, at a personal and whole school level, through a continuous professional development record promoted by the Regional Training Unit.

In **Scotland**, *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century* (2001) introduced distributed leadership by defining the core tasks and responsibilities of the head teachers, deputy head teachers and principal teachers and spelling out remuneration and other additional rewards.

In **Korea**, the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI) proposed a set of performance standards for school administrators based on research on conditions of teachers' job performance: managing and evaluating curriculum, guiding and supporting students, supervising and supporting the school staff, supervising and organising school management, handling external co-operation with parents and others and supporting professional development.

Source: Improving School Leadership Country Background Reports, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.

2.4 Summary conclusions and recommendations

Research has shown that school leaders can make a difference in school and student performance if they are granted autonomy to make important decisions. However, school autonomy alone does not automatically lead to improved leadership unless it is well supported. In addition, it is important that the core responsibilities of school leaders are clearly defined and delimited. The definition of school leadership responsibilities should be guided by an understanding of the leadership dimensions most conducive to improving teaching and learning.

Provide higher degrees of autonomy with appropriate support

While school autonomy seems to be positively correlated with improved learning as measured by international assessments such as PISA, school autonomy alone does not guarantee school improvement. Unless school leaders have the capacity, motivation and support to make use of their autonomy to engage in the practices that are most conducive to improved learning, school autonomy may have little influence on school outcomes.

- Countries where school leaders do not currently hold considerable decision making authority should explore ways to provide greater degrees of autonomy to school leadership, but keep in mind that certain conditions need to be in place for school autonomy to lead to learning-centred leadership.
- Greater degrees of autonomy should be coupled with provisions for new models of more distributed leadership, new types of accountability and training and development for school leaders.

Redefine school leadership responsibilities for improved student learning

Bearing in mind the need for contextualisation, there seems to be ample evidence from research and country practice on which to encourage country, regional and local policy to use evidence on core leadership dimensions as a basis for designing the job descriptions of their future leaders. To this end, there are four broad groups of interrelated leadership responsibilities that have consistently been identified as associated with improved learning outcomes:

a) Encourage school leaders to support, evaluate and develop teacher quality

Teacher quality is probably the most important school-level determinant of student performance (OECD, 2005) and school leadership focused on improving the motivation, capacities and working environments of teachers is thus most likely to improve student learning. To enhance the capacity of school leadership in supporting, evaluating and developing teacher quality, policy makers need to:

- *Strengthen school leaders' responsibility in curricular decision making* so that they can adapt the teaching programme to local needs and ensure coherence across courses and grade levels to achieve school goals and performance standards.
- *Provide training for school leaders in teacher monitoring and evaluation*, either as part of initial training for school leaders or in forms of in-service professional

training courses. Ensure that school leaders have the time and capacities necessary to fulfil the core task of teacher evaluation satisfactorily.

- *Enhance the role of school leaders in teacher professional development:* School leaders can ensure that teacher professional development is relevant to the local school context and aligned with overall school improvement goals and with teachers' needs. To enhance school leaders' capacities in developing their staff, policy makers should consider devolving discretion over teacher training and development budgets to the school level.
- *Encourage school leaders to promote teamwork among teachers* by explicitly recognising the core role of school leaders in building collaborative cultures and by sharing and disseminating best practice in this domain.

b) Support goal-setting, assessment and accountability

Goal-setting, assessment and school accountability are key responsibilities of school leaders in most countries. In order to optimise school leaders' use of accountability systems for school improvement processes, policy makers need to ensure that a number of conditions are in place:

- *Provide school leaders with discretion over strategic direction setting* and enhance their capacity to develop school plans and goals aligned with broader national curriculum standards and responsive to local needs.
- *Promote "data-wise" leadership:* Provide support and training opportunities for school leaders to ensure that they have the knowledge and skills necessary to monitor progress and use data effectively to improve practice.
- *Encourage school leaders to distribute tasks related to assessment and accountability within schools* by developing a group of people who are competent and confident in analysing and using data to design appropriate improvement strategies (Earl and Katz, 2002).

c) Enhance strategic financial and human resource management

Effective planning and management of resources can improve school outcomes by strategically aligning resources with pedagogical purposes. It is therefore important to ensure that school leaders are better equipped to make strategic use of resources.

- *Enhance the financial management skills of school leadership teams:* This can be done by providing training in this domain to school leaders, by establishing the role of a bursar or leadership team member with budgeting qualifications at the school level (for larger schools or clusters of small schools) or by providing financial support or services to schools.
- *Involve school leaders in teacher recruitment decisions:* School leaders should be given opportunities to influence decision making on teacher recruitment in order to improve the match between the school and the selected candidate. At the same time, it is important that parallel steps are taken within the system to professionalise school-level recruitment process to avoid an inequitable distribution of teacher quality and to protect teachers' rights (OECD, 2005).

d) Adopt a systemic approach to leadership policy and practice

Collaboration with partners external to the school is a new leadership dimension that is increasingly recognised as a clear role for school leaders, as it will benefit school systems as a whole rather than just the students of one individual school. For system leadership roles to be effective, policy makers need to ensure that school leaders have the time, capacities, administrative support and tools to become involved in matters beyond their school borders.

- *Develop opportunities for school leaders to cooperate actively with surrounding schools and the local community to ensure improved student trajectories, alignment of the curriculum at the local level, coordinated course offerings and sharing of resources.*
- *Encourage the distribution of leadership responsibilities within schools so that other people can ensure continuity in the core leadership tasks within each individual school while school leaders are engaged in activities beyond the school border (Chapter 3).*

Develop school leadership frameworks for improved policy and practice

School leadership frameworks can bring needed uniformity by providing a research-based metric for procedures intended to strengthen the field, like preparation and selection. Frameworks can also serve to signal the essential character of school leadership as the provision of leadership for learning. Yet, space for contextualisation is important to allow for local and school level criteria. When developing and introducing leadership frameworks, a number of steps should be considered:

- *Build on commitment not compliance* (Ingvarson *et al.*, 2006): School leadership frameworks can be developed with varying degrees of involvement by the profession. To make frameworks relevant and ensure they become real guidelines of practice, it is important that representatives from the school leadership profession are involved in their formulation and development.
- *Provide definitions of school leaders' major domains of responsibility*: These domains should be guided by evidence on effective leadership practice as reviewed in Section 2.2 as well as by concrete needs of national education systems.
- *Use frameworks to provide coherence to different domains of school leadership policy*: Frameworks should provide guidance on the main characteristics, tasks and responsibilities of effective school leaders. They can and should thus be used as a basis for recruitment, training and appraisal of school leaders.

Annex 2.A1

Evaluation of public schools in lower secondary education (ISCED level 2)

Country	School information		Student information	
	Requirement that schools be regularly inspected	Requirement that schools conduct regular self-evaluation	Existence of national examinations	Existence of periodical national assessment in compulsory education
Australia	•	•		•
Austria			1	
Belgium (Fl.)	•			•
Czech Republic	•			
Denmark		•	•	•
England	•	•	•	•
Finland				•
France	•	•	•	•
Germany ²	•	•	•	•
Greece	•	•	•	
Hungary		•	•	•
Iceland	•	•	•	•
Ireland	•	•	•	
Italy				•
Japan		•		
Korea	•	•	•	•
Luxembourg	•	•	•	•
Mexico	•		•	•
Netherlands	•	•	•	
New Zealand	•	•	•	
Northern Ireland	•	•		•
Norway		•	•	•
Portugal	•	•	•	•
Scotland	•	•	•	•
Spain	•	•		
Sweden	•	•	•	•
Switzerland	•			
Turkey	•		•	•
United States				•
Israel	•		•	•

Note. • = exists in the country

1. National testing of newly introduced standards in primary and secondary education will become compulsory in the 2008/09 school year.

2. Response judged to be positive if 50% or more of the reporting Länder provided a positive response

Source: OECD (2007a), *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2007*, OECD, Paris. Complemented by additional information from *Improving School Leadership* National Coordinators for Austria, England and Northern Ireland.

References

- Adams, J.E. and M. Kirst, M. (1999), “New Demands for Educational Accountability: Striving for Results in an Era of Excellence”, in Murphy, J. and K.S. Louis (eds.) (1999), *Handbook of Research in Educational Administration*, 2nd Edition, pp. 463-489, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Andrews, R. and R. Soder, R. (1987), “Principal Leadership and Student Achievement”, *Educational Leadership*, 44 (6), 9-11.
- Bamburg, J. D. and R. Andrews (1991), “School Goals, Principals and Achievement”, *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 2 (3), 175-191.
- Biancarosa, G. and C.E. Snow (2004), *Reading Next - A Vision for Action and Research in Middle and High School Literacy: a report from Carnegie Corporation of New York*, Alliance for Excellent Education, Washington, DC.
- Brewer, D. J. (1993), “Principals and Student Outcomes: Evidence from US High Schools”, *Economics of Education Review*, 12 (14), 281-292.
- Darling-Hammond, L. and C. Ascher (1991), “Creating Accountability in Big City School Systems”, *Urban Diversity Series*, No.102.
- Day, C. (1999), *Developing Teachers: The Challenge of Lifelong Learning*, Palmer Press, London.
- Day, C., J. Moller, D. Nusche and B. Pont (2008), “The Flemish (Belgian) Approach to System Leadership”, a case study report for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership and in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Earl, L. and S. Katz (2002), “Leading Schools in a Data-Rich World”, in *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration* (Leithwood, K. and Hallinger, P., eds.), Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Netherlands.
- Elmore, R. (2008), “Leadership as the Practice of Improvement”, in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- English, F. (2000), “Psssst! What Does One Call a Set of Non-Empirical Beliefs Required to Be Accepted on Faith and Enforced by Authority [Answer: A Religion AKA the ISLLC Standards]”, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 3 (2), 159-167.
- Goldring, E., A.C. Porter, J. Murphy, S.N. Elliot and X. Cravens (2007), “Assessing Learning-Centred Leadership. Connections to Research, Professional Standards and Current Practices”, paper prepared for the Wallace Foundation Grant on Leadership Assessment.

- Gray, J. (2000), *Causing Concern But Improving: A Review of Schools' Experience*, Department for Education and Skills (DfES), London.
- Gronn, P. (2002), "Distributed Leadership as a Unit of Analysis", *Leadership Quarterly*, 13 (4), pp. 423-451.
- Hanushek, E. and M.E. Raymond (2004), "Does School Accountability Lead to Improved Student Performance?", *National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) Working Paper 10591*.
- Hargreaves, A. and R. Dawe (1990), "Paths of Professional Development: Contrived Collegiality, Collaborative Cultures and the Use of Peer Coaching", *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 6 (3), 227-241.
- Hargreaves, A., G. Halász and B. Pont (2008), "The Finnish Approach to System Leadership", a case study report for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership and in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Harris, A. and C. Chapman (2002), *Effective Leadership in Schools Facing Challenging Circumstances*, National College for School Leadership (NCSL), Nottingham, UK.
- Heck, R. (1992), "Principals' Instructional Leadership and School Performance: Implications for Policy Development", *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14 (1), 21-34.
- Heck, R.H., T.J. Larsen and G.A. Marcoulides (1990), "Instructional Leadership and School Achievement: Validation of a Causal Model", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26 (2), 94-125.
- Heck, R. and G.A. Marcoulides (1996), "School Culture and Performance: Testing the Invariance of an Organizational Model", *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 7 (1), 76-95.
- Heck, R.H., G.A. Marcoulides and P. Lang (1991), "Principal Instructional Leadership and School Achievement: The Application of Discriminant Techniques", *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 2 (2), 115-135.
- Hoog, J., O. Johansson and A. Oloffson (2005), "Successful Principalship: The Swedish Case", *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43 (6), 595.
- Hopkins, D. (2008), "Realising the Potential of System Leadership", in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Hoy, W., J. Tater and J. Bliss (1990), "Organizational Climate, School Health and Effectiveness: A Comparative Analysis", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 260-279.
- Huber, S.G., H. Moorman and B. Pont (2008), "The English Approach to System Leadership", a case study report for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership and in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.

- Ingvarson, L., M. Anderson, P. Gronn and A. Jackson (2006), “Standards for School Leadership, A Critical Review of the Literature”, paper prepared for Teaching Australia, Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership.
- Kilpatrick, S., S. Johns, W. Mulford, I. Falk and L. Prescott (2001), *More Than Education: Leadership for Rural School-Community Partnerships*, Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation, Canberra.
- Leithwood, K. (2005), “Understanding Successful Principalship: Progress on a Broken Front”, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43 (6), 619.
- Leithwood, K., C. Day, P. Sammons, A. Harris and D. Hopkins (2006), *Successful School Leadership: What It Is and How It Influences Pupil Learning* (Report Number 800), National College for School Leadership/Department for Education and Skills, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, England.
- Little, J. (1982), “Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions of School Success”, *American Educational Research Journal*, 19, 325-240.
- Louis, K.S. and S. Kruse (1995), “Getting There: Promoting Professional Community in Urban Schools”, in *Professionalism and Community* (Louis, K. S. and S. Kruse [eds.]), pp. 208-227, Corwin, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Louis, K.S., H. Marks and S. Kruse (1996), “Teachers’ Professional Community in Restructuring Schools”, *American Journal of Education*, 104 (2), 103-147.
- Marks, H.M. and S.M. Printy (2003), “Principal Leadership and School Performance: An Integration of Transformational and Instructional Leadership”, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39 (3), 370-397.
- Marzano, R., T. Waters and B. McNulty (2005), *School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results*, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, VA.
- McKnight, C., J.J. Crosswhite, J.A. Dossey, E. Kifer, J.O Swafford and K.J. Travers (1987), *The Underachieving Curriculum: Assessing US School Mathematics from an International Perspective*, Stipes, Champaign, IL.
- Mulford, W. (2003), “School Leaders: Challenging Roles and Impact on Teacher and School Effectiveness”, a paper prepared for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity.
- Mulford, W., H. Silins, K. Leithwood (2004), *Educational Leadership for Organisational Learning and Improved Student Outcomes*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Mulford, W., D. Kendall, B. Edmunds, L. Kendall, J. Ewington and H. Silins (2007), “Successful School Leadership: What is it and Who Decides?” *Australian Journal of Education*, 51 (3), 228-246.
- O’Day, J. (2002), “Complexity, Accountability and School Improvement”, *Harvard Educational Review*, 72 (3), 293-329.
- O’Reilly, F. E. (1996), *Educational Accountability: Current Practices and Theories in Use*, Harvard University, Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Cambridge, MA.

- OECD (2004), *Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2005), *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2007a), *PISA 2006: Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2007b), *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2007*, OECD, Paris.
- Peterson, P. L. (1988), "Teachers' and Students' Cognitive Knowledge for Classroom Teaching and Learning", *Educational Researcher*, 19 (5), 9-15.
- Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.) (2008), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Rajala, R., M.A. Flores, A. Tornberg, A.M. Veiga Simao (2007), "The Role of School Leadership in Learning at Work and Professional Development in Three European Countries", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Fremantle Western Australia, University of Notre Dame, 25-29 November 2007.
- Robinson, V.M.J. (2007), *School Leadership and Student Outcomes: Identifying What Works and Why*, Australian Council for Educational Leaders, Winmalee, NSW, Australia.
- Scherp, H.-A. and G.-B. Scherp (2006), *Förstaelseinriktat Ledarskap och Lärande*, manuscript for Karstad University Studies, Karlstad.
- Stoll, L. and S.K. Louis (2007), *Professional Learning Communities: Divergence, Depth and Dilemmas*, Open University Press, Maidenhead.
- Stoll, L., H. Moorman and S. Rahm (2008), "Building Leadership Capacity for System Improvement in Austria", a case study report for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity", available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership and in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Teddlie, C. and S. Springfield (1993), *Schools Do Make a Difference: Lessons Learned from a 10-Year Study of School Effects*, Teachers College Press, New York, NY.
- Wellisch, J., A. Macqueen, R. Carriere and G. Duck (1978), "School Management and Organization in Successful Schools (ESAA In-Depth Study Schools)", *Sociology of Education*, 51 (3), 211-226.
- West, M., M. Ainscow and J. Stanford (2005), "Sustaining Improvement in Schools in Challenging Circumstances: A Study of Successful Practice", *School Leadership and Management*, 25 (1), 77-93.
- Woessman, L., E. Luedemann, G. Schuetz and M. R. West, (2007), "School Accountability, Autonomy, Choice and the Level of Student Achievement: International Evidence from PISA 2003", *OECD Education Working Paper N. 13*, OECD, Paris.
- Wong, K.K., L.V. Hedges, G.D. Borman and J.V. D'Agostino (1996), *Prospectus: Special Analyses. Final Report*, Department of Education, Washington, DC.

Chapter 3

Distributing school leadership

This chapter explores the distribution of leadership among different people or groups at the school level as another key policy strategy for improving school leadership. The evidence shows that different staff in schools and school boards participate in different ways in the roles and responsibilities defined in the previous chapter and that they can make a difference to school outcomes. There is recognition that school leadership teams, rather than just one person, play a vital role in school development and that a clearer definition of the roles and their distribution can contribute to increased effectiveness and better provision for future leadership. The context must always be kept in mind, as there may be different roles depending on the size, location and level of schools and the socio-economic background of the students.

The expansion and intensification of the role of school leadership means that school leaders have responsibilities for a wide range of decisions in curricular matters, assessment and evaluation, resources and, increasingly, collaboration with external partners. In response, education systems need to adopt a broader notion of school leadership. While in some countries there are clear trends towards greater distribution of leadership roles and responsibilities across school staff, the principal wields the greatest share of discretion among those who participate in the exercise of school autonomy – teachers, department heads, principals and school boards. At the same time, school boards also have been loaded with increased responsibilities without the appropriate support.

Countries are now experimenting with different ways to better allocate and distribute tasks across leadership teams. A body of research literature is emerging to support the idea that distributed leadership when formally or informally organised can improve school outcomes. A variety of approaches with more formalised or *ad hoc* leadership teams have been adopted successfully across countries. However, assignment of responsibility seems important for high quality leadership to develop throughout schools and this requires recognition through incentives and rewards as well as appropriate support structures.


3.1 Who participates in school leadership?

Figure 3.1 illustrates the involvement of different stakeholders in decision-making at the school level across OECD countries. It shows the average proportion of 15-year-old students who are enrolled in schools that have, according to the reports of their principals, some degree of autonomy in different aspects of school policy and management. The length of the bars shows the degree of school autonomy, whereas the colour distribution shows the locus of authority within the school. While there are broad differences between countries, these averages give an indication of the distribution of school-level responsibilities based on PISA data. The graph shows that on average across OECD countries, it is the principal who exerts the greatest share by far of the discretion available at the school level. Principals' responsibilities are greatest in budget formulation and allocation. Although the degree of school autonomy over personnel management is less overall, a greater share being reserved to the regional or state authorities, the principal still carries the highest degree of school-level responsibility in this domain. In addition, department heads and teachers also have important responsibilities in some areas (*e.g.* student policies and curriculum), as do school boards (*e.g.* financial resources).

This section provides an overview of those involved in leadership and the distribution of tasks across countries. School boards are covered in the following section, given their boundary role between the internal operation of the school and representation of the community, as they normally include the main stakeholders from both outside and inside the school.

Figure 3.1 Who is involved in different school level responsibilities across OECD countries, 2003

Percentage of 15-year-old students enrolled in schools where principals report that school-level professionals (the principal, the department head, teachers or school boards) have some responsibility for the following aspects of school policy and management, PISA 2003 (OECD average)



Source: OECD (2004), *Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003*, OECD, Paris.

The principal

Across countries, there is a fairly common pattern in the structure of school leadership positions. Each school is headed by a single individual known as principal, head teacher, or director. This person bears the responsibility for the school operation, which depends on country governance structures.

While in some countries (England, Ireland, Northern Ireland, Scotland) leadership concepts are very elaborate and defined in great detail, in other countries the principal's tasks are described only in broad terms (Finland, French Belgium), loosely regulated (Denmark, Norway), or not even formalised in a legislative framework at all (Netherlands).

Even in countries that do have legislative frameworks to define the responsibilities of school principals, there are concerns about the relevance and clarity of the legislation. In Austria, the duties of principals are defined by law but with very little detail and in Flemish Belgium there is no comprehensive statutory description of the post of the school leader. The Australian country background report also states the need for greater clarity around the principal's tasks.

There is considerable variety across OECD countries and sometimes within them, in just what the principal's responsibility entails and in the extent of autonomy he or she has in school affairs. The variety is apparent in the words various countries use to designate their principals. In Finland, for example, principals are called *Forestandare* – the one that represents the school. In Denmark it is the *Inspektor*, the one that supervises. In Sweden,

the principal has been called *Rektor* since the end of the 13th century, as the person with final responsibility in church schools. In the United Kingdom they are called *head teachers*. In Ireland, even though school heads fulfil a complex range of leadership tasks, their official title is *Príomhoide*, which translates as “Principal Teacher,” connoting membership in the teaching body rather than in a separate leadership category.

Traditionally in many countries school leaders have been defined as *head teacher* or *primus inter pares*, i.e. teachers who have just some more responsibilities than their colleagues. This is still the case in a number of countries and it partly has to do with recruitment of principals and how the pool of candidates is delimited: frequently only former teachers with several years of teaching experience can become principals (Chapter 5). Hence, the role of a principal is the highest step in a teaching career rather than a separate occupation. In France, for example, primary principals work *primus inter pares* as practising teachers with a reduced teaching load, carrying out some administrative, organisational, personnel and public relations tasks. School leaders in Ireland, Northern Ireland, Norway, Portugal and Spain can be teachers with a reduced instructional load, although this varies by school level or size.

Yet, even when part of a separate staffing category from teachers, the school principal holds teaching responsibilities in more than half of those countries involved in the *Improving School Leadership* activity: Austria, Belgium (Flanders), Belgium (French Community), England, France, Ireland, New Zealand, Scotland, Slovenia and Spain. It is most often smaller and primary schools in which they take this responsibility. In several countries (Austria, Finland, Hungary and Ireland), principals in smaller schools have explicit teaching obligations. In Ireland, for example, they have full time teaching duties in smaller primary schools (over 70% of Irish primary schools) and little or no teaching responsibilities in larger primary schools and in all post-primary schools. Some countries emphasise the importance of making school principals teach at least a few hours so that they can better understand and support teachers and keep up with teaching methods, tasks that can hardly be undertaken if the principal is totally detached from classroom life and educational experience.

At the primary level, the principal is more often than not the only person in a formal leadership role. Smaller schools also tend to combine all leadership and management functions in a single individual. In many small or primary schools, these functions are conducted by principals teaching full-time or sometimes at a reduced load.

In other countries, a tradition of the school principal as *bureaucratic administrator* is prevalent. In Austria, for example, although this role is changing, school heads have been mainly responsible for translating policies defined at higher levels of the educational administration into a reality at the school level. Their responsibility is to make sure that regulations are correctly implemented and the scope of actively formulating policies is limited.

There is a group of countries with a broader conception of those involved in principalship, which can be shared among different people. In Norway, for example, schools have authority to adopt more experimental arrangements and some schools have a three-person principal group, one responsible for pedagogy, one for personnel and one for finance. In Portugal, schools are grouped together with a collective management structure, so principals in each individual school are merely “establishment coordinators” with teaching responsibility and hardly any decision making power. In the Netherlands, a decentralised model, there are wide variations between schools, which are free to distribute tasks and functions to several leaders.

Finally, in many countries, the definition/job description of principals is changing to acknowledge that real steering and *leadership of the school as a learning organisation* is needed. In countries such as Sweden, England, Scotland, Ireland and Northern Ireland, principals are explicitly asked to set long-term strategies for the school and ensure future success. They are expected to formulate the overall objectives and aims of the school and policies for their implementation and to monitor student and/or staff performance to ensure that the goals are reached. Sweden is an example where “to lead and not to administer the work in schools” is an explicit leadership requirement.

The situation of school principals varies across countries, with some national information showing principals to be pleased with their tasks and extremely motivated. However, a review of the literature on effective leadership identifies long lists of practices and competencies for principals’ professional development programmes, which “prompt a concern that school leaders are not only being pulled in many different directions simultaneously, but that they may be being asked to do too much” (Mulford, 2003). The concept of the “superprincipal” has even been raised in the literature as the unattainable ideal for the school leader (Copland, 2003; Pierce, 2001).

In Australia and England there is evidence that head teachers generally work long hours and have difficulties in achieving an appropriate work-life balance. In England, primary heads work on average 54 hours a week and secondary heads 65 hours per week during school terms. Many felt that they had a long (and for some, lengthening) working week that was inextricably linked to the increasing number and complexity of tasks for which they are responsible (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2007). In fact, 61% of head teachers described their work-life balance as poor or very poor, with secondary heads more likely than primary heads to describe it as such (69% compared to 60%). Some have attributed these long working hours to deficiencies in working practices, for example due to principals not knowing how to prioritise their work to a greater extent or to delegate. In New Zealand, a study found that eight years after major education reforms were introduced, principals’ administrative work had increased substantially and they were working on average ten hours longer per week than before the reforms. This and other research found that administrative demands were clearly competing with educational leadership for priority, taking 34% of their time (Wylie, 2007).

Principals in specific school contexts experience particular challenges. For example, principals in primary schools and smaller schools in rural areas must comply with the same accountability and legal requirements (such as employment and health and safety law for example) with fewer resources than their counterparts in larger schools. Some principals, especially in rural schools and/or smaller schools, spend a relatively high proportion of their time compared to other schools either teaching classes or covering for colleagues. These factors can exacerbate the burdens on principals and reduce the effectiveness of such schools in the future.

Vice-, deputy and assistant principals

Larger and more complex schools have correspondingly larger and more complex leadership and management structures, especially at the secondary level and in the vocational and technical sectors. One of the most common roles in addition to the principal is the position of deputy principal, vice-principal, or co-principal. More than two-thirds of the *Improving School Leadership* countries report explicitly having such roles and several other countries appear also to have provisions for such a role. In most

countries, the deputy conducts administrative or managerial tasks delegated by the principal but does not directly supervise teachers.

In practice, in many schools some aspects of the functions of the principal have been delegated to one or more vice-principal(s), with the approval of the school board. This is particularly true in regard to the expected management roles of the principal, but often extends to some leadership roles. The extent to which this occurs may, however, be limited by the particular scheme of management of the employing authority for the school. In Korea, the role of vice-principal and the scope of authority are quite flexible, depending on leadership style of the principal. In France, in secondary education, the principal is supported by a leadership team including one or several deputy principals, an administrative manager and one or more educational counsellors.

In some countries, the existence of a deputy principal in a school depends on the number of students. In Korea, additional vice-principals can be hired in schools with over 43 classes and in Belgium (Flanders) for example, there must be at least 600 students. Then, usually in larger and more complex schools, there might be one or more assistant principals. These administrators are often responsible for some specific area of administrative management, such as student discipline or curriculum coordination.

The role and composition of school leadership teams varies widely across countries. The team can be larger or smaller, with more or less structural differentiation. Chile and England stand at the pole of larger, more complex teaming arrangements. In Chile, the leadership team is defined in the Good School Leadership Framework: school leadership must involve not only the head teacher but a team of leaders within each educational unit. It consists of the head teacher, the deputy, a technical head, the inspector general, reviewers, persons in charge of the curriculum and other education professionals who mostly fulfil leadership-teaching and technical-pedagogical functions. Some of the most effective schools in England have richly textured fabrics of leadership reaching deep into the school.

Middle management

School middle management in countries participating in the *Improving School Leadership* activity is made up of a variety of different roles and performs a range of responsibilities. In some countries, middle management includes the vice-principal or co-principal, deputy principal(s), assistant principals, vocational/technical school department heads, workshop managers and coordinators and teachers with special duties. In other countries, middle management refers more narrowly to classroom teachers who have responsibilities in specific operational areas, like subject area heads or counselling duties. Provisions for middle management are becoming more widespread in many countries.

Greater size and complexity usually is accompanied by a more elaborate leadership structure, where there are more layers of leadership and each layer is horizontally differentiated. Some roles are aligned with functions such as personnel, finance, ICT and accountability (Netherlands, England). Some parallel the school organisational structure, with leaders of year groups and subject areas. Some support specifically pedagogical functions, focusing on instruction, assessment and staff development. It is generally the choice of the school how to structure these roles and assignments. In Portugal for example, middle managers are heads of specific areas. They have formal roles in coordinating their departments and since 2008, they have been assigned the role of teacher evaluation. While “high management” is distributed between the school council

president, the pedagogic council president and the direction executive president, middle management holds all the managerial power over department areas and over the pedagogic council.

Vocational and technical schools usually have a more complex departmental and function-based set of leadership roles. Countries with vocational/technical education programmes may have provision for such roles as workshop coordinators, yard managers, department heads and training managers, among others.

Teachers are also taking on formal roles and responsibilities for managing and leading in schools. In Australia, for example, teacher leaders are responsible for teams, year levels, or curriculum areas and in Korea, “chief teachers” take care of middle-rung supervision. Schools in Norway are gradually organising their teachers into teams where teacher “team leaders” play a leadership role. In Spain, teachers with a reduced workload take the role of leadership assistants to take care of administrative issues and free principals from this role. Overall, more than a third of the *Improving School Leadership* countries report having some type of formal roles filled by teachers; and in other countries teachers play less formal roles in providing middle leadership (Box 3.1).

Box 3.1 Teachers also exercise leadership roles

New Zealand designates senior practitioners for grade clusters and curriculum leaders and in secondary schools heads of faculty and department heads as well as teacher leaders for pastoral care. New Zealand also recently created the role of specialist classroom teacher to support other teachers in teaching and learning. In 2006, as a result of negotiations, the government made funding available for every state and integrated secondary school to make an internal appointment of a staff member to the role of Specialist Classroom Teacher (SCT), for a fixed term for the school year. The role of the SCT is to provide professional support in teaching and learning for other teachers. This position is resourced with a time allowance of four hours per week and additional remuneration over base salary (Ministry of Education website). The SCT initiative is currently being evaluated.

Some schools in **England** are experimenting with different ways to engage teachers as leaders, with, for example, Middle Teachers functioning as department heads, Learning Managers responsible for analysing performance data and developing focused interventions and Assistant Head Teachers rotating on and off the senior leadership team. In addition, many schools have added Advanced Skills Teachers (ASTs) to their leadership teams. These ASTs help raise the quality of teaching and learning by promoting professional development and sharing skills with other teacher colleagues.

In **Northern Ireland** where there is no designated leadership tier below the principal and vice-principal(s), teachers in large schools may serve as heads of departments and more rarely heads of faculties, responsible for the work of up to 20 or more other teachers. Pastoral roles have become increasingly important and heads of junior, middle or upper school exist. In small primary schools multiple roles in leadership may be exercised by one teacher.

In **Belgium (Flanders)**, schools have some degree of freedom to design middle management. Staffing points (based on pupil enrolments) can be used to appoint additional ICT or care coordinators and administrative support in primary schools. In secondary education, a maximum of 3% of the overall teacher hour package can be set aside for special educational tasks, including coordination. Many of these roles are counted as middle management.

Source: New Zealand Ministry of Education (2007); Higham *et al.* (2007); Fitzpatrick *et al.* (2007); Devos G. and M. Tuytens (2006).

The role of middle management is highly appreciated by principals and others and according to some observers such structures are an essential pre-condition for the success of school collaboration and leadership beyond the school borders (Box 3.2). During a visit to Flanders for the *Improving School Leadership* activity, many stakeholders mentioned that middle management is of utmost importance to allow the principal to focus more on the school's educational project, to provide opportunities for shared leadership and strengthened policy implementation capacities within the school (Day *et al.*, 2008). While some schools visited by the OECD review team had well-functioning middle management structures with distributed responsibilities for different aspects of management such as ICT, material or student well-being, these practices are often more of an exception than the norm (Devos and Tuytens, 2006).

Box 3.2 Distributed leadership in Finland

In **Finland**, a municipality proposed a school leadership reform in which it allocated some school leaders to district-wide coordination responsibilities on a part time basis. The overall strategy was to share acting principals at the municipal level: five school principals were working as district principals, with a third of their time devoted to the district and the rest to their individual schools.

- This redistribution implied that leadership is redistributed between the municipal authority and the schools. Beyond leading their own schools, they now coordinate various district level functions such as planning, development or evaluation. In this way, the municipality shares some leadership functions with them that move beyond the boundaries of their own school unit.
- The new district heads are part of a municipal leadership team. Instead of managing alone, the head of the municipal education department now works in a group, sharing problems and elaborating solutions cooperatively.
- District heads now distribute their leadership energies, experiences and knowledge between their own schools and others. While coordinating activities like curriculum planning, professional development or special needs provision in their area, they exercise leadership at both the institutional and local district levels.
- Leadership within the largest schools (which are also led by the district heads) has been redistributed internally between the principal and other staff in the school. This releases the principal for the area-based responsibilities and also develops increased leadership experience and capacity within the schools.

In this new web of horizontal and vertical interdependence, new behaviours emerge. Principals start to consider and address broader community needs rather than fiercely and competitively defending the interests of their own organisation. This interaction across schools opens new windows for mutual learning. In addition, as they devote less time and energy to their own school, they are obliged to delegate various management tasks to other staff, which leads to more open lateral leadership within the school, stronger development of distributed leadership capacity and a more constructive approach to leadership succession and sustainability.

Source: Hargreaves et al. (2008).

There have been calls in many settings for middle management to be further developed. In Korea, while principals and vice-principals need the co-operation and dedication of middle management, the role of this group is still very limited and the attractiveness not fully recognised. The Korean Background Report states that there need to be greater incentives for potential middle management to be attracted to take on these roles (Kim *et al.*, 2007).

In Northern Ireland where the concept of distributed leadership is taking hold, there is less agreement on how leadership can be distributed, or how the leadership capacity can be developed. Some schools have developed constructive distributed leadership approaches where the great majority of teachers have undertaken leadership roles, perhaps in limited areas and on a short term basis. The position of “middle leaders” remains unclear. To respond to this challenge, a leadership capacity building training programme has been designed.

3.2 Distributed leadership at work

What the research tells us

To analysts and observers, the development of distributed leadership is due to the intensification of the role of school leadership, organisational change with flatter management structures in different sectors and the view that distributed leadership can be a more effective way of coping with a complex, information-rich society. There is conceptual support for the practice of distributed leadership and some encouraging, if limited, empirical research evidence. There is not much formal research on how best to staff and distribute school leadership roles and responsibilities, but some evidence that allows for the analysis of particular patterns of staff roles across countries.

Distributed leadership has a variety of meanings and seems to share certain characteristics with leadership that is “devolved,” “dispersed,” “shared”, “teamed” and “democratic”. A good starting point for understanding might be Leithwood and Riehl’s (2003) assertion that leadership is “a function more than a role”. Leadership does not need to be confined to formal or positional roles but can be the function of anyone at any level in the school who wields influence (Goleman, 2002). Leadership can accordingly be distributed in many ways.

According to a comprehensive review of the literature on distributed leadership conducted by the National College for School Leadership (Bennett, *et al.*, 2003a and 2003b), there are various interpretations from which shared characteristics can be pulled together to form an understanding of the term. The authors suggest that distributed leadership is a “way of *thinking about* leadership” that “challenges many current assumptions about leadership and the community within which it occurs”.

Gronn (2002) provides a compelling analysis of the practice. He starts with a useful distinction between two forms of leadership. Leadership that is numerically or additively dispersed through an organisation or system can be measured as the sum of leadership behaviours across the organisation. The additive concept of distributed leadership seems to be linked to conventional notions of leadership role and hierarchical work structure. By contrast, leadership that consists of “concertive action” is more than the sum of its parts, he states.

Concerning the *additive* perspective on distributed leadership, we find several formulations of distributed leadership consistent with this sum of behaviours in country reports and other evidence of practice. Bartlett (2007) describes a continuum of leadership with the “chief executive officer” at one end and the “lead practitioner” at the other. Leaders of different kinds of schools at different points along the continuum exhibit varying mixes of attributes between these pole positions. Portin *et al.* (2003) propose that “principals are responsible for ensuring that leadership happens in all critical areas, but they don’t have to provide it. Principals can be ‘one man bands, leaders of jazz combos, or orchestra conductors’.” There are, as evidenced in country reports, a range of modes of allocating leadership across senior leadership and middle management ranks, in which functional responsibilities are assigned to managers and teachers.

Concerning the *concertive* perspective on distributed leadership, Bennett *et al.* (2003a and 2003b) identify three main characteristics shared by various scholarly understandings of distributed leadership:

- Distributed leadership is not something done “by” or “to” members of organisations, but rather an emergent property inherent in the social collective such that “concerted action” responsive to situational needs and opportunities is carried out within a set of shared relationships where expertise and initiative are pooled.
- The pool or “boundaries of leadership” are not limited by formal role or position but defined by expertise and creativity in the context of specific situations.
- The openness of concerted action to the varieties of expertise distributed across the organisation makes possible the generation of a greater number of initiatives that can be taken on more broadly, improved upon and used as impetus for further change.

Another formulation proposes distributed leadership as the enactment of leadership tasks across leaders, followers and situations that transform teaching and learning, rather than basing it on knowledge and skills of single individuals. The knowledge and expertise that contribute to effective leadership draw on the interactions and interdependencies among participants and situations. These interactions can take various forms of co-leadership including collaborative, collective and coordinated distribution, each of which denotes a different form of distributions appropriate to specific tasks and activities (Spillane *et al.*, 2004).

Yet, according to Spillane and Diamond (2007), distributed leadership does not provide a blueprint for leadership and management, as its practice is not always controllable and takes work to work out. Far from negating the role of the principal, distributed leadership makes the role of the designated leader critical and does not consider that everyone is or necessarily should be a leader.

Some research has proposed that distributed leadership can contribute to school effectiveness by building school capacity and developing learning communities. Distribution contributes to strengthening school capacity by building internal leadership and staff capacity, which is a key lever in school-level variations in effectiveness (Harris, 2004a). In addition, implementation of government reforms and accountability measures requires that schools have the capacity to respond effectively (Elmore, 2008). Several scholars (Hopkins *et al.*, 1994; Hopkins and Harris, 1997; West *et al.*, 2000; Harris, 2004a; Timperley, 2005) have identified distributed leadership as an important element of school capacity necessary for improvement. More specifically, effective leaders in

secondary schools facing challenging circumstances have been found to move their schools forward by empowering others to lead and distributing leadership across the school (Harris, 2004b; Day, 2007).

Positive associations have also been found between learning communities and distributed leadership. A longitudinal study on leadership in Australia found that “the best leadership for organisational learning (and a community focus) was a principal skilled in transformational leadership and administrators (deputy principals, heads of department) and teachers who are actively involved in the core work of the school (shared or distributive leadership)”. What was shown to be especially important was that staffs were actively and collectively participating in the school and that they felt that their contributions were valued. (Mulford, 2003, p. 21, citing Mulford and Silins, 2001).

Further proponents promote distributed leadership as a core function of both the practice of improvement and school learning communities. Elmore (2008) asserts that schools can only be successful to the extent that they function as learning organisations (Box 3.3).

Box 3.3 A set of principles for distributed leadership

Creating a new model of distributed leadership implies defining the ground rules of what the leaders would have to do for school improvement and describing how they would share responsibility, based on a set of five principles:

1. The purpose of leadership is the improvement of instructional practice, regardless of role.
2. Instructional improvement requires continuous learning by all and distributed leadership needs to create an environment that views learning as a collective good.
3. Leaders lead by exemplifying the values and behaviour they want others to adopt.
4. The roles and activities of leadership flow from the expertise required for learning and improvement, not from the formal dictates of the institution.
5. The exercise of authority requires reciprocity of accountability and capacity. Overall, leadership roles based on expertise and reciprocity of accountability are those that best create the conditions for organisational learning that is the *sine qua non* of large scale reform in schooling

Source: Elmore (2008).

Most of these studies suggest that distributed leadership can play a role in school effectiveness and school improvement. A comprehensive review of the research on distributed leadership described the research base as “suggestive rather than conclusive” (Bennett, *et al.*, 2003a). Some more recent evidence does seem to show that leadership appears to have a greater impact on influencing the school and students when it is widely distributed (Leithwood *et al.*, 2006a; Leithwood *et al.*, 2006b).

Approaches to distributing leadership

It is important to understand that the principal's role and the form of distributed leadership in a school are dynamic and changing. Copland (2003), for example, found in a sample of schools at a mature stage of reform that the "principal's role shifts to focus more narrowly on key personnel issues, framing questions and supporting inquiry processes". Gronn and Hamilton (2004) report that the distribution of leadership in a school changes as the school leaders' roles change. Perhaps most important, although learning communities and distributed leadership share the leadership responsibilities and can lighten the load of some duties on the principal, the principal's responsibilities in such contexts is in no way diminished; they are if anything more sophisticated and demanding of expertise.

Where leadership is distributed through an organisation, there is evidence that some forms of distributing leadership are more effective than others (Leithwood, *et al.*, 2006a). While the implications of this research have not yet been fully developed, it appears that two initial implications can be identified. First, an increase of the power and influence of other persons in the school does not diminish the power and influence of the principal. Many country background reports suggest that distribution of the principal's power and influence serve to extend and enlarge it. Second, by contrast with *laissez-faire*, uncoordinated efforts to distribute leadership, "more coordinated patterns of leadership practice are associated with more beneficial organisational outcomes". Box 3.4 provides examples of a range of approaches to leadership distribution in England.

Context is extremely important. Hargreaves & Fink (2006) note that distributed leadership is not an end in itself; rather the way in which leadership is distributed and the rationale for such distribution will determine the success of the practice. According to these authors, each pattern of distribution has strengths and weaknesses depending on the school context. School leaders, in effect, need to be "contextually literate" (Portin *et al.*, 2003), as the school and governance context are important for the successful exercise of leadership.

The context for small schools may be different, as there may be absence of senior staff, limited administrative assistance, community conservatism and role conflict and lack of professional interaction. Research shows that principals of small schools are mobile, largely female and, with their substantial teaching responsibilities, experience role conflict. A "double-load phenomenon" results from the teaching/leader role and increasing burden of central government mandates (Ewington *et al.*, forthcoming). Given the large proportion of small school principals within the overall principal cadre, the forecast large turnover in principals and the role small school positions play in the traditional career path to larger schools, it is important to support small school principalship by ensuring that the role ambiguity and burdens are reduced. Different models of distributing leadership across schools or sharing certain tasks may be warranted for improved leadership efficacy.

Leadership may be exercised in a more formal or more informal way. According to Bennett *et al.* (2003a and 2003b), distributed leadership may be given long-term institutional form through team structures or committees. But, at the same time, an important issue of fluid leadership is that it rests on expertise rather than position, which may be exercised through ad hoc groups created on the basis of immediate and relevant expertise. But this type of leadership can only be possible in a climate of trust and mutual support which becomes an integral part of the internal organisational and cultural context. This climate might require a more blurred line throughout leadership teams.

Box 3.4 Characterisation of different models of school leadership in England

A recent study of leadership distribution practices in England has summarised the different shapes that traditional and new leadership approaches are taking across English schools, their benefits and drawbacks:

- **Traditional models** are those in which the leadership team is comprised exclusively of qualified teaching staff and typically includes a head teacher supported by deputy and/or assistant heads. This model is more common in primary schools, but also found in some secondary and special schools. Benefits include clear structure and accountability, focus on teaching and learning and reassurance for parents and the wider community. However, it can also result in extreme levels of accountability for the head teacher, problems with work-life balance, lack of flexibility, less time for strategic rather than operational leadership and, potentially, a sense of isolation for heads.
- **Managed models** are those which have adapted their leadership to some degree to include senior support staff or introduce more innovative working practices including co-headships. This approach is found more often in the secondary sector. The benefits may be greater distribution of leadership and improvements in staff motivation, greater capacity in the senior leadership team and more opportunities for succession planning. Other benefits include the possibility of disseminating a more democratic ethos throughout the school and greater flexibility. Potential constraints include issues around existing contractual arrangements for senior support staff, a lack of resources in some schools to expand the leadership team and, in some cases, the existing school culture.
- **Multi-agency models** are a variant of the managed model, characterised by a great diversity in the senior leadership team sometimes with dedicated directors for areas such as inclusion, business development and human resources and more multi-agency working with a more diverse workforce on the school site. This model can allow for the introduction of the chief executive combined with a lead practitioner model. Benefits can be greater access to a range of support services for families (including earlier and more rapid intervention in cases of need), improved pupil well-being, motivation and smoother transitions between home and school for young people. Potential constraints include uncertainty about accountability; issues relating to a more diverse workforce on the school site (line and performance management, differences in terms and conditions and distinct working cultures and practices); the sustainability of some initiatives in terms of funding; and concerns about building and premises management (such as accessibility).
- **Federated models** are characterised by varying degrees of collaboration between schools. Examples are supra-strategic or meta-strategic governing bodies; executive head or chief executive posts to oversee several schools; sharing middle leaders and consultant teachers; or federating with colleges of further education or work-based learning providers. The potential benefits are greater capacity and more sustainable and distributed leadership; economies of scale achieved through sharing teaching staff or senior support staff such as bursars across schools; smoother transitions for children; improved career opportunities for all members of the school workforce; and increased community cohesion. Potential constraints include the current competitive environment in which schools operate; the need to ensure agreement on the sharing of resources and “pooling” of governance arrangements; parental, governor and staff concerns over changes to the existing model; and the transport of pupils between institutions.
- **System leadership models** include all the different roles that heads can assume beyond the boundaries of the school excluding those that are school-based, *i.e.* those that contribute to the wider educational system at a local, regional or national level. Examples include: consultant leaders; executive heads or teams of heads working with less successful schools; National Leaders of Education assuming roles such as providing advice to the government; and new forms of leadership such as “virtual heads” in response to specific circumstances. Potential benefits include increased capacity, creativity and innovation in the sector; a more strategic, long-term approach; improved succession planning; and the opportunity to flex the model at the local, regional or national level. Potential constraints include the level of capacity within the home school if the existing head undertakes more external roles and the challenge to traditional notions of leadership.

Source: PricewaterhouseCoopers (2007).

Some of the barriers to the effective distribution of leadership may be legal or regulatory barriers to implementing new models of practice or lack of resources. A survey undertaken in England asked head teachers to list the three tasks that they would delegate if possible and the reasons why delegation was not possible. The main reasons were: legal requirements on heads; lack of suitably skilled or trained staff; the size of the school as a constraint on delegation; and the inability to match reward to the delegated task. (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2007).

Regarding the potential costs associated with distributed leadership, there are a variety of points of view. Just over half the principals in the English survey reported that the wage bill for their senior leadership team had increased as a result of greater distributed leadership; but some (11%) stated that an increased wage bill has been offset by savings elsewhere. Some principals (12%) also reported that rather than offering higher salaries, teaching time had been reduced for members of the senior leadership team. There was no increase in wages for 15% of heads responding to the survey. Secondary heads were slightly more likely to be able to offset salary increases by making savings elsewhere than primary schools (16% compared to 10%).

The reward systems adopted in New Zealand or Northern Ireland are ways to support and recognise middle management participation in leadership (Box 3.5). They allow for those people who might be taking on leadership roles in middle management to respond to specific school situations to be recognised and compensated for it and they also provide a more flexible approach to rewarding more flexible and distributed leadership approaches.

Box 3.5 Leadership distribution and rewards in New Zealand and Northern Ireland

There are no standard organisational forms or leadership structures in **New Zealand** schools. Self-managing schools are able to choose for themselves the structures that best support their delivery of education. However, it is common for secondary schools, which are generally larger, to have a senior management team comprising a principal and one or more associate, deputy, or assistant principals. The Secondary Teachers' Collective Employment Agreement allocates each secondary school a number of fixed value units to be distributed to staff, usually in recognition of additional responsibilities. The agreement requires that the distribution of units is determined following consultation with teaching staff.

Primary schools, which are often smaller schools, will also usually have a principal heading a management team. The Primary Teachers' Collective Employment Agreement includes provision of units for responsibility, recruitment and retention. Units are of fixed value and are allocated to the school under a formula based on school size. The agreement requires that the employer consult with teachers in developing a policy to determine the use of units to recognise teaching staff for additional responsibilities that they may undertake.

In **Northern Ireland**, teachers can secure one of five levels of teaching allowance that are focused primarily on teaching and learning and require the exercise of a teacher's professional skills and judgement. Teachers securing a teaching allowance will assume responsibilities that either require them to lead, manage and develop a subject or curriculum area; lead and manage pupil development across the curriculum; have an impact on the educational progress of pupils other than the teacher's assigned classes or groups of pupils; or involve leading, developing and enhancing the teaching practice of other staff.

Source: New Zealand Ministry of Education (2007); Fitzpatrick (2007).

Resource constraints were also raised as a major issue for small and primary schools in particular, where absence of senior staff, limited administrative assistance and an overburdened role (often combining full time teaching with managerial tasks) call for special support. Here greater distribution within schools may be more difficult. Potential solutions to this can be to distribute leadership beyond the school borders, if it is not possible to do so within the schools themselves. Schools in a locality may share leaders or other staff or administrative tasks, as in Finland (Box 3.5). They can also distribute leadership across schools, as in Portugal, where schools are clustered and share different responsibilities.

Finally, distributing leadership not only reduces the burden of school leaders to make it a more manageable position, it also fosters leadership capacity throughout schools and succession planning and management. Further implications of leadership distribution are the need for adequate preparation and support. Leadership development needs to be extended to middle level leaders and teacher leaders (Bush and Glover, 2004). Particularly, staff coaching, mentoring, consultancy and observation and feedback are appropriate for developing middle level leadership (Leask and Terrell, 1997, in Bush and Glover, 2004). Where distributed leadership and leadership for learning are of paramount concern, professional development that promotes collaborative work is increasingly favoured (Hannay and Ross, 1999; Crowther and Olson, 1997, in Bush and Glover, 2004).

3.3 School boards play an important role

One of the ways in which schools are asked to include the communities that surround them in school leadership is through governance arrangements that include participation of those for whom the school matters: parents, students, teachers and community representatives. School boards, boards of management, governing boards or school councils, as they may be called, exist in most OECD countries as a way to ensure effective governance, democratic participation and the establishment of relationships of schools with the community. These bodies or institutions, according to Marginson and Considine (2000), embrace leadership, management and strategy. They are referring to university governance, but we understand these concepts to relate to education more generally. They go on to reflect that in a nutshell, “governance is broadly defined to encompass internal relationships, external relationships and the intersection between them” (Duguay, 2006).

At heart of the analysis is the need to clarify the role of school boards and their contribution to leadership for school improvement. They have a wide range of roles, external and internal, which vary between countries and even within countries and between schools. While recent literature refers to the positive association between good school governance and school outcomes, the role of school boards has often been neglected by policy and practice. Many involved – both principals and board members themselves – complain about their lack of professionalism, lack of clarity in their role, lack of preparation of those involved and lack of capacity to take care of the tasks they have been given. As with school leaders, decentralisation and school autonomy have brought about the delegation of important powers to school boards, but in a number of countries they have not had the support needed to carry out the work, which is often voluntary.


In practice, across OECD countries, there are different models of composition and roles of school boards. Board roles range from merely advisory on smaller issues to having a broader school policy development role. Boards generally comprise parents, teachers, potentially students, community representatives and possibly local government representatives. The principal may or may not be a member of the school board.

A group of countries have boards with a high degree of responsibility over schools and school resources (Figure 3.2). In Flemish Belgium, for example, school boards have much freedom to develop their own roles and responsibilities. They have autonomy to choose their educational methods and curricula, appoint their own staff and determine the responsibilities of the principal. They are often professionalised and complemented by a consultative school council. In Ireland, up to 50% of school board members are elected representatives; all serve on a voluntary basis yet have important legal responsibilities. In Northern Ireland, the board of governors has extensive powers, with legal power to determine strategic direction of schools and many of the policies for implementation. In New Zealand, every school is governed by a board of trustees comprising elected members of the school community and school management is accountable to the board. In Slovenia, the school council is the highest level of governance. It consists of parent representatives, teachers, local communities and founders. They may dismiss the principal. While principals have important legal responsibilities, they must implement decisions adopted by the council. In Denmark, school boards establish annual programmes of work, appoint and dismiss staff and approve the budget under recommendation of the principal. The boards hold overall leadership responsibility for the institutions and may delegate responsibilities to the principals. In many of these countries, one of the key roles of the board is to select the principal.

In a set of countries the role of school boards is rather advisory and they do not have responsibilities. Korean boards for example review most aspects of school management but do not have responsibilities. In another group of countries, boards are participatory channels for school partners, but do not have a strong mandate to supervise or evaluate. Such could be the case of Hungary, where the principal contributes to defining the school board's role, or Portugal, where the school board is a "school assembly". In Spain, the school council comprises the leadership team, teachers, parents, administrative staff, students and a town council representative. Its role is to influence institutional policy matters and to provide channels for participative management.

Yet another approach adopted in some countries is decentralisation, in which the role is to be defined by the councils themselves or by the schools. In the Netherlands for example, boards are quite varied and can be volunteer or professional or a combination of both, while they hold most final accountability for schools. In Scotland, school boards have recently been replaced by parent councils, who will be able to decide the constitution, membership and functions of the parent council that best suits their school.

In categorising the role of school boards, Ortiz (2000) identifies some analysis models of governance: those in which the board has an advisory role, with principals as chief executive officers with broad discretion and school councils having an advisory function; those in which teachers are the dominant actors; those controlled by elected or appointed representatives of schools' communities; and those in which principals and teachers exert equal influence on site councils.

Figure 3.2 School board participation in school resource decisions, 2003

Note: This index of school and school board resource autonomy is derived from school principals' responses to the items asking who has the main responsibility for different types of decisions regarding the management of the school. The index asks about decisions taken by the school (including the principal, department head and teachers) and by the school board. The closer the index is to 10, the greater the responsibility of the school or school board, while the closer to 0, the less it is "a main responsibility of the school". Decisions related to resources include: *i*) selecting teachers, *ii*) dismissing teachers, *iii*) establishing teachers' starting salaries, *iv*) determining teachers' salary increases, *v*) formulating school budgets, *vi*) allocating budgets within the school.

Source: OECD (2004), *Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003*, OECD, Paris.

Other efforts have been made to categorise governing bodies or school boards based on their structure and practices, as identified by Ranson *et al.* (2005a): accountable, advisory, supportive and mediator or those which distinguish between abdicators, adversaries, supporters clubs and partners. Another study exploring school governing boards across the United Kingdom (Ranson *et al.*, 2005b) defined distinctive types of governing bodies based on their purpose and responsibility; the balance of power between the principal and the chair of governors; and the extent of professionalisation of the governing body in its deliberations and decision making:

- *Governance as a deliberative forum.* Governance constitutes largely a gathering of members, often parents, at which discussions of the school are determined and led by the principal as professional leader. Parents do not feel they can question the authority of the principal although they may inquire about aspects of the school's progress.
- *Governance as a consultative sounding board.* Governors provide a sounding board for the strategies and policies provided by the principal as a professional. The principal brings policies to the board for their approval. There is discussion and questioning and, on occasion, adaptation of policy, but it is clear that the principal rules.

- *Governance as an executive board.* The board has legal responsibility and accountability for the school and therefore assumes responsibility for the business aspects of the school: the budget, staffing and the infrastructure of building. The principal assumes responsibility for curricular and pedagogic aspects of the school. The board will, however, probably develop a strong role of evaluation of performance as well as the policies and financial well-being of the school. This may lead the board to develop systems of monitoring and review of school and its development.
- *Governance as a governing body.* In these schools, the governing body provides strategic leadership of the school and takes overarching responsibility for the conduct and direction of the school. The principal will be a strong professional leader, but a member rather than leader of the governing body, which acts as a corporate entity.

In fact, analysis of the existing forms of governance across schools in Wales showed that most had weak school boards, with 57% of the schools in the study with forums or sounding board forms of governance and less than 10% of schools having “governing bodies” (Ranson, 2005a). One of the important roles that school boards will undertake is the selection of principals and boards themselves find this the most important decision they make (Wylie, 2007).

Moving beyond the actual roles and membership of boards to look at the intricacies of practice can help us understand their governance challenges. Evidence presented in country background reports and in selected research reveals that in many countries there is general satisfaction about the roles of school boards. They bring communities and schools closer together, can help principals in taking decisions and be active for school improvement. In New Zealand, where a broad reform has transferred responsibilities to boards of trustees, members are generally satisfied with their role and have a clear view on what they should be doing. Most trustees (81%) have received training on the role. In addition, boards also receive support or advisory services from different bodies. In England it is from local authorities and in New Zealand from the New Zealand School Trustees Association (NZSTA). In England, only between 8-10% of schools inspected in 2000/01 were deemed to have unsatisfactory governance, in terms of fulfilling their responsibilities.

However, more detailed analysis reveals that there are issues relating to school boards and their roles and practices. The views may vary depending on whether we use evaluation based on surveys of principals, board members or observers, but many of the views coincide in the following issues:

- *There are not enough candidates for board positions:* This may be for different reasons. In Hungary and Ireland, as legal responsibilities of boards of management have increased in recent years, there is increasing reluctance of parents to become volunteers, as they understand the responsibilities the role entails. In Denmark, also, schools have difficulty attracting members of the local community to serve on the boards, as the roles are quite time consuming. In England, around 10% of school board posts were always vacant and 45% experienced difficulties recruiting candidates (Scanlon *et al.*, 1999). Some of the reasons were long meetings, time constraints and large amounts of paperwork. In Hungary, there is a lack of tradition of school boards, while there is continuing change in legislation to broaden their jurisdiction; it is reported that most school insiders do not like outsiders to interfere in the school’s life.

- *There is lack of clarity on roles and responsibilities of boards:* Board members themselves complained about lack of information and clarity on their role and on how to proceed across countries (Earley and Creese, 2003; Ranson, 2005a; Munn, 1990). While many school boards have been created to bring schools closer to the communities in which they are situated, they are being asked to take care of management of school operations. This leads to the question of whether the people who are asked to participate to represent the community are those most appropriate to run or supervise the running of a school.
- *There may be too many responsibilities involved for a volunteer position:* This applies to a number of countries. In New Zealand for example, 61% of school board members surveyed stated that they had too much responsibility in 2006, after a major devolution of responsibilities to school boards. As Earley and Creese (2003) have put it: “Are the current responsibilities and expectations of governors simply unrealistic or too high? Is too much expected from a group of part-time (or more correctly, occasional time) unpaid volunteers?”
- *Tensions may exist between boards and principals:* In a number of countries, principals complain of the lack of clear demarcation of tasks between the board and the principal (Australia, Ireland), which at times may lead to tensions between principals and their boards. In New Zealand, the division of responsibilities between governance and management are not always clear cut and can also lead to tensions (noted in 15% of cases, Wylie, 2007). In Belgium, principals complained about obstruction by boards. Board members sometimes complain about lack of information from principals (Devos and Tuytens, 2006).
- *Limited participation and engagement:* Evidence across countries points to high levels of absenteeism in school board meetings. Board members may have limited time available and may not be able to participate as much as they would like to. Given the voluntary nature of the post, they might not make it a priority. In addition, much absenteeism may be due to the nature of the school board and board members’ sense of the usefulness of their contributions. Many board members reflect that they are there merely to sign off on decisions already made and do not have a sense of ownership.
- *Lack of skills of board members:* According to principals, board members often lack the knowledge and skills required, so accountability falls to the principal. Other observers reveal the same, including board members themselves. Among the different types of skills required were team work, financial management skills and the capacity to appropriately select principals, develop school plans and monitor and evaluate school performance. Some evidence points to the fact that in schools with low socio-economic status, it is even more difficult to find skilled board members (England and New Zealand, Wylie, 2007). In England, the National Governors Council asks for mandatory induction training for all governors because of their significant responsibilities. In Northern Ireland, a range of training opportunities are available for school governors (Box 3.6).

Box 3.6 Training opportunities for school boards

In **Northern Ireland**, the various employing bodies provide a suite of training opportunities for governors. Recently they have focused on child protection issues and the role of governors in performance management. Responsibilities in the appointment, promotion and dismissal of staff have been recurrent themes in training as new boards of governors are elected approximately every four years.

The Education and Library boards have supplemented such training by the maintenance of website areas specifically dedicated to governor support. For examples see www.neelb.org.uk/governors.

Source: Fitzpatrick (2007).

Characteristics of effective school boards

In clarifying how to best design the roles and responsibilities of school boards as partners in school management, understanding their impact on school governance and outcomes can help. As Chapter 1 has reviewed, the devolution of decision making power to schools has also implied that school boards have received additional roles and responsibilities. However, this has not been accompanied by research on their role in improving schools and raising standards (Earley and Creese, 2003). Research has rather concentrated on the ways in which management was enacted and examined how the impact of the new decision making arrangements in schools reshaped the principal's role.

Recent research mostly in English-speaking countries has explored the indirect impact of school governance. Most studies have been small and have had selection biases. Most have concentrated on picking schools that have been successful or unsuccessful and explored the reasons why. One study of governance in England found a strong association between inspection assessments of a school's effectiveness and their assessments of its governing body (Scanlon *et al.*, 1999). Another study undertaken by the Office of Standards for Education, (Ofsted, 2002) also argued that where governance is good, standards of attainment are likely to be higher than in other schools. These evaluations have continued in the United Kingdom. In 2006 the English National Audit Office identified five main reasons for schools failing inspections of the Office for Standards in Education: ineffective leadership; weak governance; poor standards of teaching; lack of external support (around half these schools had received no advice from their local authority); and challenging circumstances. It noted that these reasons were often connected and also that "a school with a very good leadership team can still succeed in spite of a weak governing body" (National Audit Office, 2006). School performance reflects a number of different factors, including social context; it cannot be attributed to governance alone.

In Belgium (Flanders), a study which focused on principals who were able to shape school culture for teaching and learning concluded that support or obstruction from school boards makes a difference on principals' perception of their jobs and feeling of satisfaction. Those who were satisfied with the autonomy and support they received from their school board were also those who had a high level of job satisfaction. Those who reported low job satisfaction and high scores for emotional exhaustion and cynicism and/or low scores for personal accomplishment felt that the school board provided more obstruction than support (Devos *et al.*, 1999).

Good governance helps to improve management practices at the school level, which in turn generate improved standards of attainment. As Ranson (2005a) summarises: “Governing bodies can play a role in reinforcing the quality of institutional leadership: providing strategy, enabling scrutiny of direction and practice, offering guidance and support and ensuring accountability. By helping to improve the working of the institution, the governing body will make more effective the environment of learning and teaching and thus the possibility of enhanced standards of educational attainment. Better governance establishes processes that generate better results.”

But what are the key characteristics of good governance? A recent evaluation of the evidence available on this topic provides an overview (McCormick *et al.*, 2006). In the United States, a number of studies have identified several characteristics: focusing on student achievement and policy; effective management; development of conditions and structures that allow the principal to manage; agreement on processes to evaluate the principal; communication, trust and collaborative relationships with the principal and between board members; communication with outside groups and government; effective performance in policy making and financial management; evaluation and training; regular board meetings and long-term service of board members and heads. In Australia, studies have also reported similar characteristics considered to be essential for effective governance in Australian independent schools. However, according to them, more research is needed to substantiate these characteristics and establish the exact nature of governance activities in Australian schools.

A study of English governance practices found that there are a number of ways in which governors can make a difference in schools. An evaluation of the performance of governing bodies in school improvement by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted, 2001) focused on schools “in special measures” (those deemed to need action for serious weaknesses) and on how governing bodies had contributed to improve their performance. While they found many problems that had made governing boards ineffective and also part of the problem of failing schools, they found positive features that had contributed to turn around schools’ results. Particularly, governors can make a difference when they are clear about school objectives and values; when the governing body has clear references and is clear about its role; when governors have a wide range of expertise and experience and attend meetings regularly; when meetings are run efficiently; when there is a clear school plan for school improvement, understood by all; when there are good relationships between governors and staff; when there is a rigorous system for monitoring and evaluating school performance; and when governors’ training is linked to school priorities and needs of governors.

3.4 Summary conclusions and recommendations

The increased responsibilities and accountability of school leadership are creating the need for leadership distribution both within schools and across schools. While the principal’s role remains very strong in the management of financial resources and personnel, varying degrees of responsibility are increasingly shared with other professionals within the school and with school board members.

However, while practitioners consider sharing of responsibilities vital for school leadership practice, these practices are rare, often remain unclear or those involved often do not get recognition for their tasks in some countries. In view of these conditions, it is important that both policy makers and the public recognise the need to broaden the concept of school leadership and take steps to adjust policy and working conditions accordingly.

Encourage distribution of leadership

The distribution of leadership across different people and in organisational structures can be a way to meet the challenges of contemporary schools and improve school effectiveness. They can strengthen management and succession planning. There may be different options for distributing leadership from more formal to more informal ways and these need to be organised, recognised and rewarded in different ways. Some practical approaches of doing so are to:

- Develop leadership teams and distribute tasks formally by giving long-term institutional form through team structures and other bodies.
- Develop more informal processes of distributing leadership, based on expertise rather than on position, by developing *ad hoc* groups based on contextual or current challenges or needs.
- Encourage distribution of leadership as a way to strengthen succession planning and management. By allowing teaching and other school staff to participate in leadership, it is helping to develop leadership skills in staff and to forge future principals.
- Distribute leadership across schools to benefit from economies of scale, especially in smaller schools with fewer staff.

Support distribution of leadership

The implications of leadership distribution are the need to adequately prepare and support building leadership capacity.

- Leadership development needs to be extended to middle level management and to potential leaders in the school (Chapter 4).
- Policy makers need to reflect on modifying accountability mechanisms to match distributed leadership structures.
- There needs to be a wider recognition of the role of leadership teams in schools. This may imply the need to reinforce the concept of distributed leadership teams in national frameworks and develop incentive mechanisms to reward participation and performance in these teams.

Support school boards in their tasks

While school boards in many countries have wide responsibilities and have become more accountable for school improvement, they have not received enough support. Often, school board members are volunteers, elected or nominated. Evidence points to problems such as tensions between boards and principals because of lack of demarcation between their roles, shortages of potential members to serve on boards, a high level of absenteeism of members and the lack of knowledge or skills.

Evidence also shows that effective school boards may contribute greatly to the success of their schools. But this can only happen if they are well prepared and have a clear definition of roles and responsibilities as well as appropriate support to develop their

tasks and when they are considered an integral part of school governance. Policy makers can contribute to this end by valuing the role of school boards to a larger extent in policy-making frameworks.

- Ensure consistency between the objectives and expectations of the board and the composition of the board and support it receives. This includes the clarification of the roles and responsibilities of boards *vis-à-vis* schools and *vis-à-vis* principals.
- Improve recruitment and selection processes so as to encourage representativeness, high quality and engaged candidates with suitable skills.
- Develop support structures to ensure active participation in school boards, with opportunities for skills development on topics related to school governance, including school evaluation and school improvement.

Annex 3.A1

Distribution of leadership and the role of school boards

Country	Role of the principal	Middle management / leadership teams		School boards/councils	
		Composition	Management / leadership role	Composition	Participation in leadership?
Australia	Overall operational authority for the school. Substantial responsibility for management, educational leadership and accountability.	Positional leadership roles usually comprise principal, deputy and assistant principal and teacher leaders.	Leadership role. Teacher leaders may be responsible for teams, year levels or curriculum areas.	School councils provide community input at the local government and school level.	Yes. The council has a clear role in policy development while principals and teachers are responsible for implementation. In practice, the boundaries are often blurred.
Austria	Managerial and communication tasks. Limited autonomy.	Deputy principals. Department heads in secondary technical and vocational schools.	Management role. Deputies support the principal in administration. Department heads take over some of the principal's duties in their area of responsibility.	"School partnership bodies": representatives of teachers, parents and sometimes pupils.	Yes. Leadership at school level is based on "democratic consultation". The bodies can vote curricular regulations and school profiles.
Belgium (Fl.)	Status, position, job description vary between the education networks.	Deputy principals in larger schools. Vocational training coordinators, internal educational support and stage coordinators are considered "middle management".	Management role. Participation in policy implementation.	School boards: Groups of schools in community education; municipalities or provinces in public-sector education; mostly religious congregations in private education. School councils: representatives of parents, staff, local community, students (in secondary education); principal holds advisory function.	Yes. Boards have far-reaching autonomy in leading and managing their schools: they devise curricula and regulations, appoint all staff, determine role of the principal. General information rights, control and advisory function.
Belgium (Fr.)	Mainly managerial and organisational tasks.	In secondary education, there is a deputy principal, a material coordinator and a secretary. In technical/ vocational education there is also a workshop coordinator.	Management role. Middle management supports the principal's work. Workshop coordinator is responsible for managing all technical activities.	m	m

Country	Role of the principal	Middle management / leadership teams		School boards/councils	
		Composition	Management / leadership role	Composition	Participation in leadership?
Chile	Role and function of the principal are clearly defined in the “Good School Leadership Framework”.	The Leadership Team consists of the teaching-leadership function (principals and deputy principals) and the technical-pedagogical function.	Leadership role. Educational guidance, teaching supervision, curricular planning, assessment, pedagogical research, teacher training.	School councils (since 2004): head teacher, sustainer, one teacher representative, president of parents’ association, president of student association (in secondary schools).	m
Denmark	Academic leadership.	Deputy principal and departmental managers.	m	Board of governors (compulsory education): representatives of parents, teachers, students. School board (post-compulsory education): most members from outside the institutions, mostly employer and employee representatives, but also staff and student representatives.	Yes. Based on recommendations from the principal, boards establish the annual programme of work, appoint and dismiss the institution’s staff and approve the budget.
England	Six key areas: shaping the future, leading learning and teaching, developing self and working with others, managing the organisation, securing accountability, strengthening community.	Senior leadership comprises the head teacher, deputy heads, assistant heads and sometimes a bursar or school business manager. Middle leadership includes heads of year or key stage managers, heads of department and advance skills teachers.	Leadership and management role. Increasingly senior school leaders are recognising that their purpose is to develop a wide leadership team which can transform practice and outcomes and that this means a distribution of leadership roles.	Governing bodies have 9 to 20 members. Depending on type of school, these may include governors appointed by the local authority, community governors representing community interests, foundation governors, partnership governors, sponsor governors and associate members appointed by the governing body.	Yes. Governing bodies are responsible for the conduct of the school and have a range of legal powers and duties. Their key roles are: strategic decision making, accountability and being a “critical friend” to the head teacher. In practice, these bodies often gain advice from the head teachers and/or delegate tasks to them.
Finland	Wide-ranging decision making autonomy in school development issues.	Vice-principals, department heads, consortium heads and teachers participate in leadership. Teachers are supposed to participate three hours per week in school’s joint instructional planning.	Leadership role. Instructional planning, etc.	m	m

Country	Role of the principal	Middle management / leadership teams		School boards/councils	
		Composition	Management / leadership role	Composition	Participation in leadership?
France	" <i>Primus inter pares</i> ", especially in primary education where principals are practising teachers without particular status.	In secondary education, there is a leadership team comprising one or several deputy principals, one administrative manager, one or several educational counsellors and in technical education, one workshop manager.	Leadership and management role.	Primary education school council: mayor, one departmental delegate, parent and student representatives. Secondary education administrative council: one-third representing the leadership team, the commune, the regional authority and chosen external members, one-third representing personnel, one-third representing students and parents.	No. Consultation and reciprocal information role. Yes. Councils vote the budget, school project, educational organisation, internal organisation, school book choice, etc.
Hungary	Principals draw largely on the members of the teaching staff for support in school management.	No real middle management structure, but deputy principals and teaching staff participate in management and leadership.	Deputy principals and teachers play a role in school leadership, with varying delegated authority. Teaching staff have a right to participate in decision making (acceptance of educational programme, organisational and operational statute, school rules and quality management).	School board comprises representatives of parents, pupils and the school team.	Its functions and authority vary between schools. The principal contributes to defining the board's role.
Ireland	" <i>Primus inter pares</i> ". Flat management structure, collegial vision.	Deputy principals, assistant principals and special duties teachers are part of middle management.	Management role.	Board of Management: nominees of the school patron, elected representatives of parents, teachers and sometimes the local community (all serve on a voluntary basis).	Important legal responsibilities.
Korea	Principals are well respected as "the highest of all teachers".	Vice-principals and chief teachers are considered part of middle management.	Middle management shares important leadership functions.	School council comprises representatives of teachers, parents and the local community.	More of a control function: it reviews school management.

Country	Role of the principal	Middle management / leadership teams		School boards/councils	
		Composition	Management / leadership role	Composition	Participation in leadership?
Netherlands	No legal prescriptions on the role of the principal.	Wide-ranging differences between schools. Schools are free to allot tasks and functions to several leaders. In larger schools, leadership is increasingly shared among officials.	Teachers play an important part in management support. In professional education, professional personnel in accounting, real estate management, HRM have become part of management teams.	School boards can take many forms: non-for-profit legal entities, municipal executives, governing committees, foundations, etc. The management consists of volunteers or professionals, or a combination.	Yes. Management and leadership role. Boards govern the schools, but they do not always intervene in schools' internal policies.
New Zealand	"Professional leader" with 3 functions: executive, instructional and reporting.	m	No middle management in smaller schools. Some distribution of management / leadership tasks in larger schools.	Board of Trustees: principal (chief executive of the board), elected representatives of the school community, the staff and (in secondary education) pupils.	Yes. Boards are responsible for student achievement, strategic management, school self-review, personnel, finance and property, health and safety, compliance with legislation.
Norway	Education Act (1998) prescribes that principals hold total responsibility for the schools' operation.	m	m	m	m
Northern Ireland	Principals are responsible for internal organisation, management and control of the school and are expected to offer leadership.	Principals and vice-principals are the "leadership group". Senior management teams comprise vice-principal(s) and senior teachers.	Some aspects of leadership may be delegated to one/several vice-principals. Middle managers may focus on strategic, curricular and pastoral areas. There are teachers with additional allowances for tasks such as leading a curriculum area or developing teaching practice of other staff.	Board of governors: all key stakeholders from both outside and inside the school: principal and staff governors, parents, nominees of the Education and Library Board and Ministry of Education.	Yes. Boards have extensive powers. These bodies rather than the principals have the legal power to determine the strategic direction of schools and many of the policies for implementation.

Country	Role of the principal	Middle management / leadership teams		School boards/councils	
		Composition	Management / leadership role	Composition	Participation in leadership?
Portugal	"Establishment coordinators" at the school level are practising teachers with hardly any decision making power	Schools are grouped together in Groups of Schools with a collective management structure. Leadership teams exist at the group level, but not at the school level	m	Executive management: 1 president, 2 or more vice presidents Pedagogical council: representatives of guidance structures, educational support services, parents associations, secondary school students Administrative council: presided by the president of the executive management	Yes. Establish annual plan of activities, report on its implementation, budget projects, administrative & organisational management, teacher evaluation Gives advice for management/ leadership. Gives opinions on the definitions of criteria for student guidance, assessment, school book choice, hiring teaching staff, curricular management Management role. Responsible for budget and accounting matters
Scotland	Principals are responsible for administration and management.	Deputy head teachers and principal teachers are part of distributed leadership.	Management / leadership roles. Deputy head teachers assist in the conduct of school affairs. Principal teachers lead initiatives and teams for pupil achievement and well-being.	School boards: elected representatives of parents and teachers and members co-opted by these 2 groups. Will be replaced by "Parent Councils" as of August 2007.	Members of the council will decide on the constitution, membership and function of the council which best suits their local school.
Slovenia	Principals are "pedagogical leaders" and have managerial and administrative tasks.	Deputy principals in bigger elementary schools. Directors in upper secondary schools.	Deputy principals and directors may be in charge of management tasks while the principal concentrates more on his/her pedagogical leadership duty.	School council: representatives of parents, teachers, local community and school founder.	Yes. The council is the highest level of governance at the school level.

Country	Role of the principal	Middle management / leadership teams		School boards/councils	
		Composition	Management / leadership role	Composition	Participation in leadership?
Spain	Principals are legally responsible for school management but have little autonomy	The "Leadership Team" consists of the principal, the head of studies and the school administrator.	Distributed management. Head of studies is responsible for the academic processes, organisation and disciplinary matters, the school administrator for administrative and financial process. This allows the principal to concentrate on institutional and external relations and leadership coordination.	School council: leadership team, representatives of teachers, parents, administrative staff, students, town council.	Consultative and managerial powers both at the state level, the autonomous community level and the local level.
Sweden	Principals are expected to act as leaders and managers (not administrators).	Deputies are part of the management group and report to the principal. Teachers have a strong participatory position.	Deputies are often leaders of a certain sector or level of the school. Teachers are informed and consulted by the principals on all important matters (regular meetings and consultation rounds).	m	m

Note: m = information missing

Source: OECD *Improving School Leadership* Country Background Reports, available at www.oecd.org/edu/school/leadership.

References

- Bartlett, J. (2007), “Distributed Leadership: Involving the Whole Pedagogical Community in the Administration and Management of Schools”, presentation at the Education International School Leadership Conference: Meeting the Challenges of School Leadership in Secondary Educational Establishments, Birmingham, 15-16 May 2007.
- Bennett, N., C. Wise, P. Woods and J. Harvey (2003a), *Distributed Leadership*, National College for School Leadership, Nottingham, England.
- Bennett, N., C. Wise, P. Woods and J. Harvey (2003b), *Distributed Leadership: Summary Report*, National College for School Leadership, Nottingham, England.
- Bush, T. and D. Glover (2004), *Leadership Development: Evidence and Beliefs*, National College for School Leadership, Nottingham, England.
- Copland, M. (2003), “Building and Sustaining Capacity for School Improvement”, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25 (4), pp. 375-395.
- Crowther F. and P. Olsen (1997), “Teachers as Leaders - an Exploratory Framework”, *International Journal of Educational Management*, 11(1), pp 6-13
- Day, C. (2007), *Presentation at International Community Building: Successful School Leadership in Challenging School Contexts: Cross National Perspectives*, UCEA Convention 2007, November 15-17, Alexandria, VA.
- Day, C., J. Moller, D. Nusche and B. Pont (2008), “The Flemish (Belgian) Approach to System Leadership”, a case study report for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership and in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Devos, G., J.C. Verhoeven, I. Beuselinck, H. Van den Broeck and R. Vandenberghe (1999), *De Rol van Schoolbesturen in het Schoolmanagement* [The Role of School Boards in School Management], Garant, Leuven/Apeldoorn.
- Devos, G. and M. Tuytens (2006), “Improving School Leadership - OECD Review, Background Report for Flanders”, a report prepared for the Flemish Ministry of Education and Training, Belgium, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Duguay, M.C. (2006), *Literature Review on Models of Governance in Higher Education*, a literature review prepared for the Thematic Review of Tertiary Education, OECD, Paris.
- Earley, P. and M. Creese (2003), *Governors and School Improvement*, National School Improvement Network Research Matter # 20, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Elmore, R. (2000), *Building a New Structure for School Leadership*, The Albert Shanker Institute, available at www.ashankerinst.org/Downloads/building.pdf.

- Elmore, R. (2008), “Leadership as the Practice of Improvement”, in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Ewington, J., B. Mulford, B., D. Kendall, B. Edmunds, L. Kendall and H. Silins (forthcoming), “Successful School Principalship in Small Schools”, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(4).
- Fitzpatrick, R.J. (2007), “Improving School Leadership, Country Background Report for Northern Ireland”, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Goleman, D. (2002), *The New Leaders: Transforming the Art of Leadership into the Science of Results*, Little Brown, London.
- Gronn, P. (2002), “Distributed Leadership”, in Leithwood, K. and P. Hallinger (eds.), *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, Springer International Handbooks of Education, 8, Springer, New York, NY, pp 653-696.
- Gronn, P. and A. Hamilton (2004), “A Bit More Life in the Leadership”, *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 3 (1), March, pp. 3-35.
- Hannay, L. M. and J.A. Ross (1999), “Department Heads as Middle Managers? Questioning the Black Box”, *School Leadership and Management*, 19 (3) pp 345-358
- Hargreaves, A. and D. Fink (2006), *Sustainable Leadership*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Hargreaves, A., G. Halász and B. Pont (2008), “The Finnish Approach to System Leadership”, a case study report for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership and in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.) (2008), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Harris, A. (2004a), “Distributed Leadership and School Improvement: Leading or Misleading?” *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 32 (1), pp 11-24.
- Harris, A. (2004b), “Democratic Leadership for School Improvement in Challenging Circumstances”, in MacBeath, J. and L. Moos (eds.), *Democratic Learning: The Challenge to School Effectiveness*.
- Higam, R., D. Hopkins, E. Ahtaridou, E. (2007), “Improving School Leadership, Country Background Report for England”, a report prepared for the Department for Children, Schools and Families, England, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Hopkins, D. and A. Harris (1997), “Improving the Quality of Education for All”, *Support for Learning*, 12(4), pp. 147-151.
- Hopkins, D., A. Harris and M. West (1994), *School Improvement in an Era of Change*, Cassell, New York, NY.
- Kim, E., D. Kim, K. Kim and E. Kim (2007), “Improving School Leadership: Country Background Report for Korea” (English version), a report prepared for the Korean Educational Development Institute, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.

- Leask, M. and I. Terrell (1997), *Development Planning and School Improvement for Middle Managers*, Kogan Page, London.
- Leithwood, K., C. Day, P. Sammons, A. Harris and D. Hopkins (2006a), *Successful School Leadership: What It Is and How It Influences Pupil Learning*, Research Report Number 800, NCSL/Department for Education and Skills, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, England.
- Leithwood, K., C. Day, P. Sammons, A. Harris and D. Hopkins (2006b), *Seven Strong Claims About Successful School Leadership*, National College for School Leadership/Department for Education and Skills, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, England.
- Leithwood, K. and C. Riehl (2003), *What We Know About Successful School Leadership*, Laboratory for Student Success, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Marginson, S. and M. Considine (2000), *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- McCormick J., K. Barnett, S. Babak Alavi and G. Newcombe (2006), “Board Governance of Independent Schools: A Framework for Investigation”, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44 (5), pp. 429-445, Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Mulford, B. (2003), “School Leaders: Challenging Roles and Impact on School and Teacher Effectiveness”, a paper prepared for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity.
- Munn, P. (1990), *Pilot School Boards: Parents’ Views*, Scottish Council for Research in Education, SCRE Spotlights n. 22.
- National Audit Office (2006), *Improving Poorly Performing Schools in England*, The Stationery Office, London, available at: www.nao.org.uk/publications/nao_reports/05-06/0506679.pdf
- New Zealand Ministry of Education (2007), “Improving School Leadership, Country Background Report for New Zealand”, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- OECD (2004), *Learning for Tomorrow’s World: First Results from PISA 2003*, OECD, Paris.
- Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education) (2001), *Making It Better: Improving School Governance*, Ofsted, London, available at www.ofsted.gov.uk.
- Ofsted (2002), *The Work of School Governors* (HMI, 707), Report from HMCI, London.
- Ortiz, F.I. and R. Ogawa (2000), “Site-based Decision-making Leadership in American Public Schools”, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38 (5), pp. 486-499.
- Pierce, C. (2001), *The Effective Director*, Kogan Page, London.
- Portin, B., P. Schneider, M. DeArmond and L. Gundlachet (2003), “Making Sense of Leading Schools: A Study of the School Principalship”, Center on Reinventing Public Education, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.
- PricewaterhouseCoopers (2007), *Independent Study Into School Leadership: Main Report*, Department for Education and Skills, London, England.

- Ranson, S., C. Farrell, N. Peim and P. Smith (2005a), “Does Governance Matter for School Improvement?”, *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 16 (3), September, pp. 305 – 325
- Ranson S., M. Arnott, P. McKeown, J. Martin, P. Smith (2005b), “The Participation of Volunteer Citizens in School Governance”, *Educational Review*, 57 (3), August.
- Scanlon, M., P. Earley and J. Evans (1999), *Improving the Effectiveness of School Governing Bodies*, DfEE, London.
- Spillane, J. and Diamond, J. (eds.) (2007), *Distributed Leadership in Practice*, Teachers College Press, New York, NY.
- Spillane, J., Halverson, R. and Diamond, J. (2004), “Towards a Theory of Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective”, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 3-34.
- Timperley, H. (2005), “Distributed Leadership: Developing Theory from Practice”, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37 (4), July.
- West, M., D. Jackson, A. Harris and D. Hopkins (2000), “Learning Through Leadership: Leadership Through Learning”, in Riley, K. and K. Louis (eds.), *Leadership for Change and School Reform*.
- Wylie, C., (2007), *School Governance in New Zealand – How Is It Working?*, New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington.

Chapter 4

Developing skills for effective school leadership

This chapter analyses appropriate options for developing the leadership skills required to lead schools today and in the future – as another policy for professionalising school leadership. While school leadership development has become a reality across OECD countries in the past 10 to 15 years, there is still a need for more coherent approaches to leadership development. Most principals come from a teaching background, which does not normally lead to the skills required to deal with the broadened roles of leadership for teaching and learning, for resource management, for setting goals and measuring progress and for leading and collaborating beyond school borders.

The evidence shows that leadership development can contribute to shape the performance of leaders. Most countries have developed a wide range of programmes and options that target different stages of school leadership, from initial pre-service training through induction programmes to in-service provision. Leadership development is broader than specific programmes of activity or intervention and can be done through a combination of formal and informal processes throughout the stages and contexts of leadership practice. This requires sequential provision to respond to the different stages of leadership careers as well as coherence between the different institutions offering leadership development. Best suited to this end are methods and content that include mentoring/coaching, work-based and experiential learning, peer support and networking and formal leadership learning programmes.

As discussed in previous chapters, school leadership roles have changed considerably in recent years and today's principals have greater responsibility both for managerial and administrative tasks and for pedagogical leadership. Effective preparation and development of current and prospective school leaders is one means of responding to these challenges.

In the past 10 to 15 years school leadership development has become a reality across OECD countries and it is now one of the key levers for professionalising the practice. Evidence about the effectiveness and impact of school leadership training and development is limited. But, as this chapter explores, there is enough evidence to warrant expanded efforts to improve leadership skills and to guide the design and implementation of those efforts.

4.1 Professionalisation of leadership development varies across countries

Since the mid-1990s, training and development for principals have been introduced or strengthened in almost all countries involved in the *Improving School Leadership* activity, either as preparation for entry to the post or to further develop the skills of active principals (Huber, 2004, 2008).

The degree of professionalisation varies across countries, as there are different requirements and types of programmes. Figure 4.1 provides an overview of common leadership development approaches across countries. We have grouped country approaches under *a)* pre-service or preparatory training to take up the position, *b)* induction training for those who have recently taken up the position and *c)* in-service training provided to practising principals.


Some countries have all types of provision running in parallel, while others provide only one or two types. England, Finland, Northern Ireland, Israel and Slovenia offer leadership development training at all steps in a principal's career. Chile, Ireland, the Netherlands and Norway have in-service education programmes. The remaining countries rely on either pre-service preparation or induction or a combination of the two to ready leaders for their posts. Overall, of the 22 countries/regions analysed, a majority have pre-service training, in most cases as a pre-requisite for the job. Additionally, twelve countries have induction courses for already selected principals. In most cases, induction programmes are at the discretion of the municipality or local area government, except for Austria, where they are part of the national requirements to become a "full-fledged principal". For in-service training the trends are less clear, with some countries showing the key role it can play and others barely providing opportunities to strengthen practice.

Courses may vary from short certificate courses to post-graduate or PhD programmes. Continuing development may last from a few days over a principal's career to annual provision. Training may be carefully orchestrated and sequenced to fit the stages of a leader's evolving career or offered as "one size fits all". The content of training also varies, from training focused on ensuring that school leaders are familiar with and able to implement legislation pertinent to school leadership to training focused on the broader concept of leadership for change. Training may also vary depending on the roles and responsibilities of school leadership adopted by the country (Chapter 2), as different kinds of skills may be required. In countries where schools and principals have a low degree of autonomy, training approaches may concentrate on practical and legal aspects of the job. Where countries place a higher degree of autonomy and accountability at the school level,

training may be broader in scope or focus on the wider concept of leadership. It can also depend on the length of tenure of the principal's post.

Regarding funding of training, the most common approach has been to make training a requisite to apply for the post and provide some kind of public funding or support. Induction processes are rarely mandatory but rather left to the discretion and support of regional authorities. Some countries provide support for in-depth training for mid-career principals, which is generally not mandatory but rather linked to wage incentives. For induction or in-service training, some of the costs may be borne by school development budgets.

Figure 4.1 Leadership development approaches across countries, 2006/07, public schools



Note:

1. Belgium (Fl.): Only community schools.

Source: *Improving School Leadership* Country Background Reports, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.

The increased provision of training across countries has developed in response to the changes in school leadership roles and responsibilities. Many school leaders themselves are calling for it as a teaching background does not necessarily prepare for leadership practice and there is evidence indicating its positive impact on practice.

There is some evidence pointing to the need for training from practising school leaders themselves and other key stakeholders. In countries such as Denmark where training is not common practice, 90% of principals felt a need for mandatory initial training. In Norway, where there are no requirements for training, Master Studies in

school leadership/education leadership have been developed at several universities in recent years. In Flemish Belgium, researchers point to the need for certified training for head teachers to provide management skills not included in teacher training (Devos and Tuytens, 2006). Mahieu (1998) also points to the need not only to professionalise school leaders but also to contribute to home study and development of networks through training.

Almost all principals or candidates have a background as teachers. When principals take up their position they may not necessarily be competent as pedagogical leaders and they often lack knowledge in personnel and financial management and the skills for working beyond the school borders – the leadership tasks required for schools of the 21st century.

The base of empirical evidence demonstrating impact of leadership training and development on leadership effectiveness is small (Davis *et al.*, 2005) and it does not demonstrate a direct impact of leadership training and development on school outcomes. Nevertheless, there is widespread consensus among practitioners, researchers and policy makers that professional training and development have an impact on participants by improving leaders' knowledge, skills and dispositions. This can contribute to more competent and effective leadership behaviours and eventually lead to improvements in teaching and learning (Moorman, 1997; Evans & Mohr, 1999; U.S. Department of Education, 1999; Davis *et al.*, 2005; Darling-Hammond *et al.*, 2007).

As an example, a Swedish longitudinal study of 35 schools measured the effects of school leader education (Blossing and Ekholm, 2005). In some schools, the school leaders' use of teachers or representatives of the teachers in leadership processes, as well as more collective work among teachers, have appeared as a result of training. Another change has been institutionalised school-based evaluation with a mixed focus on student achievements and teacher work (Swedish National Agency for School Improvement, 2007). This reveals that training is having an impact on improving leaders' knowledge so as to promote changes in the way schools are led and managed.

Analysis of needs can help develop effective programmes. A meta-analysis of studies of effectiveness of managerial development programmes found that "practitioners can attain substantial improvement in both knowledge and skills if sufficient front-end analysis is conducted to assure that the right development is offered to the right leaders" (Collins & Holton, 2004). This needs analysis is widely regarded as an important means of determining the leadership development requirements of school leaders, but there is only limited evidence of it being put into practice (Davis *et al.*, 2005).

The need for leadership training and development is supported by research on leadership in other sectors such as private business and other fields:

- There is much similarity between the challenges facing leaders in business and in education and in the importance of professional development to respond to those challenges. A recent study undertaken by the Center for Creative Leadership predicted trends in business leadership. The results could easily apply to trends in education. Senior business leaders face increasing complexity due primarily to a set of factors that call for them to do more with less and respond even more quickly to change in their environment. The development of organisational talent and improving the way organisations plan for leadership succession is a priority (Griswell & Martin, 2007).

- Challenging experience is only one of several developmental elements in the business world, albeit a very important one. Despite the widely accepted tenet of business leadership development that the best preparation for leadership is found in experience and not in training programmes (Yukl, 2001), McCall and colleagues (1988) describe a developmental model comprising six developmental experiences including both job experience and formal training. Each experience must contain three features: assessment, challenge and support. Three of the six experiences are formal: 360-degree feedback, feedback-intensive programmes and skills development training. Three are informal, occurring naturally on the job but also involving some design: job assignments, developmental relationship and hardships. These elements must be linked in a systematic way to ensure that the developing candidate can integrate new learning, practise it, reflect on it and improve.
- Research on expert performance, originally conducted to understand expert chess play and more recently extended to such areas as sciences, sports, music and managerial work, also offers relevant insights. A principal finding of this work is that expertise requires vast amounts of knowledge that takes many years of training and experience (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1993). Ericsson and Lehmann (1996) report that the “highest levels of human performance in different domains can only be attained after around ten years of extended, daily amounts of deliberate practice activities”. It appears that experts have a larger repertoire of knowledge and patterns to draw upon and that they are more skilled in assessing the fitness of a particular piece of knowledge or practical routine to some particular situation. Experts have a “growing edge”, which they use in difficult situations to learn even more and develop even greater expertise. The implications for school leadership development, where high levels of expertise if not virtuosity are desirable, are that building a strong base of knowledge is important and years of practice are required, as effective leadership will not emerge from teaching alone or upon conferral of a qualification.

Evidence from leadership development in the public sector also provides some lessons from which school leadership can benefit. According to an OECD study, leadership development is critically important in many countries. A set of common patterns includes: the development of systematic leadership development strategies; the establishment of new leadership development institutions; linking current management training with leadership development; devising leadership competence profiles, as in qualifications, standards and frameworks; identifying and selecting potential leaders; coaching and mentoring; and promoting sustainable leadership development through the recognition of managers’ responsibilities for development of other leaders (OECD, 2001).

As discussed in Chapter 1, leadership can be viewed as a process of influence. School leaders today require greater leadership skills for strategic resource management and for guiding teaching and learning. The skills needed for such a role, which can be distributed, cannot be developed solely in one programme, but rather in a combination of learning, coaching and practising that develops formally and informally. What is required is the knowledge of how best to combine these approaches to provide a holistic learning experience to meet the needs of leaders at different career stages.

In addition, some argue that leadership skills may be based on certain individual traits or dispositions that correlate well with leadership effectiveness (Yukl, 2001). These can provide the foundation for some aspects of effective leadership behaviour, a foundation that may not be able to be developed extrinsically or may not be amenable to development. Yet, it is important not to overemphasise the identification of leadership traits. As noted in Chapter 3, school leadership is becoming more distributed and a focus on traits can lead to an undue emphasis on the leader. Individual leaders are but one element of leadership practice and they usually act with other leaders, formal as well as informal.

Different theories of leadership and understandings of personality produce sets of traits with both a common core and considerable divergence. Yukl (2001), for example, identifies energy level, stress tolerance, self-confidence, internal control orientation, emotional maturity and personal integrity. Northouse (1997) lists self-confidence, determination, integrity and sociability, while Hogan *et al.* (1994) favour agreeableness, conscientiousness and emotional stability. Several other authors with partially overlapping elements could be cited (*e.g.* Bass, 1990; House and Aditya, 1997). The following broad categories of traits can be identified from a selective review of the literature: values, cognitive ability, interpersonal and communication skills, proactive, pragmatic and entrepreneurial, trustworthy and a committed teacher and learner. It is important to understand that these elements contribute interdependently to the enactment of leadership tasks.

But traits in and of themselves do not produce leadership practice until they are combined with knowledge and competence and used to enact the particular performances of leadership practice. According to Elmore (2008), leadership is a knowledge-based discipline and only becomes leadership as it is put into action. The practices associated with leadership exist independently of the people who use them and they are subject to constant testing against the rigours of practical work and evidence of effectiveness. Leadership does not inhere in the personal characteristics of the individual; it inheres in the knowledge, skill and behaviour of the individual.

The context is also important for specific skills. In decentralised systems, leadership development is the responsibility of local or regional governments, which might make it more difficult to develop national coherent approaches for leadership development. In Sweden, for example, school leaders working in different municipalities can have quite different opportunities to attend in-service education events. In addition, in areas characterised by lower socio-economic status of the population, with less study tradition, challenges for schools might be larger than in other municipalities. This might lead to under provision, as there is more need but fewer budgetary resources for development. A similar situation is reported in New Zealand, where schools have high levels of autonomy and flexibility. While this level of self-government is highly regarded, one of the risks is that mechanisms to ensure consistency and equity across schools are weaker, which creates challenges to improving weak school leaders. If school leaders themselves, or their employing boards of trustees, do not recognise the need for development, the system has no strong levers to require it of them. In Sweden, it is proposed that school leaders working under extreme social and economical conditions should have a guarantee of investment in developing their competence.

4.2 The different stages of leadership development

A career perspective to leadership development

Experts in leadership and development argue that school leaders’ “professional development activities should be ongoing, career-staged and seamless” (Peterson, in Davis *et al.*, 2005). They should build on prior learning and continue throughout the stages of a principal’s career. Professional development occurs in forms suitable for different stages in the school principal’s or leader’s career and is part of a larger, ongoing and coherent set of experiences for career-long personal growth and professional skill enhancement.

Ideally leadership development would start at teacher level and continue for principal candidates and induction or first-year principals. Continuing professional development would then enlarge and capitalise on the leader’s base of experience. A growing body of experience would be available to draw upon as well as a more mature understanding of the demands of the job and criteria for effectiveness. Continued opportunities would enable highly proficient leaders to transfer their knowledge, skill and wisdom to junior leaders while themselves gaining additional insight and rejuvenation through mentoring and coaching.

A group of countries or states has adopted a holistic approach to the provision of leadership development, viewing school leadership as a continuum and trying to cater to principals’ different needs so that all can receive some professional development to strengthen their practice. Among these are the approaches to school leadership development in England, Northern Ireland and Victoria (Australia). All have designed more or less cohesive provision that caters to pre-service training needs by developing a specific qualification for practice, induction programmes that support leaders in their initial stages as leaders and in-service training programmes that focus on more targeted needs for established school leaders. In addition, all have broader frameworks which include training opportunities for others involved in leadership teams beyond the principal or deputies. These countries are adopting the distributed leadership concept and are consistent with their training opportunities.

Victoria (Australia) has adopted a particular coherent approach to leadership development, which is part of a broader national policy for school reform. What is valued in this approach is the recognition and integration of leadership development as a key component of school improvement efforts (Box 4.1).

Box 4.1 Coherent leadership training and development provision in Victoria, Australia

In 2003, the Victorian government developed a plan for improvement in the quality of the government school system. It set out three priorities for reform, based on a broad consensus of what should be done to lift student outcomes: *i)* recognising and responding to diverse student needs, *ii)* building the skills of the education workforce to enhance the teaching-learning relationship and *iii)* continuously improving schools.

The Victorian leadership development strategy (*Learning To Lead Effective Schools*, 2006) is within a coherent reform agenda (*Blueprint for Government Schools*, 2003) and comprises a sequence of reform initiatives aimed at improving practice, enhancing performance and reducing achievement gaps within the government school system. Leadership development is understood as an essential part of a comprehensive framework for system-wide improvement.

The education department recognised that effective leadership at all levels in the system was a pre-condition for implementing the school improvement aspirations reflected in the *Blueprint*. The increased investment in leadership development was based on a “comprehensive and deliberate suite of strategies aimed at improving the quality and performance of our leaders”. These strategies include development opportunities for aspirant leaders and principals, including a Master in School Leadership qualification for teachers who demonstrate high leadership potential, mentoring for new principals and coaching for experienced principals. A programme for high performing principals aims to advance those who can contribute to system development.

The opportunities for professional learning for current and aspirant leaders are set out in *Learning to Lead Effective Schools* (Office of School Education 2006), which provides 19 programmes for aspirant leaders, assistant principals and principals. Each programme fulfils fundamental principles rooted in research evidence and best practice. The principles, which were identified by the Department in 2004 (Department of Education and Training, 2005), characterise effective professional learning as:

- focused on student outcomes (and not just individual teacher needs);
- embedded in teacher practice (not disconnected from the school) and informed by the best available research on effective learning and teaching (not just limited to what they currently know);
- collaborative, involving reflection and feedback (not just individual enquiry);
- evidence-based and data driven (not anecdotal) to guide improvement and to measure impact;
- ongoing, supported and fully integrated into the culture and operations of the system (not episodic and fragmented);
- an individual and collective responsibility at all levels of the system (not just the school level) and not optional.

The 19 programmes have been commissioned by Victoria from higher education institutions and other suppliers of professional development, together with nationally funded programmes and they show considerable synergy with the Victorian *Blueprint* priorities and leadership development strategy.

While it might be too early to show an impact on school outcomes, independent evaluations of the leadership development strategy are showing positive results in developing participants’ leadership skills, sense of purpose and motivation.

Source: Matthews *et al.* (2008).

In England, a leadership development strategy sets out five stages of school leadership. Each stage has a range of related development opportunities based on preparatory, induction and further training for head teachers and other school leaders. In Northern Ireland, there is training for emergent and aspirant leaders as well as serving heads and managers. The Scottish approach is set out in Box 4.2.

Box 4.2 Scottish education leadership development

Scotland has recently been shaping its leadership development agenda to match new requirements. Since 2000 it has had a mandatory training qualification for service and induction programmes for most new school leaders and since 2003 a new framework for leadership development. It provides learning opportunities for those involved in leadership teams as well as more senior staff. *Continuing Professional Development for Educational Leaders*, intended to provide a means of promoting professional development rather than a structure for managing schools, is based on the notion of professional progression in educational leadership through four broad levels:

- **Project Leadership**, for teachers who have, or may take on, responsibility for leading a small-scale project. This refers to teachers possibly quite early in their careers, who wish to develop their leadership skills, for instance in an area related to curriculum development or supporting pupils' learning, or through a small school-based research project.
- **Team Leadership**, for teachers who, in addition to leading small-scale projects, have regular responsibility for leading either permanent teams of staff or task groups/working parties. This might be particularly relevant to aspiring and established principal teachers, whether their responsibilities are primarily in the areas of curriculum or of guidance.
- **School Leadership**, for staff who lead projects and teams and who have, or are seeking, overall responsibility for an aspect of leadership across an establishment. This might include teachers or principal teachers who aspire to membership of a senior leadership team and to established members of such teams. Some members of senior leadership teams will aspire to headship and the achievement of the Standard for Headship might be sought within this level.
- **Strategic Leadership**, for staff who, in addition to project, team and school leadership responsibilities, have overall responsibility for the leadership of an establishment or are leading strategic initiatives at local or national level. This is particularly relevant to head teachers and to those working in the education service who have a strategic role in improving Scottish education.

This particular approach seems to be adapting to the need to develop and encourage distributed leadership by investing in project and team leadership as vital for school success.

Source: Scottish Executive Education Department, 2007.

Slovenia also views school leadership as a professional endeavour and provides opportunities at all stages in a consistent way, as there are initial pre-service training requirements and a one-year induction programme. Various in-service training opportunities are available, but Slovenians wonder whether candidates for principalship and actual principals should attend the same programmes. In addition, it is thought that

leaving professional development and training of head teachers to their choice can have a negative effect, as they are overburdened by managerial roles and would not have time to train on other topics, especially as instructional leaders (Koren, 2007).

Other countries may provide several types of training, but through different government levels, depending on governance contexts, so it is not a coherent model of provision. In Norway and Denmark, for example, pre-service and induction training might be carried out by the municipality, but it is not documented at the national level. In Finland as well, the three types might be available for principals at the municipal level. But the devolved nature of education policy does not advance a coherent approach to leadership development and different municipalities provide different programmes. In Ireland, the three types of training and development are available as an option and a national initial pre-service training will be launched in 2008.

School leadership has gained prominence within education policy and development opportunities have become common. In Victoria (Australia), most of those involved in school leadership now understand what is at the heart of successful leadership and are aware that there are training and development opportunities for them. School leaders are no longer alone in their endeavour, but can rely on specialised institutions and training programmes that target their specific needs. There seems to be some evidence that the framework and structures are changing the landscape of school leadership, as has been the case of England with the National College for School Leadership.

Further analysis of the design and possible success of these approaches shows that where schools and principals have a high degree of autonomy in decision making, they need greater skills to improve school outcomes. New Zealand, one of the most devolved countries in our study, provides an example of how leadership development has been viewed as a key factor in the process of granting autonomy to schools. At first, it was left largely to each school's board and principal to decide what professional development the principal or those aspiring to principalship needed. Individual principals and principals' associations were raising concerns about principal preparation and development. This aligned with the Ministry of Education's commitment to support principals in determining school effectiveness in a self-managing situation. Four development initiatives for principals were developed: an induction programme for first-time principals; an electronic network for principals (LeadSpace); development centres for existing principals (Principals' Development Planning Centre); and guidelines on professional development for principals (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2002). All are of a voluntary nature.

In addition, most of the coherent approaches to leadership development have been based on a concerted effort and led by a clear leading institution, such as the National College for School Leadership in England, the Regional Training Unit in Northern Ireland or the Department for Education in Victoria (Australia). These institutional arrangements, explored in the following sections, have been key vehicles for designing coherent approaches and ensuring provision.

Finally, whether there is a career perspective to leadership development depends on the principals' contractual arrangement, whether it is a tenured or a fixed-term post (reviewed in Chapter 5). If posts are seen as temporary, this might limit public support for training and reduce the interest of candidates. The length of tenure of the position can strongly influence the type of training to be provided.

Initial training

Around half of the countries participating in the activity have pre-service training programmes focused on leadership development. These mostly lead to a university or specialised qualification and can be of a post-graduate nature or a very specific qualification. Most of them are two years on a part-time basis, but some run between 12 and 18 months (Annex 4.A1.).

The Korean and French programmes have been running for longer and have some commonalities: shorter programmes focused on the candidates as a way of training and also of pre-selecting good candidates to become principals. The rest are programmes initiated and supported system-wide that either base their offering in partnerships with universities, local municipalities or other providers or run through partnerships.

In almost all countries which have pre-service training, it is a prerequisite for the job or will be in coming years (Hungary, Northern Ireland and Spain). In England, after creating a specialised institution for school leadership development, a National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) has been made mandatory for all first time principals. Other parts of the United Kingdom are following suit: Scotland also has a mandatory certification and Northern Ireland will make it mandatory depending on the ratio of graduates to vacancies. Even in Finland, where there is a broad range of training for principals, the Ministry of Education still considers their biggest challenge to make leadership preparation a fundamental and fixed part of the school leader profession. In Hungary, where they consider preparing leaders and the transmission of leadership knowledge of great importance, they are concerned that the introduction of the requisite of pre-service leadership training for school leaders will only start in 2015/16. In Korea, where there is mandatory pre-service, critics have called for the programme to be extended from 30 days to 6 months to cover skills and knowledge focusing on schools and to include induction services during the first year in the post.

Setting standards or frameworks

Some countries have established standards or professional qualifications defined specifically for training. There are some objections to the use of standards. Some critics object that standards like those in the UK tend to codify a charismatic, heroic form of leadership that runs counter to the need for more participatory and distributed leadership. Critics of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards in the United States similarly believe that they reinforce a view of leadership that is non-democratic and ignores important values in school (CCSSO 1996, 2000). Gronn (2003) applies the concept “designer leadership” to underscore how standards for school leaders have become a defining theme for leadership through regimes of assessment.

While it seems evident that standards can be developed in a way that privileges certain bodies of knowledge and values, they can help make objectives transparent. What is important is that the process of establishing the standards be open, rigorous, objective and subject to ongoing review and improvement. In addition, standards need to allow for the possibility of contextualisation to local and school needs – to respond to criticism that standards are often centralised and decontextualised (Louden & Wildy, 1999).

The use of standards and frameworks to organise programme content and maintain quality control is practised in Chile, New Zealand and the United Kingdom (Box 4.3), among participating countries. In general, standards and frameworks identify the core

roles and functions of the leader, state what the leaders need to know and be able to do and set levels of performance competence. In the Netherlands, the Association of School Leaders (AVS) has developed its own national standards that govern the certification of programmes from which individuals or their organisations may choose.

Box 4.3 Selected leadership qualifications

In **Northern Ireland**, the Professional Qualification for Headship (PQH[NI]) was introduced in 1999 as part of a school Improvement reform. It was hoped that it would create a pool of qualified leaders as measured against the National Standards for Headteachers (NI) as well as to ensure succession of highly qualified applicants into principal posts. All candidates are deemed eligible for entry to PQH(NI) on the basis of their application and offered funded places into one of the three routes to achieving the qualification after interview by panels representing the various employing bodies. While the qualification is not mandatory, it has proved to be very popular and has attracted a total of 1 787 applicants to date, with a third of the schools in Northern Ireland supporting their principals. The figures indicate that within the next two years the total number of graduates will have more than doubled. It is increasingly becoming embedded into the school system as the essential route for those aspiring to headship. Anecdotal evidence suggests that it is also the preferred form of professional development for many who wish to take on other senior leadership roles in school apart from headship.

In **Scotland**, the Scottish Qualification for Headship was established to help candidates achieve the Standard for Headship. Recently, because of a decline in the number of people undertaking this qualification, the government is trying to diversify and provide alternatives to this qualification.

In the **United States**, the Southern Regional Education Board in Atlanta, Georgia has developed a research-based, extensively tested leadership preparation and development framework and curriculum modules that can be used by states, universities, school districts – any qualifying agency interested in them. The framework is built on 13 critical success factors drawn from the research literature that distinguish principals who have been successful at raising student achievement, especially in schools with concentrations of at-risk students. The 17 modules cover such competency areas as using data to lead change, creating a high-performance learning culture, professional development, team-building, coaching, monitoring the curriculum, leading assessment and instruction, leadership for numeracy and literacy and developing effective internships and mentoring for leaders. Modules can be organised into strands that suit the needs of school leaders in particular situations: improving the school as a system, improving curriculum and instruction, improving leadership preparation. The curriculum has been used for initial preparation of principals or for in-service professional development with leadership teams in 48 of the 50 states and more than 2 000 trainers have been certified to use the curriculum.

Source: Fitzpatrick (2007); Scottish Executive Education Department (2007); SREB (undated).

Mandatory or voluntary?

Whether or not to make training and development mandatory is a matter of debate. There are arguments on both sides. Mandates in the form of qualifications or certifications that serve as prerequisites to eligibility or continued service in the principal's job are seen by their sponsors as necessary to raise the quality of school leadership. Mandatory programmes, along with standards regulating the provision of

training and development programmes, can also serve to align programmes with national goals and priorities. On the other hand, there are also voices against mandatory training, as in England, where some have expressed concern that mandatory training is not allowing enough freedom to develop different types of training and developing “designer leaders” who are focused too exclusively on the national agenda (Gronn, 2003). In New Zealand, Stewart (2000) concluded that principal learning is better initiated by the individual than imposed by legislation.

Some analysis has proposed that the political distribution of responsibilities may be one of the reasons for the lack of support at a national level. Moller and Schratz (2008) found that in Scandinavia, local and regional authorities have argued against mandatory leadership training because it is the school owners (municipalities) who should have responsibility, as they are best placed to understand and evaluate the need, in co-operation with their school leaders and to respond through the creation of local networks of schools. This results in a great variety across municipalities, as leaders may get different support depending on location.

In a survey of school leadership development in England, some school leaders indicated that other qualifications such as MBAs and Masters degrees had proved to be very useful in helping them deal with leadership challenges. This suggests the need to widen the concept of leadership qualifications and draw on the best of other management and leadership qualifications available.

In countries where the position of principal is temporary, such as Spain and Portugal, there has not been much training. In Spain, principals are *primus inter pares* and return to the teaching profession once their four-year headship is finished. The efficiency of investing in training for principalship for a three-to-four year position can therefore be questioned. In Chile, while the post is temporary, those that take on a leadership position are recognised to need more rigorous and developed competences requiring tutoring or other support.

There are other ways to ensure training without making it mandatory, as is the case in some countries. In the Netherlands or Flemish Belgium, school owners are responsible for ensuring competencies and universities are expected to assist in developing training options responding to needs. Some school boards or national networks of schools make training mandatory; others consider certification or a degree in school leadership an important asset for principals when they apply for a position. In other countries such as Sweden, where school leadership has been greatly decentralised, the government ensures that there is provision of training and it is up to municipalities to choose whether or not it is mandatory for their principals. In Denmark and Norway, where there are no national guidelines or requirements for preparation and the responsibility for leadership development is located at municipal level, they are considering options to provide initial training for principals.

Finding the appropriate candidates

Many countries rely on self-selection to fill enrolments in training and development programmes. This approach appears to reward initiative and it solves the problem of who should take part in these programmes and how to select them. But it does have inefficiencies. Candidates may or may not be of high potential. In countries where training implies additional salary increments, some candidates have little intention of taking a leadership position but simply want to raise their income. Moreover, self-

selection bears little connection to an organisation's or jurisdiction's needs for succession planning. It seems increasingly apparent that more selective, intentional processes for allocating training and development are warranted.

To respond to the shortages and insufficient numbers of applicants, it can help to take a proactive approach in selection of potential candidates. One of the key issues is whether such programmes should be open to all candidates interested in headship or only those already pre-selected or acting in management positions within the school. Most of these programmes are open to interested candidates, but institutions which provide them can have selection processes that may screen potential candidates for headship. These programmes have a triple role: as entry barrier, screening device and a way of developing suitable candidates for the positions.

Some countries pre-select candidates who will become school leaders and do not allow them into the post until they have passed the courses. This is the case in France and will be the case in Spain as of 2008. In France, pre-selected candidates receive in-depth training and are entitled to apply for a position once they have passed the examinations. This can be a way of reducing costs and ensuring that only those with leadership potential take the training.

How to increase the number of good potential candidates for school leadership while avoiding the high costs of training all those who want to apply? The Netherlands has designed a particularly interesting approach (Box 4.4).

Box 4.4 Leadership “taster” courses in the Netherlands

To attract potential candidates to leadership without the high cost of training programmes, training institutes offer orientation courses to allow teachers interested in leadership functions to discover whether they have the required capabilities. One example of such a course is *Orientation towards Management*, brief training given by the Association of School Leaders for the Sectoral Board for the Education Labour Market (a fund of employers and employee organisations in the educational sector). School boards, upper school managers and leaders of schools are asked to select candidates from their own schools. These candidates first take part in an information session, where they fill in a survey form that provides some insight into their leadership talents and affinity with leadership. They then participate in a two-day training course which covers various leadership topics. After this, candidates draw up a Personal Development Plan based on a competence analysis. *Orientation towards Management* then moves on to further training for candidates who are interested and suitable.

Source: Bal and de Jong (2007).

Another approach to pre-screening and selecting good candidates is to include some components of leadership training in initial teacher training. In Denmark for example, a survey from the Danish University of Education shows that newly trained teachers feel they are well equipped to deal with academic challenges, but are afraid that they will not be able to communicate their academic abilities due to anxiety and other non-academic challenges in the classroom. Being a classroom teacher also involves being a leader for students – and colleges of education do not specifically focus on leadership skills.

In Finland, in pedagogical university studies that covered 19 subject areas, 53.7% of teachers and 46.9% of students expressed the opinion that school leadership and development should be transferred from basic teacher education to continuing education.

Induction programmes

Another way of developing principals is to provide induction programmes for those newly appointed to the job. Ten *Improving School Leadership* participants use this approach. For Austria, Ireland, New Zealand and Sweden (Box 4.5), it is the main way to provide leadership training for their principals. England, Scotland and Northern Ireland use this as a complementary feature of initial training. These programmes are almost all optional and may include in-depth training on legislative, financial and other topics. They may also provide mentoring for the first years in office and help new principals develop networks of support (Annex 4.A2.).

Box 4.5 The Swedish national head teachers training programme

This training programme is given to principals after about two years in office. It comprises about 30 seminar days over a two-year period. The purpose of the training is to build knowledge and understanding of the national school system, the national goals for the school, the role of the school in society and the local community and the dynamics of leadership within the school culture. This programme has been running for more than 30 years with only minor modifications. It is currently under review as part of a new government's review of leadership training arrangements.

The state offers the National Head Teachers Training Programme to all school boards in Sweden. Tuition is funded by the state, while the municipalities and other employers bear the costs of travel and subsistence allowances, stand-in teachers and reading material. For the present programmes, which started in 2002, the National Agency for Education defines the goals, content and coverage of the training and distributes state funding allocated for this purpose to the eight universities that carry out the programme. The agency is also responsible for follow-up and evaluation of the training on a regular basis.

Municipalities decide if they will enrol their school leaders in this programme and most of them do. Principals have at least a 10% reduction in their work load while they are participating. During the first three years of appointment as a school leader the majority of Swedish principals join this programme. The Swedish strategy can be characterised as a combination of centralisation and decentralisation; it is a balance between political and professional power over leadership training. This programme seems to have brought an equilibrium between national goals and decentralised needs.

Source: Moller and Schratz (2008).

These programmes may be short one- or two-day courses organised by local authorities to introduce school leaders to their surroundings, as is the case in Australia and Hungary. In Denmark, the courses may run for about a month, but in other countries, they run from one to three years and provide a variety of support arrangements for taking up the position and initial steps into school leadership. In Finland, for example, induction programmes support the new principal in developing professional views, adopting different tasks and increasing working ability. Support from colleagues and professional co-operation networks is considered an important part of this training provision. In this way, countries may reduce the cost of providing widespread training for anyone interested and target the training to the specific needs of new principals.

In countries where induction is the main professional pathway for developing leadership skills, the key role of these programmes has been reported by many practicing principals. In Ireland for example, a programme for newly appointed principals, *Misneach* (Gaelic for courage) was launched in 2001. A later evaluation showed that most newly appointed principals felt that in the absence of initial training, an induction programme was necessary to prepare and support them to deal with issues arising in the early years of practice. Only 18% considered that they were well prepared to take on their role as principals before participating in the programme (Morgan and Sugrue, 2005). This report also noted that the programme helped to address isolation and to encourage the development of professional networks. Box 4.6 describes induction programmes in Austria and New Zealand.

Box 4.6 Some induction programmes and their impact

In **Austria**, there is a strong induction programme as the main way to provide foundation skills for school leaders. Principals are initially appointed on a provisional basis. To be extended, they must complete a course in management training within the four years after taking up the position. Initially the training was limited to preparation for legal and administrative tasks, but as school autonomy grew, more appropriate qualifications were adopted. The two-year programme has different phases of study, including basic training modules and self-study. An evaluation study was carried out to gauge the degree of improvement of school leaders' competences through the programme. The evaluation is relevant for other countries, as it raises key issues on structure and content of induction programmes. Most of the participants rated their own competences higher than the training impact, revealing the importance of additional influences, formal or informal experiences that play an important role during the two year period. While they confirmed the structure of the programme, they did make suggestions for upgrading. They felt that the course should respond better to real needs and be contextualized; should offer an appropriate balance between self-study, project-work, peer-work and individual and team coaching; and should link basic training with professional development.

In **New Zealand**, an 18-month First Time Principals (FTP) induction programme for newly appointed principals from all types of schools began in 2002. The programme is designed to meet the individual needs of first time principals by developing their professional and personal skills and capabilities so that they can work effectively with their colleagues and communities to further improve teaching and learning. It has three main components: nine days of residential sessions held in the school holidays; on-going mentoring on site (including unlimited phone and e-mail contact); and a confidential website. An evaluation was commissioned for those who participated in 2003. It found a great diversity among the participants: some brought little knowledge and relevant leadership experience to their new roles, while others had spent several years preparing for the position, both professionally and academically. Principals also came from widely different school types – from very small rural schools to large urban secondary schools. Principals appeared to have grasped the importance of leadership for learning, although a number were constrained by particular school contexts and the match between their current abilities and leadership requirements. The evaluation found the FTP programme to be an initiative with potential to impact significantly over time on principals' knowledge and approaches to learning-focused school leadership

Source: Schratz and Petzold (2007); Cameron *et al.* (2004).

For countries where induction programmes are a complement to initial pre-service training, their value has also been rated highly. In the United Kingdom for example, school principals surveyed at a time when most of them had had no prior training for their first position stated that the most important thing they needed in their first post was “someone to talk to”. Nearly half the respondents identified their greatest need as support and mentoring from an experienced colleague (Bright and Ware, 2003). Reflecting on the Scottish experience, Stewart (2000) observes that the first three to four years of school leadership are a crucial time for principal learning and support. In the United States, more than half of the 50 states now require that new principals receive some form of induction support.

Finally, a number of countries also offer induction for other school leadership personnel, similar to that offered to principals. Indeed many of those involved in leadership teams do find that they require additional support in their role. In New Zealand, a 2006 report on career paths in the primary school sector revealed that teachers reported that there was patchy professional guidance and support available to them when they first undertook new leadership or management roles, although few reported that there was no help available. In fact, while 84% of principals who responded indicated they offered mentoring to newly appointed deputy and assistant principals, only a third of teachers believed this to be the case. This finding illustrates a gap between principals’ perceptions of the professional learning opportunities and support available in their schools and the reality experienced by teachers participating in leadership. The study also found that teachers who aspire or are new to management positions are seeking both mentoring and on-going professional learning opportunities (Cameron *et al*, 2004).

In-service training

In-service training programmes are also widespread across countries and there is a great variety in type of provision, support and delivery (Annex 4.A3.). In Australia, Austria, Chile, England, Finland, Ireland, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Slovenia and Sweden, there are systematic in-service training programmes for their leaders. In Chile, a new national training programme has become the main venue for the provision of leadership skills (Box 4.7). Some of these programmes have arisen recently because of a strongly felt need to improve and develop leadership skills of practising school heads, especially in light of changes in their environment and new requirements imposed upon them. Governments have recognised the need to help their principals adapt to expanded and intensified leadership responsibilities. Where there is no initial prerequisite training for entering the profession, some countries have been particularly aware of the need for enhanced professionalisation through training even at later stages in principals’ careers. Many of these programmes run for one or more years part-time and help principals reflect on their practice and work with other principals towards change.

Some systems require professional development of school leadership personnel, either at a national level or at a local or regional level. In Finland, the minimum annual requirement is 3 days; in Hungary it is 120 hours every seven years. But in most places, there are no requirements. In Scotland, to ensure that principals and teachers undertake in-service training, an additional contractual 35 hours per year training has been introduced for all teachers and principals. It requires each teacher to have an annual continuing professional development plan agreed with her/his immediate line manager and maintain an individual record of continuing professional development activities (CPD). CPD activities should be based on an assessment of individual needs which take account of school, local and national priorities.

Box 4.7 Chile's head teacher training for school leadership

In Chile, a pilot programme was launched in 2004 to develop the skills of acting principals, using a well defined *Good School Leadership Framework*. *Head Teacher Training for School Leadership* was started by the Ministry of Education to help improve the skills of principals, integrate competences linked to leadership performance standards, promote better performance of their functions and evaluate this type of training. Based on this experience, the *Management Team Development Programme* was launched in 2006 to contribute to professional development of principals and management teams and to develop and consolidate practices linked to the *Good School Leadership Framework*. Delivery of the programme has been through universities and regional peer-group meetings. Universities provide face-to-face training sessions, workshop sessions and practical work at schools. The experience has been quite positive: a participant survey showed that 71% of participants found it extremely relevant and 98% reported that the training had helped them to improve their leadership skills, especially those of conflict resolution, quality assurance in didactic strategies, motivating personnel and promoting collaboration

Source: Fuentes Díaz (2007).

It is also interesting to see whether it is the principals themselves or other bodies who make the decisions about who will participate in training. In fact, it is most often central or regional educational authorities that decide who will participate in training. But in Denmark, England, Finland, Ireland, Northern Ireland, Norway and Slovenia, it is principals who take that responsibility.

Others involved in leadership teams also have opportunities to take training or development. While the types of training undertaken are similar, it is generally the principals who decide on the training opportunities for their teams.

Regarding the content and methodology, there is a wide range of provision, so it is not easy to generalise. Training covers a range of different aspects of school management or educational leadership, or can focus on new requirements from public authorities. Countries have course-based training, group training, self study and other arrangements (Annex 4.A3.). One example of a continuing training approach that has contributed to change the school leadership focus is the recently developed Austrian Leadership Academy (Box 4.8).

As can be seen, there is no standard way of providing leadership development opportunities, but rather a wide range of possibilities that may focus on particular contextual factors to be targeted at national, regional, local or school level.

Networks have also become an informal way of developing principals and leadership teams. In Australia, England, New Zealand and Northern Ireland for example, virtual networks have developed as a way for principals to share practice. Other examples are of a more personal nature. In Sweden, where many school leaders are interested in different kinds of learning networks, "critical friends" was initiated by a handful of school leaders who work together and seek new knowledge to improve the quality of their schools. In addition, leaders in Swedish public schools belong to a professional network in their municipality. They are coached and supervised by a director of education, who has the task of supporting and developing school leaders in their professional role. In many municipalities, school leaders have regular meetings to discuss problems at their schools or to test new ideas. Through these regular meetings, principals strengthen their identity

as school leaders, support each other and feel the support of the director of education. In many municipalities, the employer of the principals also guarantees them another job in the municipality if they need to step down from the principal position (Swedish National Agency for School Improvement, 2007).

Box 4.8 The Austrian Leadership Academy

In Austria, national policy makers identified the need to prepare school leadership to lead and sustain systemic change and in 2004 created the Leadership Academy (LEA). The original intent was for the LEA to prepare school heads, with newly acquired autonomy but little experience operating outside a hierarchical, bureaucratic structure, with the capacity to act more independently, to take greater initiative and to manage their schools through the changes entailed by a stream of government reforms. As the benefits to systemic change of involving a wider participant group became apparent, inspectors, staff of in-service training institutes, executives from the Ministry of Education and provincial education authorities were added as participants. The LEA's brief was to train 6 000 school leaders and other executives in leadership positions in the Austrian school system in a very short period of time on the basis of the latest scientific findings on innovation and change.

At present, the Leadership Academy provides leadership development to prepare leaders to manage the introduction of national reforms and to lead processes of school improvement. Individual learning and development, project leadership and network relationships are the key elements of the Leadership Academy's programme. Each year, a cohort (called a "Generation") of 250 to 300 participants progresses through four forums (three-day learning experiences consisting of keynote presentations with group processing); work-in-learning partnerships between two participants; and collegial team coaching (CTC) groups, each comprising three sets of partnerships. With support and critique from these learning partners and CTCs, each participant develops and implements a project in his or her own institution over the course of the year.

Source: Stoll et al. (2008).

4.3 Institutions focused on leadership development

Across OECD countries, provision of preparation, induction and development programmes is managed at different levels of government and by a variety of organisations. Some countries and regions, Austria, England, Ireland, Northern Ireland and Slovenia among them, determine the need for training at state level and establish state-level programmes for its provision. England and Slovenia fund non-departmental public bodies, the National College for School Leadership (England) and the National School for Leadership in Education (Slovenia), which design programmes with input from the field and make them available through regional centres. Ireland and Northern Ireland have departmental bodies, Leadership Development for Schools (Ireland) and the Regional Training Unit (Northern Ireland), which define and provide leadership training across the different stages of leadership careers. Austria funds independent universities to develop and deliver mandated programmes (the Leadership Academy). In Finland, there are several in-service training providers, the National Centre for Professional Development in Education (OPEKO) being one of the best known among teachers and principals.

Provincial and municipal levels are free to determine leadership training policy in some countries (Australia, Spain or Sweden for example). In Spain, in recent years, the regional governments of Andalusia, the Canary Islands, the Basque Country, Catalonia,

the community of Madrid and the Ministry of Education have developed their own regulations and have implemented leadership training programmes which are now quite established. The majority of the courses usually last from 60 to 100 hours and are almost exclusively for acting leadership teams.

Whether the initiative rests primarily at national, provincial, municipal, or local level, programmes can be provided by a range of institutions. Providers include purpose-built organisations like the National College for School Leadership in England, university degree programmes, private companies with proprietary training and schools or school systems themselves. Each kind of organisation can offer different advantages in expertise, flexibility, alignment with governmental priorities, cost and contextual sensitivity. In countries where there is no national approach to leadership development, there is also a need for some type of quality control of provision, as many different providers train school leaders for a public service, often receiving public funding for it.

Darling Hammond and colleagues (2007) identify four models for provision of school leadership training and development, especially at the pre-service stage. The most important contributions organisations can make include appropriate expertise in a mix suitable to the programme; a capacity to focus on real needs of schools and policy systems (as opposed to the theoretical perspectives contained in academic disciplines); contextualisation of knowledge and skills in specific kinds of school settings (urban schools, for example); and arrangements that succeed in meeting critical needs and shortages of school leaders (in rural areas, for example).

Typically, universities provide academic expertise, schools and school systems provide context and practical expertise, private or non-profit organisations provide independence, flexibility and some specialised expertise and governments and associated non-governmental bodies provide authoritative focus, quality and alignment with policy. Combinations of organisations can provide a mix of these characteristics. What is most important is not the organisation that is providing the programme but the presence of the requisite characteristics for a given situation, such as expertise, context, flexibility and alignment.

School leadership institutions

As countries consider how best to organise their leadership programmes, one approach has been to set up a national institution that ensures coherence and effective supply of training, in addition to research and policy guidance. This section describes different models of this approach.

In the UK, the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) was created less than a decade ago as a non-departmental public body intended both to serve the policy aims of government and to be responsive to its constituents. It has aimed to establish ties with its public that a government agency might not be able to manage. England has an exceptionally well developed education policy framework and NCSL is tightly aligned with this framework. Since the policy issues and problems with which England is grappling are shared by many of the OECD and *Improving School Leadership* participants (e.g. preparing heads to lead student learning, closing the achievement gap, developing capacity for systems and distributed leadership, succession planning) the NCSL's approach to and accomplishments on such issues will be of interest to other countries.

England's National College for School Leadership

The National College for School Leadership (NCSL) was established in 2000 as the lead non-departmental public body with responsibility for school leadership (Higham *et al.*, 2007). It is at the heart of national policy initiatives aimed at increasing both the quality and supply of school leaders. Its mission is to support the commitment of the Department for Education and Skills (now the Department for Children, Schools and Families [DCSF]) to ensuring “an adequate supply of school leaders in the right places and of suitable quality”. Thus the college remit covers research, training, policy analysis and advice, public/professional consultation and information and strategic initiatives on issues of national priority. The NCSL has launched a Leadership Development Framework that provides programmes and standards that extend across a leader's career. It sets out five stages of school leadership, each with a range of related development opportunities based on preparatory, induction and further training for head teachers and other school leaders:

- emergent leadership, when a teacher is beginning to take on management and leadership responsibilities and perhaps forms an aspiration to become a head teacher;
- established leadership, comprising assistant and deputy heads who are experienced leaders but who do not intend to pursue headship;
- entry to headship, including a teacher's preparation for and induction into the senior post in a school;
- advanced leadership, the stage at which school leaders mature in their role, look to widen their experience, to refresh themselves and to update their skills;
- consultant leadership, when an able and experienced leader is ready to put something back into the profession by taking on training, mentoring, inspection or other responsibilities.

NCSL provides national coordination of residential courses for school leaders that are delivered through registered local providers. It provides quality assurance by piloting its programmes and adjusting them according to findings (feedback from participants, endpoint evaluations and external evaluations of new programmes, usually by research teams or institutes) and by requesting that providers conduct their own internal evaluations, results of which are reported back to NCSL.

Although the NCSL is seen positively by many as serving the needs of school leaders, it has been criticised for promoting the government's educational policy agenda rather than operating more independently. This challenge for the NCSL of “responding to DfES demands and also maintaining credibility with the profession” is recognised by the government.

Overall, however, since the creation of the NCSL and the launching of a professional qualification for headship, in conjunction with a broader agenda to improve school leadership, there is evidence that this institution is having a positive impact on education and that those involved have improved their knowledge. A majority are reported to have felt that the NCSL had contributed to improve standards of achievement in their school.

Northern Ireland Regional Training Unit

A similar approach to that adopted by England is the Northern Ireland Regional Training Unit (RTU) (Fitzpatrick, 2007). Through its School Leadership College and Staff College, the RTU provides leadership, co-ordination and direction in the planning and delivery of professional development and training for the whole education community in Northern Ireland. The Leadership College supports the professional development of leaders and senior managers in all schools, including emergent and aspirant leaders as well as serving heads and managers. With over 900 candidates on its preparation for headship programme and over 90 studying for the MBA in educational leadership, the RTU is responsible for a large investment in leadership development and for the development of the National Professional Qualification for Headship. Experienced leadership trainers, serving principals and recently retired head teachers and senior educationalists work together with stakeholders to provide education sector leaders with a range of development opportunities. These include extended accredited programmes on seminal issues as well as single day or residential conferences on practical issues. In 2006 nearly 2 000 teachers attended the annual Summer School covering a wide range of current and future educational issues.

The Slovenian National School for Leadership in Education

Slovenia was an early developer of leadership training and now has provision of initial, induction and in-service training through its National School for Leadership in Education, established in 1995 for the training and professional development of head teachers and candidates (Koren, 2007). While concentrating on training and development, it has slowly broadened its remit to cover a variety of leadership tasks:

- implementation of the headship licence programme;
- mentoring for newly appointed heads of schools;
- in-service training and conferences for school leaders;
- networks of learning schools (programme based on the concepts of school effectiveness and school improvement);
- development of new approaches to education for leadership in schools: leading for learning, action research for head teachers;
- publishing a journal, “Leadership in Education”;
- research in the fields of education, educational policy and leadership.

The Netherlands School Leaders Academy

Another example of an institutional arrangement that focuses on leadership development issues is the Netherlands School Leaders Academy (NSA), which is a professional body representing school leaders (Bal and de Jong, 2007). The NSA works towards training and registration of school leaders and has also developed a set of competences for school leaders. It plays a part in describing and assessing education and training for primary education. Assessing the criteria of institutions supplying education and training and also tailor-made courses and private coaching started in 2004. It has developed a professionalisation indicator containing data about over 100 organisations

and institutions and describing over 500 products and services. All these products and services are linked to the competences in the NSA vocational standard. Using this vocational standard as a basis, the NSA tests all products and services for the management of primary education as to their quality (certification based on NSA quality standards).

Ireland's Leadership Development for Schools

Another particular institutional arrangement is the one adopted in Ireland. Leadership Development for Schools is the body charged with providing professional development for school leaders (LDS, 2007). It comprises a team of school leaders (principals, deputy principals and other teachers) seconded from their schools to the Department of Education and Science for this purpose.

Across OECD and partner countries, there is a wide range of specialised bodies and institutions, public or semi-public, targeting leadership training and development at different levels. All of these targeted institutions have become champions for leadership development and have contributed to changing the school leadership landscape in their contexts. Acknowledging the differences from country to country in approaches to organising such centres, they appear to play an important role in the development of high-quality school leadership. By focusing on the needs for school leadership, they have managed or are managing to integrate theory, research and experience and thus strengthen the understanding of school leadership as an area of expertise, encourage new research and assist in the spread of best practice.

Higher education institutions

Across all countries, universities provide some school leadership skills development. Universities may establish programmes tied to state credential requirements, or may jointly provide courses with municipalities. A particular example of the state working with universities to provide a nationally directed leadership training programme is that of Sweden (Box 4.5).

In Finland, university-level post-basic educational leadership courses are run by the Institute of Educational Leadership at the University of Jyväskylä. The university started a study programme in 2000 targeted at educational leaders holding an office and aspiring to develop their competence through practical leadership training. Similar programmes have been arranged by the universities of Turku, Helsinki, Vaasa, Lapland and Oulu, among others. Because there are no uniform regulations or instructions, the programmes have taken very individual directions and have become quite different from each other.

In Denmark, there is a new Master's degree in leadership of educational institutions offered by the Danish University of Education in co-operation with Copenhagen Business School. The purpose of this course is to give students research-based further education which assists with professionalisation of leadership work. Students acquire knowledge which may form a background for change leadership, as well as an insight into pedagogical and academic teaching which may strengthen the leadership of work to develop pedagogical practice.

Other approaches

Universities in many OECD countries have traditionally had the expertise thought necessary for professional training. But some such programmes have been criticised for providing programmes that are too theoretical and out of date and failing to produce practically competent graduates. Partnerships with schools, non-profit or private competitor programmes, private firms (Box 4.9) or the development of national academies funded by government have arisen in response. Whatever organisations are providing the programmes, many governments have chosen to put in place mechanisms like standards and evaluations to monitor and regulate programme quality.

The wide range of providers of leadership training across countries and the difficulties in measuring impact have led some countries to establish different types of quality control. In the Netherlands, for example, the Netherlands School Leaders Academy describes and evaluates education and training for primary education, using the “professionalisation indicator” described above. In Finland there is follow-up on participation in different types of training. Finland’s National Board of Education collects information from training providers at the beginning and end of programmes in addition to each person filling out feedback and background information. This is required before payments to training providers and used by the government for quality assurance.

Box 4.9 Teaming up with the private sector for school leadership development

Co-coaching in the Netherlands

In the Netherlands, the co-coaching project can also be seen as an initiative in which the exchange of knowledge and sharing experience are in the forefront. The project is similar to Partners in Leadership, which has been running in the United Kingdom for some years and brings managers from education and business together. The Sectoral Board for the Education Labour Market (SBO) has taken the initiative to offer the same opportunities in the Netherlands to school leaders in primary and secondary education. It is the intention that pairs of partners should coach each other with the goal to achieve higher personal and professional effectiveness. In addition the project stimulates further co-operation between education and business. The SBO organises the co-coaching project together with a management company. The project started in three regions in 2005. The managers themselves determine the frequency and nature of the coaching sessions; once every three months is the minimum. The first impressions of co-coaching, in which 60 pairs of partners are involved at the present time, are positive. The participants are enthusiastic. It does however appear to be difficult to find businesses willing to co-operate.

A public-private partnership for school leadership in Bavaria, Germany (Modus F Initiative)

In Bavaria an interesting public-private partnership for school leadership was initiated in 2006 (Modus F Initiative) to promote the development of innovative school leadership concepts by creating links between educational institutions and private enterprises. It responded to increasing demands on school leaders due to enhanced school autonomy in Bavaria. The Pact for Education Foundation (*Stiftung Bildungspakt*) is a public-private partnership founded in 2000 between the Bavarian Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs and currently 130 private sector partners ranging from local start-up companies to international corporations.

Box 4.9 Teaming up with the private sector for school leadership development (*cont'd*)

The initiative initially selected 53 school leaders from different school types (primary, lower and higher secondary and special needs schools), but the objective is to extend successful concepts to all Bavarian schools. The programme combines leadership seminars and individual coaching for principals in office plus a series of training sessions to prepare future school leaders selected by the 53 participants among the younger teachers in their schools. Managers from private sector companies that form part of the public-private partnership cooperate with the Foundation on a voluntary basis. They form tandems with school leaders who are interested in personal coaching and individual partnerships to discuss everyday challenges rather than attending leadership training in seminar groups. An internet forum and regular plenary meetings ensure that experience is shared and a pool of best practice approaches is established.

The Modus F Initiative is an example of how private sector expertise can be used to empower school leaders and equip them with competences enabling them to develop their own innovative leadership strategies. It combines the private sector's innovative and entrepreneurial attitude and the public sector's power to implement binding legislative changes, creating a multiplier effect to spread innovation. While at the end of the first of five years the pilot project is too young for a rigorous evaluation, positive signs stem from the strong interest and demand for participation and the extensive use of the different training opportunities and fora for exchange of experience. Moreover, networks have developed beyond the mandatory training and coaching sessions, both between private sector and school leaders and among school leaders often from the same school type. This approach presents a cost effective way of self-directed learning and spreading of positive results.

Source: Bal and de Jong (2007); www.modus-f.de.

4.4 Methodology and content

Instructional design and methods vary across programmes. Some programmes emphasise propositional knowledge (knowing *what*), while others emphasise procedural knowledge (knowing *how*), but there is a need to prepare leaders who are both knowledgeable and practically effective. Theoretical or academic work is complemented to a greater or lesser degree by experiential, problem-based and clinical learning and experience. Group work, networks, coaching and mentoring are features of many countries' programmes and serve both to engage learners more intensively in managing their learning and to ground their knowledge and skill development in real-world, practical and consequential settings.

Pre-service and induction programme content ranges from developing knowledge and skills of the fundamental legislative, administrative and managerial content needed to function at a basic level in a school organisation (Austria and Belgium [Flanders] community schools) to developing more sophisticated pedagogical leadership capable of raising school and student performance standards (Northern Ireland). Content can be based on traditional managerial disciplines (Hungary, Korea) or on individual school contexts complemented by coaching (England). Most programmes appear to try to blend theoretical and practical knowledge.

In-service professional development also varies along several dimensions. In the broadest terms, content can focus on generic leadership competence, instructional leadership capacity or issues of topical interest, either legislative priorities or urgent local problems. Some programmes concentrate on one dimension or another, while others present a mix of these approaches.

Leadership programme content responds to a set of country imperatives and contextual features including national culture and traditions, priorities, pedagogical traditions and beliefs about individual and social efficacy:

- In England, where building leadership capacity to respond to rigorous central standards, accountability and local management of schools is a priority policy, there is an elaborate programme of offerings (largely through the state-funded National College for School Leadership) tailored to career stage, school context and leadership level in the school or system. Programmes tend to be grounded in school leadership theory but to be highly practical and applied.
- In Austria, where the aim is to counter traditional habits of bureaucratic control and deference to authority by developing a national core of more proactive, self-directed and collaborative leadership, the government has recently established the Leadership Academy with an emphasis on the development of generic leadership and entrepreneurial habits of mind and skills (Box 4.8).
- In Sweden, the national head teacher training programme follows a central design that is implemented in regional centres where the emphasis between theory and practical content and between didactic and participatory learning approaches, varies by provider.
- National traditions also shape content in significant ways. French developmental programmes aim to produce graduates who above all represent or exemplify the core values of the state and society, whereas English-speaking countries tend to produce technical competence that ensures realisation of national policy goals.

School leaders need both generic and locally contextualised skills

It is important to recognise that no single set of administrative competences will be effective in all different school and social contexts (Davis *et al.*, 2005). Different types of skills will be required, for example, for leading small rural schools and large urban vocational centres. It is increasingly accepted that there is a set of leadership constructs that are broadly applicable across cultures and a set of culturally contingent values and behaviours in accordance with which these constructs need to be implemented in any specific context. This argument would hold whatever the contextual level, whether it is a country, a society or a school.

The suggested distinction between generic skills and locally contextualised skills is echoed in Crow's (2001) assertion that there is a significant distinction between taking on a new leadership role such as head teacher (professional socialisation) and focusing on the specific school where a leadership role is performed (organisational socialisation). One implication is a need to provide the developing school leader with both professional and organisational socialisation skills, possibly through some combination of pre-service preparation and induction or in-service professional development.

Features of successful development programmes

Some researchers suggest that key features of effective programmes do not vary between pre-service or in-service programmes and that there is considerable similarity in the nature and content of leadership programmes internationally. Davis *et al.* (2005) found that effective programmes are research-based, have curricular coherence, provide experience in real contexts, use cohort grouping and mentors and structure for collaborative activity between the programme and the schools. Bush and Glover's (2004) analysis of recent literature on leadership development, both within and beyond education, suggests that an international curriculum for school leadership development is emerging with emphasis on the following elements: work-based learning, action learning, mentoring, coaching, diagnostics and portfolios.

At the same time, others argue that there are specific features to pre-service and in-service training programmes. A recent study by Darling-Hammond *et al.* (2007) identified differentiated elements as contributing to the success of pre-service and in-service training programmes.

For successful *pre-service* training, starting with the targeted recruitment and selection of teachers with leadership potential, key elements were:

- a coherent curriculum aligned to state and professional standards which emphasise instructional leadership and school improvement;
- active student-centred instruction;
- social and professional support as well as formalised mentoring and advising;
- designed internships that provide exposure.

Successful training of practicing principals involves them having a training continuum, which includes pre-service, induction and in-service. Particular elements that made for successful training are:

- leadership learning grounded in practice, including analysis of classroom practice, supervision and professional development using on-the-job observation;
- collegial learning networks such as principals' networks, study groups and mentoring or peer coaching that offer communities of practice and ongoing sources of support.

In the United States for example, many of these concepts have been codified in the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium "Propositions of Quality Professional Development" and the National Staff Development Council "Standards for Staff Development" (NSDC, 2001). Other features of successful programmes can be found in Box 4.10.

Box 4.10 Some features of school leadership development programmes in the United States

The report *Professional Development of School Principals for Leadership of High Performance Learning Communities* elaborates state-of-the-art goals, processes, content and design principles for leadership development programmes. Of particular relevance in this context are the recommendations concerning goals and design principles, aimed primarily at school, local and state governing bodies. According to this report, principal professional development should, among other factors:

- be grounded in principles of effective staff development;
- be tailored to the candidate's needs as determined through assessment and the candidate's development plan;
- draw upon skills and competences of effective school leadership;
- fit onto a larger, coherent development plan linked to relevant strategic and improvement plans;
- provide measurable objectives of learner progress;
- address the full spectrum of the leader's career needs and stages;
- respond to a set of critical "design questions".

Source: Moorman (1997).

Propose workplace learning opportunities

Workplace learning has an important place as a complement to formal training in the development of the school leader's competence. Lambrecht *et al.*, (2008) report that successful vocational administrators/leaders identified five types of experiences as most helpful to their development as leaders: assignments with new or greater responsibility; start-up work assignments; difficult personnel matters like firings; mentoring, counselling and support; and working with a supervisor. The two common elements underlying such experiences noted by respondents were 1) being placed in challenging circumstances where they had to make decisions and choices with an element of risk involved and 2) being in a supportive environment where their supervisors modelled good practice and provided support and mentors provided counsel.

Two particular dimensions of learning in the workplace are action learning and situated learning (Lankard, 1996). Action learning engages individuals (usually in teams or work groups) in learning through systematic problem-solving around real organisational needs or concerns. Although the problems may in fact get solved, it is the broader learning that is of chief interest. When, for example, teachers and principal work together to learn what is behind and to resolve different teacher standards for student work, they might in fact solve the problem and rationalise school-wide standards for student work, but they will also have learned how to work together, to break down barriers that isolate teachers from each other and to identify and make use of leadership expertise distributed across the teacher ranks.

Situated learning refers to the conduct of the learning experience in the context that gives rise to the need for skills and where they will be put to use. Internships and exercises experienced in actual classroom or school settings can offer situated learning. School walk-arounds can also situate the learning gained through observation, explanation and dialogue among peer leaders. Conditions enhancing learning that are common to action and situated learning are *a)* proactive when the learners take responsibility for and direct the learning experience, *b)* provide critical reflection when the learners make explicit the often hidden assumptions governing the situation and consciously open them to challenge and *c)* creative when learners are enabled to look beyond their own points of view and see matters from the perspectives of others, such that innovative and more powerful solutions and learning can be produced.

Design research-based programmes

Programmes should be designed to draw upon what is known about effective leadership development and to be aligned with needs and policies of the sponsor jurisdiction, whether national, province or state, municipality, or school. According to Davis *et al.* (2005), leadership development content should be research-based, incorporating knowledge of instruction, organisational development and change management as well as leadership skills. The core leadership development skills highlighted in the literature as being at the heart of successful school reform are: developing knowledge to promote successful teaching and learning; developing collaborative decision making processes and distributed leadership practices as well as processes or organisational change; and developing management competences in the analysis and use of data and instructional technologies to guide school improvement activities (Waters, *et al.*, 2003; Knapp, *et al.*, 2003).

Focus on mentoring and peer learning

The processes of mentoring and coaching are increasingly popular in business and education. While the terms are sometimes used interchangeably, mentoring is more generally used to refer to a process whereby a more experienced individual seeks to assist someone less experienced and coaching is used to refer to forms of assistance relating more specifically to an individual's job-specific tasks, skills or capabilities, such as feedback on performance (Hobson, 2003). There is a larger body of research evidence on mentoring than on coaching. Major studies of mentoring have shown it to be effective (Hobson, 2003) and it is a standard element in principal preparation programmes in the United States and the United Kingdom.

A study of mentors and mentees among school leaders in England (Luck, 2003) found these leaders unanimously endorsed the value of mentoring. Some respondents who were mentored in the course of formal development programmes rated mentoring as the most important part of the programme. Some new head teachers reported that without it they would have “gone under”. In his report on the New Zealand context, Stewart (2000) states that on-the-job learning is most effectively strengthened by the link between the principal learners and an outside school leader, with a non-threatening structured reflection on practice.

According to Evans and Mohr (1999), principals learn most effectively when they engage in continuous discussion groups in which they form commitments to one another and build a web of “lateral accountability”. Peer learning pushes principals to move

beyond their assumptions and to expand or change their original thinking through disciplined analysis and rigorous discourse around challenging texts on difficult or controversial issues. At the same time according to Evans and Mohr (1999), it is also essential to provide a safe setting in which principals can dare to risk, fail, learn and grow.

4.5 Summary conclusions and recommendations

Leadership skills development can strengthen practice

Country practices and research evidence show that there is a need for the provision of specific school leadership training to respond to the broadened roles and responsibilities of school leadership. The fact that most of those becoming principals have a teaching background does not mean they necessarily have the skills required for leading schools for the 21st century (Huber, 2004). The practice of school leadership requires specific skills and competencies that may not have been developed with years of teaching alone.

- Development strategies need to focus on developing and strengthening skills for dealing with the roles that contribute to improve school outcomes: *a)* supporting, evaluating and developing teacher quality; *b)* supporting goal setting, assessment and accountability; *c)* enhancing strategic financial and human resource management and *d)* leading beyond the school borders (Chapter 2).
- Training programmes also need to be based on analysis of need, as well as on contextual factors that influence practice and support for training. This implies ensuring targeted provision in areas of special need or for special contexts, such as schools in low socio-economic contexts or small rural schools, which might not have the budget for development.

Leadership development needs to be seen as a continuum

Leadership development needs to be seen as a lifelong learning process. Most evidence on development impact points to the fact that leadership development is broader than specific programmes of activity or intervention. It can be learned and developed through a combination of formal and informal processes throughout the different stages and contexts of leadership practice.

The school leadership career needs to be supported through the different stages in a balanced manner, including induction and in-service provision and be complemented when important changes come about. Programme content and length need to be coherent with the rest of development opportunities.

a) Encourage leadership initial training

Making leadership training a prerequisite or a strong asset for practice can contribute to improved schooling quality through greater professionalisation of the role, to greater satisfaction of principals in their jobs and possibly to increased numbers of candidates for positions.

- Whether leadership training is voluntary or mandatory can depend on national governance structures. Governments can define national programmes, collaborate with local level governments and develop incentives to ensure that school leaders themselves participate. In countries where the position does not have lifetime tenure, a trade-off must be found in order for principals to find it rational to invest time in their development.
- Efforts need to be made to find the right candidates for leadership development. One option is to include school leadership topics in teacher training, encouraging teachers to start reflecting on leadership roles and help them contribute in leadership teams. Preparatory qualifications or “taster courses” are a way of selecting, screening and preparing future school leaders. They can also help individuals to self-evaluate their capacities, strengths and weaknesses for the position.

b) Organise induction programmes

Induction programmes are particularly valuable to prepare and shape initiating school leadership practices, as well as to provide networks for principals to share concerns and challenges. They may contribute to reducing the costs of providing widespread training for anyone interested and target the training for the specific needs of beginning principals.

- These programmes should provide a combination of theoretical and practical knowledge and self-study. They should be designed in coherence with the broader development framework to provide the appropriate focus.

c) Ensure in-service training to cover need and context

In-service training can respond to need and to context. There is no standard way of providing leadership development opportunities, but a wide range of possibilities that may focus on particular contextual factors at a national, regional, local or school level.

- In-service programmes need to be seen in relation to the availability of prior learning opportunities for school leadership. When there are no other prerequisites, strong in-service programmes should encourage the development of basic leadership skills.
- In-service training should be provided periodically for principals and leadership teams to update their skills or inform them of new developments. Networks (virtual or real) also provide an informal development means for principals and leadership teams.

Ensure coherence of provision by different institutions

There is no standard approach to provision of leadership development. Choices of provision have to be made taking into consideration factors such as the current training and development opportunities, the availability of expertise, country governance arrangements and the current and anticipated quality and availability of leadership. Incentives for participating in training should be calibrated to encourage participation and quality in provision.

- A broad range of providers can cater to the varied training needs for school leadership. Training is provided by Ministries of Education or local governments, or outsourced to specialised institutions, to teacher training institutions or to a specialised body established to focus on school leadership training. Universities have also a broad range of supply. In addition, teacher and school leaders' institutions have developed their own training programmes.
- There is evidence that the development of national institutions of school leadership has contributed to transforming the school leadership landscape in some countries by raising awareness, improving knowledge and provision of leadership development opportunities.
- Where there is no national orientation but a range of institutions catering to local or regional needs, it is important to have clear standards that ensure that suppliers focus on good leadership development. Many governments have mechanisms like standards and evaluations to monitor and regulate programme quality.

Collaboration with the private sector in leadership development can also bring positive results.

Ensure appropriate variety for effective training

A broad body of knowledge supported by practice has identified the content, design and methods of effective programmes. It points to the following being key factors: curricular coherence, experience in real contexts, cohort grouping, mentoring, coaching and peer learning and structure for collaborative activity between the programme and the schools.

Annex 4.A1

Preparatory training for school leadership, 2006/07, public schools

Country	Target group	How offered	Typical length	Institution responsible	Who pays	Delivery methods	Content
Australia	1,2,3	Optional	Varies greatly across jurisdictions, from one day to one year	Universities, vocational training organisations, independent training providers or education authorities	Jurisdiction support or programme participants	Varies but may incorporate course based training, group work, self study and virtual networks	Varies greatly
Austria	2	At the discretion of the regional educational authority	Varies according to educational authority	From 10/2007 on: <i>Pädagogische Hochschulen</i>	Central / regional educational authority	Varies according to educational authority	Varies according to educational authority
Belgium (Fr.)	2	Mandatory for the French Community School Network	12 days of 6-8 hours	French Community of Belgium	m	m	m
Denmark	1	Primary schools: at the discretion of municipal authorities. Secondary & upper secondary: at the discretion of local schools.	No typical length	University or training institute or independent training provider	Employer or the individual	Depends on the different training institution	Different aspects of the skills necessary in leadership
	2,3	At the discretion of the individual to qualify for the position; or at the discretion of the individual school (3).	As above	As above	Present employer or the individual	As above	As above

Country	Target group	How offered	Typical length	Institution responsible	Who pays	Delivery methods	Content
England	1	Mandatory national requirement for all first time heads to hold or be working towards National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH)	15 months	National College for School Leadership (NCSL)	NCSL subsidises most programme fees. NCSL draws its funding from DCFS	NPQH is “blended” - includes F2F days, residentials, self-study, in-school work, peer and tutor support, online learning including online communities	Based on six Key Areas of national standards; also reflective of current policy and research. Legislative, HR, finance issues also covered
	2,3	No requirements. There is local and national optional provision to support these target groups	No typical length	Too numerous. Includes NCSL, universities, local authorities, private sector providers	NCSL subsidises most fees	Blended provision	Broad base
Finland	1,2,3	Optional	No typical length, variation of optional courses	Institution run by municipal / local educational authority, university or training institute linked to university, independent training provider	Central/ regional educational authority, Municipal / local educational authority, participants	Many	Many
France	2 (sec. schools only)	Optional	A few days	Institute	Institute	Training for two national exams	m
Hungary	2	Optional or at the discretion of municipal educational authorities	Two years	Training institute linked to university	Central (the state); municipal authority (maintainer); programme participants	Course based lectures/seminar; experience-based projects at own or different schools; group work; self-study; virtual network (not typical)	National education legislation; general leadership skills; resource management; organisation development; pedagogical leadership; evaluation and accountability

Country	Target group	How offered	Typical length	Institution responsible	Who pays	Delivery methods	Content
Ireland	2	Optional	Post graduate Certificate, Diploma, Masters, Doctoral programmes in Educational Leadership and/or Management	Universities and Colleges of Education linked to Universities	Programme participants	Course-based training	At the discretion of the institution involved
Israel	1	Mandatory	Two years, including 600 hours	Only in universities and colleges of education under central authority	2/3 of the cost is paid by the Ministry of Education, 1/3 paid by participants	All programmes are experience based. All are required to have at least ¼ of programme length as internship	National legislation, Interpersonal and leadership skill. Finance and organisational. Pedagogical leadership. Evaluation and accountability. Improving school climate and other related topics
New Zealand	2	Aspiring Principals Programme	12 months	Universities	Central government and programme participant	Course-based training Experienced-based training. Group work. Self-study. One-to-one counselling. Virtual networks. Mentoring/ coaching	National/regional education legislation. Interpersonal skills. General leadership skills. Resource management. Organisation development. Pedagogical leadership. Evaluation and accountability. Improving school climate
Northern Ireland	2	The Professional Qualification for Headship (Northern Ireland) is offered to those aspiring to headship. It is not mandatory	16 months for those with considerable experience of senior leadership. 28 months for those with experience of middle leadership	The Regional Training Unit for Northern Ireland provides training on behalf of all the employing bodies	Funded places are offered by the Department of Education Northern Ireland	A blended model of face to face tutoring and training, online support through a virtual learning environment and provision of study materials	The content is directly related to the knowledge, professional qualities and actions that are required of head teachers in the 6 key areas of headship outlined in the National Standards for Headteachers (Northern Ireland) 2005
Norway	1	Optional	m	m	m	m	m

Country	Target group	How offered	Typical length	Institution responsible	Who pays	Delivery methods	Content
Portugal	1	Mandatory: for candidates without experience in school management Optional: for candidates with experience in school management	250 hours for an academic qualification in school management	Universities and high school education	Programme participants	Universities have to develop the following competences: critical analysis; intervention; formation, supervision and evaluation; consulting	School management and administration
Slovenia	1 2,3	Mandatory licence at the end of training or within 1 year of taking up post Optional	6 weeks 144 contact hours (in 1 or 2 years)	Institution run by central educational authority	Central educational authority	Course based training, experience based training, group work, self study, virtual networks	Organisational development, general leadership, interpersonal skills, resource management, evaluation and accountability, national legislation
Spain	1 3	Mandatory (i.e. requirement established by the central/regional educational authority) Optional	70 hours	Institution run by regional educational authority	Regional educational authority	Course-based training	National/regional education legislation. Interpersonal skills. General leadership skills. Resource management. Organisation development. Pedagogical leadership. Evaluation and accountability. Improving school climate.
Sweden	1	Optional/discretion of local authority	Varies.	m	m	m	m

Note: The term preparatory training refers to training for school leadership that takes place before the training participants start in the school leadership post. Training may be offered to pre-selected candidates during the time between appointment and starting the post, or it may be offered to a wider group of interested participants.
m = Information missing

Target group:

1. Pre-selected candidates for principalship: individuals who have been chosen for a principal position but who have not started the post yet.
2. Potential candidates: individuals, mostly teachers, aspiring to school leadership positions (e.g. principal, assistant principal or other management positions with similar responsibilities) who have not yet passed the formal selection process for the position. Preparatory training may be part of the selection process, or it may be seen as an additional qualification.
3. Pre-selected candidates for other school leadership positions: individuals who have been chosen for other school level leadership positions (e.g. assistant principal, assistant headmaster and other leadership/management positions with similar responsibilities) but who have not started the post yet.

Source: OECD *Improving School Leadership* Country Questionnaires.

Annex 4.A2

Formal induction programmes for beginning school leadership, 2006/07, public schools

Country	Target group	How offered	Typical length	Responsible for supporting new principals during programmes	Who pays
Australia	1,2	In most cases mandatory	Typically 1-2 days	Jurisdictions	Jurisdictions
Austria	1	Mandatory. Part of national requirements to become a fully fledged principal	Two years	Training institute linked to Pädagogische Hochschule	Central/regional educational authority
Belgium (Fr.)	1	Not offered	a	a	a
Denmark	1,2	At the discretion of municipal educational authorities or of the individual school	Primary schools: 3-5 weeks introduction Secondary and upper secondary: From master programmes of 1 year. (60 ECTS) to shorter 1-week courses	Primary schools: Municipal education programme in co-operation between all municipalities. Secondary and upper secondary: universities, university colleges and private providers	Primary school: Municipality. Secondary and upper secondary individual schools fund it with their government appropriation
England	1	Optional, local authority, NCSL offers Early Headship Provision (EHP)	EHP grant can be used over first three years in post. Most LA provision will be at least one year	In EHP NCSL has contracts with 3 providers; these offer some of the support directly, e.g. New Visions but also have a brokerage function	NCSL grant of £2500 funded by DCFS. Other funding will be from school's own budget
	2	Optional, school level	Will vary between one and three terms	Multiple possibilities for external provision, with much done by internal coaching	From within schools' CPD budgets
Finland	1,2	Optional	Not specified	Not specified	Central/regional educational authority, Municipal/local educational authority, Programme participants

Country	Target group	How offered	Typical length	Responsible for supporting new principals during programmes	Who pays
Hungary	1	At the discretion of local authorities or not offered	1-2 days	Municipal educational authorities if there is such a programme	Municipal educational authorities if there is such a programme
Ireland	1,2	Optional	Two years (75-100 contact hours, including class, online learning and mentoring) for principals; 1-2 years for other school leaders	Leadership Development for Schools	Central Education Authority
Israel	1	Municipal/local educational authorities with the support of county superintendent	1-3 years	1. Superintendent of schools at the county level. 2. Municipal and local education authority	Regional educational authority. Municipal/local educational authority
New Zealand	1	Optional	18 months	University of Auckland on behalf of the Ministry of Education	Central educational authority
Northern Ireland	1,2	Optional but with strong expectations from the central authority and the various employing bodies	One year training with up to an additional year of on-line support	Jointly planned between the Regional Training Unit (RTU) and the employing authorities. RTU delivers on leadership matters. Induction on managerial and procedural matters is organised by each employing body	Funded by RTU
Norway	1/2	Offered at the discretion of municipal /local educational authorities	m	Other (all suggested answers)	Central and municipal authorities
Portugal	a	Not offered	a	a	a
Slovenia	1	Optional	One year	National School for Leadership in Education School leadership/management personnel from other schools and state educational authority	Central education authority

Country	Target group	How offered	Typical length	Responsible for supporting new principals during programmes	Who pays
Spain	a	Not offered	a	a	a
Sweden	1,2	National head teachers' training programme at the discretion of local educational authorities	Three years	Universities (in 8 geographical areas)	50/50 national authority/local authority

Note: The term induction programmes refers to organised arrangements for supporting and monitoring beginning school principals at the start of their careers. They typically include support specially devised to provide guidance, assistance, coaching, mentoring and advice to new school leaders and may also include compulsory training which could serve to confirm their appointment.

a = not applicable

m = information missing

Target group:

1. Principal: the school head teacher, director or administrator who holds the highest leadership position within an individual school.
2. Other school leadership personnel: school level professional personnel (other than the principal) whose primary or major responsibility is for school leadership, management and administration. It includes assistant principals, assistant head teachers and other leadership/management staff with similar responsibilities.

Source: OECD *Improving School Leadership* Country Questionnaires.

Annex 4.A3

In-service professional development for school leadership, 2006/07, public schools

Country	Target group	Responsible for decision	How training is provided	Support for training	Delivery method	Content
Australia	1,2	Jurisdictions and individual principals	May be universities, vocational training organisations, independent training providers or education authorities	Jurisdiction support or programme participants	Varies greatly but incorporates course-based training, group work, self study and virtual networks	Varies greatly across all aspects of school management and educational leadership
Austria	1	Central/regional educational authority	Institution run by central/regional educational authority	Central/regional educational authority	Course-based training, Experience-based training, group work, self-study, one-to-one counselling, virtual networks	National/regional education legislation. Interpersonal skills. General leadership skills. Resource management. Organisation development. Pedagogical leadership. Evaluation and accountability. Improving school climate
Belgium (Fr.)	Not offered	a	a	a	a	a
Denmark	1,2	Principal, municipality, school board or individual school	University or training institute or independent training provider	Primary school: Municipality, Secondary and upper secondary individual schools fund it with their government appropriation	Depending on the type of course	Different aspects of the skills necessary in leadership
England	1	Head with SIP and/or governing body	NCSL/other providers (LA, university, etc.)	School's own budget	Will depend on provision	Will depend on needs of HT. Often will be updating on new requirements and how to enact
	2	Individual, with line manager (often head at this level)				Will depend on needs of leader

Country	Target group	Responsible for decision	How training is provided	Support for training	Delivery method	Content
Finland	1	Municipal/local educational authority, Principal	Institution run by central / regional / municipal educational authority, University or training institute linked to university, Independent training provider	Institution run by central / regional / municipal educational authority	Not specified	Programme dependent
	2	Principal, teaching staff	Training institute linked to university; independent training provider	Central (the state), municipal authority (maintainer), programme participants	Course-based training; experience-based training; self-study	Varies greatly, e.g. organisation development, pedagogical leadership, evaluation
Ireland	1	Principal	Institution run by central educational authority, e.g. Leadership Development for Schools, Education Centres	Central Education Authority	Course based training Action Learning Networks	National education legislation. Interpersonal Skills. General leadership skills. Organisation development. Resource management. Pedagogical leadership. Curriculum and Assessment. Improving school climate. School Development Planning
	2	Principal, Participants themselves				
Israel	1	Inspector and principal	Independent training provider. It could be university or college of education or expert person.	Central educational authority and municipal educational authority.	Course based training, Group work, Experience based training	Building school programme, management budget, planning curriculum, pedagogical leadership, evaluation, improving school climate
	2	Principal	Usually the principal invites expert person	Independent training programme. It could be the persons or institution contributing to covering the costs	Course based training, Group work, Experience based training	Interpersonal skills, knowledge and skills in the discipline

Country	Target group	Responsible for decision	How training is provided	Support for training	Delivery method	Content
New Zealand	1	Board of Trustees	University or training institute.	Central educational authority	Course-based training, Experienced-based training, Virtual networks	National/regional education legislation. Interpersonal skills
	2	Principal	Independent training provider			General leadership skills Resource management Organisation development Pedagogical leadership Evaluation and accountability Improving school climate
Northern Ireland	1	Principal	A full suite of in-service development programmes is provided by Regional Training Unit, Northern Ireland (RTU)	Through the Regional Training Unit	Course and conference based training includes group work and self study. Virtual networks exist in connection with several of the courses	Emphasis is on leadership and management skills outlined in National Standards for Headship (NI) needed for school and personal development in differing contexts
	2	The Principal in consultation with the leadership personnel	As above with some conferences organised by the appropriate employing body	Largely through RTU except for short courses provided by individual employing bodies	Course and conference based training includes group work and self study	Personal and professional development. Building Leadership capacity. Management skills
Norway	1,2	Municipal/local educational authority, principal	Institution run by central / regional / local educational authority, university or training institute linked to university, independent training provider	Central and municipal authorities	m	m
Portugal	1	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia	1	Principal	Various	Central education authority and programme participants	Various	Various
	2	Principal, usually in agreement with personnel				

Country	Target group	Responsible for decision	How training is provided	Support for training	Delivery method	Content
Spain	1	m	m	m	m	m
Sweden	1,2	Local educational authority	Institution run by central / regional / local educational authority, inspectorate, university or training institute linked to university, independent training provider	Local educational authority	Course-based training. Experience-based training. Group work. Self-study. One-on-one counselling. Virtual networks	National/regional education legislation. Interpersonal skills. General leadership skills. Resource management. Organisation development. Pedagogical leadership. Evaluation and accountability. Improving school climate

Note: Professional development refers to in-service training which seeks to update, develop and broaden the knowledge and skills of school leaders who have been in the post for a while. Professional development may also be provided to accompany the implementation of education reforms.

a = not applicable

m = information missing

Target group:

1. Principal: the school head teacher, director or administrator who holds the highest leadership position within an individual school.
2. Other school leadership personnel: school level professional personnel (other than the principal) whose primary or major responsibility is for school leadership, management and administration. It includes assistant principals, assistant head teachers and other leadership/management staff with similar responsibilities.

Source: OECD *Improving School Leadership* Country Questionnaires.

References

- Bal, J. and J. de Jong (2007), “Improving School Leadership - OECD Review, Background Report for the Netherlands”, prepared for the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, Netherlands, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Bass, B. (1990), *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, Free Press, New York NY.
- Bereiter, M. and M. Scardamalia (1993), *Surpassing Ourselves: An Inquiry into the Nature and Implications of Expertise*, Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago IL.
- Blossing, U. and M. Ekholm (2005) “School Reforms and Local Response in the Long Run, A Twenty-year Longitudinal Study of 35 Swedish ‘Grund’ Schools”, paper presented at the Second OECD Conference on Evidence-Based Policy Research, Stockholm, 27-28 January, 2005.
- Bright, T. and N. Ware (2003), *Were You Prepared? Findings from a National Survey of Headteachers*, National College for School Leadership, Nottingham.
- Bush, T. and D. Glover (2004), *Leadership Development: Evidence and Beliefs*, National College for School Leadership, Nottingham.
- Cameron, M., S. Lovett, R. Baker, R. and P. Waiti (2004) *Evaluation of First Time Principals Induction Programme 2003*, New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington.
- CCL (Center for Creative Leadership) (2007), *Catholic Healthcare Partners – Developing Next-Generation Leaders with an Action-Learning Approach*, a “Story of Impact” Presentation, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, North Carolina, viewed on line 12 January, at www.ccl.org/leadership/pdf/aboutCCL/chp.pdf.
- Collins, D. and E. Holton (2004), “The Effectiveness of Managerial Leadership Development Programs: A Meta-analysis of Studies from 1982 to 2001”, *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15 (2), pp. 217-248.
- CCSSO (Council of Chief State School Officers) (1996), *Standards for School Leaders*, Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, Washington, DC.
- CCSSO (2000), *Standards-Based Professional Development for School Leaders*, Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, Washington, DC.
- Crow, G. M. (2001), *School Leader Preparation: A Short Review of the Knowledge Base*, National College for School Leadership, available at www.ncsl.org.uk/researchpublications.
- Devos, G. and M. Tuytens (2006), “Improving School Leadership - OECD Review. Background Report for Flanders”, a report prepared for the Flemish Ministry of Education and Training, Belgium, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership
- Darling-Hammond, L., M. LaPointe, D. Meyerson, M.T. Orr and C. Cohen (2007), *Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World: Lessons from Exemplary Leadership Development Programs*, Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, Palo Alto, CA.

- Davis, S., L. Darling-Hammond, M. LaPointe and D. Meyerson (2005), *Review of Research, School Leadership Study: Developing Successful Principals*, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, commissioned by the Wallace Foundation, Palo Alto, CA.
- DePinto, R. and J. Deal (2004), “Differences in the Developmental Needs of Managers at Multiple Levels, A research project presentation”, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC, viewed on line 12 January 2008, at www.ccl.org/leadership/pdf/community/siop2004emerging.pdf.
- Elmore, R. (2008), “Leadership as the Practice of Improvement”, in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Ericsson, K. and A. Lehmann (1996), “Expert and Exceptional Performance: Evidence of Maximal Adaptation to Task Constraints”, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47, pp. 273-305.
- Evans, P. and N. Mohr (1999), “Professional Development for Principals: Seven Core Beliefs”, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80 (7), pp. 530-533.
- Fenwick, L. and M. Pierce (2002), “Professional Development of Principals”, ERIC digest (ED477731), viewed on line 8 January 2008, at www.ericdigests.org/2004-1/principals.htm.
- Fitzpatrick, R.J. (2007), “Improving School Leadership, Country Background Report for Northern Ireland”, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Fuentes Díaz, R. (2007), “Improving School Leadership. Country Background Report for Chile”, a report prepared for the School Management and Educational Improvement Unit, General Education Division, Ministry of Education, Chile, www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Griswell, C. and A. Martin (2007), “10 Trends: A Study of Senior Executives’ Views of the Future”, A CCL White Paper, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC, viewed on line 12 January 2008 at www.ccl.org/leadership/pdf/research/TenTrends.pdf.
- Gronn, P. (2003), *The New Work of Educational Leaders: Changing Leadership Practice in an Era of School Reform*, Paul Chapman Publishing, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Hernez-Broomes, G. and R. Hughes (2004), “Leadership Development: Past, Present and Future”, reprinted with permission from *Human Resource Planning*, 27 (1) (2004), viewed on line 12 January 2008 at www.ccl.org/leadership/research/sharing/index.aspx.
- Higham, R., D. Hopkins and E. Ahtaridou, (2007), “Improving School Leadership, Country Background Report for England”, a report prepared for the Department for Children, Schools and Families, England, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Hobson, A. (2003), *Mentoring and Coaching for New Leaders*, National College for School Leadership, Nottingham.
- Hogan, R., G. Curphy, J. Hogan. (1994), “What We Know about Leadership: Effectiveness and Personality”, *American Psychologist*, 49, pp. 493-504.

- House, R. and R. Aditya (1997), “The Social Scientific Study of Leadership: Quo vadis?” *Journal of Management*, 23, pp. 409-473.
- Huber, S.G. (2004), *Preparing School Leaders for the 21st Century: An International Comparison of Development Programs in 15 Countries*, Taylor & Francis Group, London.
- Huber, S.G. (2008) “Management and Leadership Development – New Approaches in Preparing School Leaders” in *International Encyclopaedia of Education*, Elsevier.
- Ingvarson, L., M. Anderson, P. Gronn and A. Jackson (2006), *Standards for School Leadership: A Critical Review of the Literature*, Teaching Australia, Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership Ltd., Canberra.
- Knapp, M. S., M.A. Copland, J.E. Tabert (2003), *Leading For Learning: Reflective Tools for School and District Leaders*, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, Seattle.
- Koren, A. (ed.) (2007), “Improving School Leadership, Country Background Report for Slovenia”, a report prepared by the School for Leadership in Education for the Ministry for Education and Sport, Slovenia, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Lambrecht, J., C. Hopkins, J. Moss Jr., C. Finch, (2008), “Importance of On-the-Job Experiences in Developing Leadership Capabilities” (MDS-814), viewed on line 17 January 2008 at <http://vocserve.berkeley.edu/Summaries/814sum.html>.
- Lankard, B., (1996), “New Ways of Learning in the Workplace”, ERIC Digest, viewed on line 7 January 2008 at www.ericdigests.org/1996-2/work.html.
- LDS (2007), “Improving School Leadership OECD Project, Background Report – Ireland”, a report prepared by the Leadership Development for Schools (LDS) Programme for the Department of Education and Science, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Louden, W. and H. Wildy (1999), “Short Shrift to Long Lists: An Alternative Approach to the Development of Performance Standards for School Principals”, *Journal of Educational Administration*. 37(2), pp. 99-120.
- Luck, C. (2003), *It’s Good to Talk: An Enquiry into the Value of Mentoring as an Aspect of Professional Development for New Headteachers*, National College for School Leadership, Nottingham, England.
- Mahieu, P. (1998), “Het Jaar 8, Schoolleiding in Historisch Perspectief”, in L. Braeckmans, P. Mahieu and G. Van Horebeek, *De Schoolleider in Beeld, 25 Jaar Directie-opleidingen*, Garant, Leuven/Apeldoorn
- Martin, A. (2007a), “What’s Next? The 2007 Changing Nature of Leadership Survey”, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC, viewed on line 12 January 2008, at www.ccl.org/leadership/pdf/research/WhatsNext.pdf.
- Martin, A. (2007b), “The Changing Nature of Leadership: A CCL White Paper”, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC, viewed on line 12 January, 2008 at www.ccl.org/leadership/pdf/research/NatureLeadership.pdf.
- Marquardt, M., (1997), *Harnessing the Power of Action Learning*, American Society for Training and Development, Alexandria, VA.

- Matthews, P., H. Moorman and D. Nusche (2008), “Building Leadership Capacity for System Improvement in Victoria, Australia”, a case study report for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership and in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- McCall, M.W., M.M. Lombardo and A.M. Morrison (1988), *Lessons of Experience, How Successful Executives Develop on the Job*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Møller, J., M. Schratz (forthcoming 2008), “Leadership Development in Europe”, in Crow, G., J. Lumby and P. Pashiardis (eds.), *UCEA/BELMAS/CCEAM International Handbook on the Preparation and Development of School Leaders*, Erlbaum Publishing Company, Mahwah, NJ.
- Moorman, H., (1997), *Professional Development of School Principals for Leadership of High Performance Learning Communities*, the preliminary report of the Danforth Foundation Task Force on Leadership of High Performance Learning Communities, dated 20 September 1999. Excerpts viewed 8 January 2008, at www.e-lead.org/principles/principal.asp.
- Morgan, M. and C. Sugrue (2005), *Evaluation of the MISNEACH Programme*, Clare Education Centre, Ennis, Ireland.
- Murphy, J., H. Moorman and M. McCarthy (accepted for publication), *A Framework for Rebuilding Initial Certification and Preparation Programs in Educational Leadership: Lessons from Whole-State Reform Initiatives*, Teachers College Record, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY.
- NCSL (National College for School Leadership) (2003a), “What Leaders Read 1”, summary of Yukl, G. (2001), *Leadership in Organisations*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- NCSL (2003b), “What Leaders Read 1”, summary of McCall, M., M. Lombardo and A. Morrison (1988), *The Lessons of Experience*, The Free Press, New York, NY.
- NSDC (National Staff Development Council) (2001), *Standards for Staff Development* (revised), Oxford, Ohio.
- Newmann, F., B. King and P. Youngs (2000), “Professional Development that Addresses School Capacity: Lessons from Urban Elementary Schools”, *American Journal of Education*, 108 (4), pp. 259-299.
- New Zealand Ministry of Education (2002) *Principals’ Development Package*, unpublished paper.
- Northouse, P. (1997), *Leadership Theory and Practice*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- OECD (2001), *New School Management Approaches*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2004), *Trends in Human Resources Management Policies in OECD Countries: An Analysis of the Results of the OECD Survey on Strategic Human Resources Management*, OECD, Paris.
- Orr, M. T. (2003), “Evaluating Educational Leadership Preparation: A Review of Empirical, Conceptual and Methodological Literature”, paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

- Orr, M.T. and S. Orphanos (2007), “Learning Leadership Matters: Teachers’ Experiences of Innovatively and Conventionally Prepared Principals”, paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Orr, M.T., R. Silverberg and B. Letendre (2006), “Comparing Leadership Programmes from Pipeline to Preparation to Advancement: A Study of Multiple Institutions Leadership Preparation Programmes”, paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Schratz, M. and K. Petzold (2007), “Improving School Leadership, Country Background Report for Austria”, A report prepared by the Department of Teacher Education and School Research, University of Innsbruck for the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, the Arts and Culture, Austria, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Scottish Executive Education Department (2007), “Improving School Leadership, OECD Background Report: Scotland”, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- SREB (Southern Regional Education Board) (undated), *University Leadership Network Framework*, Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, GA, viewed on line 7 January 2008 at www.sreb.org/main/Leadership/UnivLead/SREB_UniversityLeadershipFramework.pdf.
- SREB (undated), *Schools Can’t Wait: Accelerating the Redesign of University Principal Preparation Programs*, Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, GA, viewed on line 7 January 2008, at www.sreb.org/programs/hstw/publications/special/06V04_Schools_Cant_Wait.pdf.
- SREB (undated), *Good Principals Aren’t Born – They’re Mentored: Are We Investing Enough to Get the School Leaders We Need?*, Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, GA.
- Stewart, D. (2000), *Tomorrow’s Principals Today*, Kanuka Grove Press, Palmerston North.
- Stoll, L., H. Moorman and S. Rahm (2008), “Building Leadership Capacity for System Improvement in Austria”, a case study report for the OECD activity *Improving School Leadership*, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership and in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Swedish National Agency for School Improvement (2007), “Improving School Leadership, Background Report Sweden”, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Tjedvoll, A., C. Wales and A. Welle-Strand A. (2005), “School Leadership Training Under Globalization: Comparisons of the UK, the US and Norway”, in *Managing Global Transitions*, 3 (1), Spring.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Institute on Educational Governance (1999), *Effective Leaders for Today’s Schools: Synthesis of a Policy Forum of Educational Leadership*, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC.

- Waters, J. T., R.J. Marzano and B.A. McNulty (2003), *Balanced leadership: What 30 Years of Research Tells Us About the Effect of Leadership on Student Achievement*, Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning, Aurora, CO.
- West-Burnham, J. and J. Ireson (undated), *Leadership Development & Personal Effectiveness*, National College for School Leadership, Nottingham.
- Yukl, G. (2001), *Leadership in Organisations*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ

Chapter 5

Making school leadership an attractive profession

This chapter analyses the supply of school leaders and identifies policy levers to make the school leadership profession more attractive to suitable candidates. Large numbers of serving school leaders will be retiring over the next years and this is causing concerns about school leader shortages in a number of countries. School leadership is often perceived as an unattractive profession, for which fewer candidates are applying. Some countries report that teachers and middle managers show little interest in moving up to top school leadership positions due to negative images attached to the job, inadequate recruitment structures, high levels of responsibility and relatively low salaries. In order to make school leadership more successful in recruiting and retaining high quality candidates, strategic policy action is necessary. It should focus on professionalising recruitment and succession processes, aligning rewards and incentives with new responsibilities and designing career development opportunities for school leaders.

As previous chapters have highlighted, rapid changes in society and education require new forms of leadership. School leaders' responsibilities, preparation and training and working conditions all need to be revised. This chapter focuses on policies aimed at recruiting competent people into the profession and providing incentives for high performance for current and future leaders.

Many countries are expecting a generational change as the baby boom generation of school leaders retires. While this means a major loss of experience, it also provides an unprecedented opportunity to recruit a new generation of school leaders with the knowledge, skills and dispositions to meet the current and future needs of education systems. But some countries report that teachers and middle management show little interest in moving up to top leadership positions. To make school leadership a more attractive profession, countries should consider designing more effective succession planning and recruitment strategies, providing appropriate rewards, improving employment conditions and defining more career prospects for school leadership.

5.1 The supply of school leaders

While the average age of school leaders is rising across OECD countries (Chapter 1), many countries are simultaneously reporting decreasing numbers of applications for school leadership positions. Some speak of an approaching "leadership crisis". This first section analyses the supply situation of school leadership personnel and examines motivating and discouraging factors that influence the decision of individuals to apply for school leadership.

Countries have difficulties in filling the position of principal

It should be noted that in most countries the concerns about shortages in school leadership personnel actually refer to difficulties in filling the position of *principal*. While most participating countries have concerns about declining application numbers for the position of principal, hardly any country reports shortages of middle leaders, assistant or deputy principals.

Out of the 22 education systems participating in the *Improving School Leadership* activity, 15 reported difficulties in finding enough suitable candidates for principalship. In Chile for example, various municipalities face difficulties in finding the required five suitable applicants for the second stage of the public contest for school leadership positions. In Hungary, it is estimated that only about 1.25 candidates apply per post on average, normally including the current principal. In England, almost one-third of principal posts are re-advertised because no suitable candidate comes forward. In Norway, the Netherlands and Scotland, principal posts have also been advertised for lengthy periods of time. Among the countries not experiencing difficulties in recruiting principals, Portugal reports that this is due to the fact that 80-90% of these positions have been occupied by teachers who had been elected as principals by their peers.

Succession planning surveys in different countries have revealed that teachers and school-level management staff with high leadership potential are often not interested in moving up to principalship. For example, NCSL (2006a) reports that in England 43% of deputy heads and 70% of middle leaders express a desire not to move into headship. Another survey conducted in two English and Welsh local education authorities (James and Whiting, 1998a and 1998b) found that merely 18% of secondary deputy head

teachers were actively seeking headship and only 25% were planning to do so in the future. In a study from the United States (Pounder and Merrill, 2000, cited in Norton, 2003), only 30% of 170 high school assistant principals and middle school principals indicated that they had a career goal to seek a high school principalship.

Factors influencing the motivation of individuals to apply for school leadership

In order to widen the applicant pool for school leadership, it is important for policy makers to understand which factors influence people's decisions to apply for school leadership.

Intrinsic motivations such as intellectual fulfilment and contributing to school improvement are often emphasised as main factors why people choose to become educational leaders. In Canada, Begley *et al.* (1990) found that intrinsic motivation including a commitment to lifelong learning and wanting to make a difference were strong attractors to school leadership positions. In line with these results, Beaudin *et al.*'s (2002) findings from the United States confirm that nearly 50% of administrators and 39% of teachers were attracted to leadership positions because they presented a new challenge and an opportunity to make a difference. In a 2004 survey on attitudes towards the role of the primary principal conducted by a stakeholder group in Ireland, the top two persuading factors of teachers who intended to become principals were "keen to influence school culture" and "desire to become a leader of a school community" (IPPN, 2006). In a comparative study of Australian and American principals, Su *et al.* (2003) reveal that in both countries principals are primarily motivated by intrinsic rewards, such as having a personally satisfying job, providing effective leadership and making a contribution to society.

At the same time, a number of factors related to recruitment and working conditions of school leaders may act as barriers to potentially interested candidates. First, the procedures used may discourage qualified individuals. In Australia, for example, research from several states has shown that school-based selection processes are widely seen as flawed. In a Western Australian survey, almost half of the respondents cited the selection process as the biggest deterrent to potential applicants (Pritchard, 2003).

Second, potential future leaders may be hesitant to apply because of concerns about role overload and work-life balance. Beaudin *et al.* (2002) found that in the United States the longer working hours required by principalship were an important factor discouraging potential candidates. An Australian succession planning survey (Lacey, 2000) revealed that the strongest disincentives for promotion to principalship identified by teachers included negative effects on family, stress level of the job, impact of societal problems on the role and time required by the role. A case study from England (James and Whiting, 1998a) identified role overload and negative impact on the individual's family as two (out of six) important factors that had influenced the decision of deputy heads not to apply for headship.

Third, the relatively low salary levels also seem to have an impact on the decision of teachers not to apply for principalship (Kimball and Sirotnik, 2000; Norton, 2003; Whitaker, 2001). In the United States, studies by Whitaker (2001; 2002) identify low salaries as the top factor discouraging potential applicants and ERS (1998, 2000) found that superintendents perceive insufficient salaries as compared to responsibilities as the most important barrier in applying for principalship. Studies from Australia (Lacey, 2002) also cited salaries as a strong discourager for potential applicants.

Finally, lack of career prospects for promotion and job development may contribute to make school leadership an unattractive career choice. Most countries do not seem to offer opportunities for principals' further career development. At the OECD school leadership development conference held in Dublin 7-8 November 2007, some delegates referred to principalship as a "life sentence" because the possibilities for career development are so limited. In an exploratory study on causes of principal burnout, Whitaker (1996) finds that principals in the United States do not have clear ideas on what they could do after leaving principalship; most of them think of either going back to teaching or moving to positions within the educational administration. In many countries, a return to teaching after principalship is considered problematic, but there are few other possibilities.

The above findings suggest that policies to recruit and maintain a highly motivated school leadership workforce need to ensure both that intrinsic motivation is sustained and that extrinsic incentives are provided to attract motivated candidates. Johnson *et al.* (2005) have revealed in the case of teachers that there are important interactions between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. For example, salary levels may become more important as a motivating factor when other circumstances make it difficult for individuals to perform well (OECD, 2006). Extrinsic rewards can play an important role in raising motivation for unexciting and routine tasks and if introduced in appropriate contexts, they may also raise the motivation for inherently interesting activities (OECD, 2006).

The analysis of factors influencing the motivation of potential leaders needs to be contextualised. In most countries, difficulties in attracting candidates for school leadership are not a generalised phenomenon, but are concentrated in certain types of schools or certain areas. For example, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland and Northern Ireland report particular difficulties in attracting leaders to small schools and in Austria it is difficult to find candidates for certain geographical regions due to low population mobility. In Belgium (Flanders) and England, schools in urban areas are facing particular difficulties. In England, head teacher vacancies are about five times higher in inner city London areas than in other schools. In France, the Flemish Community of Belgium, Northern Ireland and the Netherlands, problems related to filling vacancies are concentrated in primary education.

Other countries report that no research has been undertaken at the national level on why qualified candidates choose not to apply for school leadership. In order to pre-empt a possible decline in school leadership quantity or quality, policy makers need better knowledge about the country-specific circumstances discouraging individuals from applying for school leadership positions.

Workforce policies aimed at making school leadership a more attractive profession should focus on improving the factors that have been found to negatively influence the motivation of highly qualified candidates. These factors include inappropriate succession planning and recruitment, inadequate support, incentives and rewards and lack of opportunities for career development. While these factors seem relevant for most OECD countries, it is important to keep in mind that the supply situation of principals varies significantly across different settings and that responses need to be adapted to national, regional and local context.

5.2 Recruiting an effective workforce

The objective of any recruitment process is to choose a candidate who will successfully perform in the vacant position and do so better than all other candidates (DEECD, 2007). In order to make the process as objective as possible, it is important to develop systematic frameworks ensuring that the recruitment procedures and criteria used are effective, transparent and consistent. Recruitment processes can have a strong impact on school leadership quality. Future training and development programmes for school leadership will have a greater impact if they are delivered to individuals who already bring high motivation and leadership potential to the job.

What qualifications do school leaders need?

The first step in designing recruitment procedures for school leaders is to define *eligibility criteria* which all candidates must meet regardless of the characteristics of other candidates. This involves the choice of whether to select future leaders from outside the education sector or to foster them within it or both. While almost all countries have so far chosen to recruit from within, some are beginning to experiment with ways of bringing competences from outside the education sector into school leadership teams.

The second step is to determine *selection criteria* which allow recruitment panels to select the best qualified individual *from a given pool of eligible candidates*. Selection criteria should articulate the essential characteristics needed by the incumbent to successfully perform on the job, as well as desirable factors that would strengthen a candidate's application in comparison with other candidates. Traditionally, selection criteria have often involved seniority as a teacher, but more recently in many countries recruitment processes focus more on the actual skills and competences of candidates than on length of experience as a teacher.

Currently across OECD countries, the single most important eligibility criterion to become a school leader is to have a teaching background (Annex 5.A1.). In 14 out of 19 countries for which specific information is available, candidates for school leadership must hold a teaching or pedagogical qualification. In New Zealand, a formal qualification is not mandatory, but eligible candidates must be currently registered as teachers. In most of these countries, candidates must also have several years of teaching experience. The exceptions are England, Portugal, Sweden and Norway. In England, successful completion of the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) is the only eligibility criterion and in Portugal applicants must have followed training on school management or prove that they have management experience. In Sweden, candidates must prove they have “pedagogical insight” and some kind of educational experience and in Norway the local authorities decide about eligibility criteria.

While only a few countries have experimented with recruiting school leaders from outside education, *Improving School Leadership* country representatives and participants have vividly debated whether or not all school leaders should be required to have prior experience or qualification as teachers. While most would agree that pedagogical competences should be represented within school leadership, the wide range of leadership tasks to be fulfilled can make it necessary to recruit both a pedagogical leader with a teaching background and a more managerial leader with competences in areas such as communication and financial and human resource management.

Some argue that schools are complex organisations that call for sophisticated managerial and entrepreneurial skills not always readily available in the teaching ranks. Particularly in the vocational and technical sector, the school missions and areas of specialisation are as close to private industry as they are to education. Private sector expertise is likely to be beneficial to schools and the requirement for a teaching degree may place an obstacle in the way of potential leadership candidates. Danish representatives, for example, suggested that not all school leaders needed to be trained as teachers if these important pedagogical competences are already represented within the school leadership team.

Others disagree, stating that schools should be led exclusively by pedagogues. They alone will have the sensitivity to staff and intimate knowledge of the educational core necessary for schools to succeed. Abundant amounts of untapped leadership talent lie latent in schools. It is necessary to put more effort and resources into identifying and developing this talent. Certainly no efforts at recruiting from outside should be considered until all possible efforts to tap what talent can be found in schools have been exhausted, so this argument has it. The Northern Ireland Regional Training Unit for example does not believe that new school leaders will come from outside the teaching profession. Rather, it looks to the quality and capacity of the young professionals who enter the teaching profession and whose entry into leadership positions needs to be facilitated.

There are strengths and weaknesses in both arguments. Much talent in schools appears unwilling to move up to leadership ranks and experience as a teacher – or even as a subordinate administrator – may sometimes do relatively little to prepare for the job of principal. More emphasis needs to be put on succession planning to widen the applicant pool among teachers themselves. Opening leadership positions to candidates from outside schools but with an understanding of pedagogy, as Sweden has done, is another way of responding.

Although there are legitimate arguments on both sides of this issue, it appears that the size and complexity of some schools can call for leadership teams where one or more members bring competences found in managers and leaders from outside the education sector. Schools or clusters of schools could benefit from the business expertise of someone who does not have qualified teacher status but who could manage the complexity of school finances or establish links with local industries.

The Netherlands is one of the few countries having introduced the recruitment of school leaders from outside education. Initial evaluation results of the Dutch pilot programme report positive developments (Box 5.1). Sweden is another example of a country where it is possible to employ school leaders with non-teaching backgrounds. But this happens only rarely: in 2005, around 3% of the school leaders did not have a teaching background. These included school psychologists, military officers and former managers of companies.

Beyond the baseline eligibility criteria, countries need to develop selection criteria to compare candidates with one another. Traditionally in a number of countries the selection of principals has been linked to their length of service as teacher. However, most countries have recognised the inadequacy of seniority as a major selection criterion and only a few countries including Austria, Korea and Spain maintain seniority as an important selection criterion. In many countries, there is a new emphasis on breaking hierarchical models of leadership to allow faster emergence of younger dynamic personnel into leadership positions. In Korea, for example, new selection criteria will be introduced to focus more on competences than on seniority as a teacher.

Box 5.1 Bringing business leaders into schools: experience from the Netherlands

In the Netherlands, a great deal of attention has recently been directed to recruiting school leaders from sectors other than education, especially for primary schools. One example is *Bazen van buiten*, a training programme for leaders from the business sector to become primary school leaders. These newly trained leaders have no qualifications in education; they focus entirely on management and leadership. According to the Dutch Country Background Report, initial evaluations showed positive results and considered this initiative as very promising. In the first round of the programme, 13 participants completed the training and became school leaders. Those involved in this project appreciated the fresh views brought into schools by the new leaders from outside education.

Source: Bal and de Jong (2007).

Most countries emphasise the need to consider a wide range of aspects in their assessment of candidates for school leadership. The most frequently used selection criteria are *management and/or leadership experience* (in Austria, Denmark, Ireland, Israel, Northern Ireland, Portugal and Spain), *additional academic or other qualifications* (in Austria, Ireland, Northern Ireland, Portugal and Spain), *interpersonal and personal skills* (in Austria, Denmark, Ireland and Northern Ireland), *vision/ values for school leadership* (Austria, Denmark Ireland and Israel) and the *quality of work proposals for the school* (in Austria, Denmark, Ireland and Israel).

Systematic frameworks are essential to make recruitment processes as objective as possible. The list of competences required for the job should take into account the current state of the school and possible future developments. For example, in Victoria (Australia), the Department of Education has developed five selection criteria that the Department believes capture the essential work of school leaders. In addition, the school council may add a community criterion that reflects specific local needs or challenges (Box 5.2). In England, while selection criteria are determined by the board of governors, the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) encourages governors to reflect on the major challenges facing the school, their aspirations for the future and possible future changes in the community and education system. Based on this analysis they are asked to describe the role and ideal candidate in a demanding but realistic way.

Box 5.2 Recruitment and selection criteria of school leaders in Victoria (Australia)

Prior to 2005, the Victorian recruitment process had been criticised for discouraging potential candidates from applying. To respond to this criticism, the Victorian State government introduced a new principal selection process in 2005, as part of its overall school improvement agenda. The major elements of this initiative include: modern recruitment practices rather than basing selection decisions largely on the results of interviews; principal representation on selection panels; tailoring of selection criteria to reflect the differing needs and characteristics of schools including key goals and targets; proactively encouraging applicants with the required profile to participate in the selection process; encouraging more two-way communication between candidates and the school.

Five mandatory selection criteria have been developed based on the critical domains of leadership that the Department for Education believes capture the essential work of school leaders, which are spelled out in the Department's *Developmental Learning Framework for School Leaders*. In addition, the non-mandatory community criterion to reflect local need may be included.

- **Technical Leadership:** Demonstrated capacity to effectively optimise the school's financial, physical and human resources through sound management practices and organisational systems and processes that contribute to the implementation of the school's vision and goals.
- **Human Leadership:** Demonstrated ability to foster a safe, purposeful and inclusive learning environment and the capacity to develop constructive and respectful relationships with staff, students, parents and other stakeholders.
- **Educational Leadership:** Demonstrated capacity to lead, manage and monitor the school improvement process through a current and critical understanding of the learning process and its implications for enhancing high-quality teaching and learning in every classroom in the school.
- **Symbolic Leadership:** Demonstrated capacity to model important values and behaviours to the school and community, including a commitment to creating and sustaining effective professional learning communities within the school and across all levels of the system.
- **Cultural Leadership:** An understanding of the characteristics of effective schools and a demonstrated capacity to lead the school community in promoting a vision of the future, underpinned by common purposes and values that will secure the commitment and alignment of stakeholders to realise the potential of all students.
- **Community Criterion:** The addition of a community criterion provides an opportunity for the school council (or committee if there is no school council) to frame a criterion informed by the specific context and leadership needs of the school.

Source: DEECD (2007).

Planning for leadership succession

If a country is to put more emphasis on nurturing and developing leadership within schools, it should focus on how best to identify and support future leaders early in their careers. Succession planning is essential to widen the applicant pool for school leadership and increase the quantity and quality of future school leaders. It involves fostering interest in leadership by providing opportunities for teachers to participate in leadership and to learn more about the day-to-day tasks it involves, as well as offering training for aspirant leaders.

Beyond small-scale case studies and doctoral theses, there is surprisingly little research on leadership succession in education. One of the most substantial is Hargreaves and Fink's (2006) investigation of leadership succession and sustainable leadership over 30 years in 8 Canadian and U.S. high schools. They identify four key factors in leadership succession.

- *Succession planning:* The process of following one leader with another. Most successions, they find, are unplanned reactions to events with little prior preparation before positions become vacant. Planned succession need not only be about promoting continuity and development of the departing leader's legacy, but where a school is performing beneath expectations, discontinuity may be the preferred scenario. In response, the authors advise that all school improvement plans should contain succession plans that identify the future leadership needs of the school as it progresses (without necessarily nominating specific individuals for particular roles). They also propose that those responsible for appointing or electing new leaders be clear about whether continuity or discontinuity is most needed.
- *Succession management:* The creation of large pools of leadership from which future leaders emerge. Succession management, Hargreaves and Fink point out, is increasingly common in the business sector. It connects leadership succession to the creation of greater distributed leadership. A key strategic choice here is whether potential leaders should be identified early then sponsored and mentored (*i.e.* select and develop), or whether distributed leadership should develop as many leaders as possible from which future successors will emerge (develop and select). One strategic way of handling succession management, they propose, is to create Leadership Development Schools where future leaders learn outstanding practices of leadership and learning in sites of concentrated excellence that they then carry to other parts of the system as their leadership responsibilities and careers progress.
- *Succession frequency and duration:* This addresses the optimum periods of leadership tenure and turnover. In Canada and the United States, Hargreaves and Fink determined that the optimum period appeared to be about five to seven years (see also Reeves *et al.*, 1998). Shorter tenures are insufficient to establish shared cultural commitment to the school's mission, while longer periods can give rise to coasting and complacency. However, research on the leadership in highly successful Welsh primary schools that operate in challenging circumstances shows that long tenures and high leadership stability can build effectiveness by developing trust with the community (James *et al.*, 2006; also Bryk and Schneider, 2004). In policy terms, therefore, establishing an expectancy for

minimum tenure (subject to performance), is a better priority than establishing an upper time limit, which may require more complex judgments and variable application.

- *Succession and the self*: This relates to personal development issues of leaving and not spoiling one's leadership legacy. This entails being able to face, accept and rise above the leaving of leadership, which is a rehearsal, in many ways, for the leaving of life. The personal task is to avoid holding others back in order to protect oneself and instead to leave a legacy by developing leadership capacities in others. These are essential issues to be addressed in programs that develop the personal, emotional and reflective capabilities of school leaders (Harris, 2007; Leithwood and Beatty 2008) and in leading others not just behind but also beside oneself through systemic leadership (Hopkins, 2008; Hargreaves *et al.*, 2008).

These four issues tie leadership succession to system leadership and distributed leadership through the broad principle of sustainable leadership. This is defined by Fullan (2005) as “the capacity of a system to engage in the complexities of continuous improvement consistent with deep values of human purpose” and by Hargreaves and Fink (2006) as leadership that “preserves and develops deep learning for all that spreads and lasts, in ways that do no harm to and indeed create positive benefit for others around ... now and in the future”.

In many countries, leadership succession relies on self-selection of talented candidates rather than on clear strategies to identify and develop future leaders. The country background reports quite clearly show that insufficient attention is being given to identifying and fostering potential future leaders in most countries. Research from Australia has shown that self-identification as leaders is a gradual process of trial and error during which individuals are emotionally vulnerable and often lack professional and systems support (Gronn and Lacey, 2004). Classroom teachers need to be encouraged to think of themselves as leaders as a first step towards proper succession planning.

Individuals who have gained some experience in leadership or aspects of it are more likely to be interested in leadership and to be confident in their capacity to do it (NCSL, 2006b). It is therefore important that potential leaders are given opportunities to participate in leadership early in their careers. This can be done by distributing leadership within the school and encouraging teachers to take on responsibility for certain areas or aspects of leadership (Chapter 3). Interest in leadership can also be fostered by shadowing programmes which allow teachers to observe and learn more about the concrete activities it entails.

High potential teachers need to be identified proactively and encouraged to develop their skills (Box 5.3). In-house professional development opportunities can be a good way for teachers to test their potential for management and leadership. Training opportunities may be targeted to develop leaders for schools particularly in need, or they may be embedded in larger strategies for school leadership development. In addition, including leadership topics in initial teacher training can foster interest among teachers with leadership potential in the longer term.

Box 5.3 Identifying and developing future leaders

Widening the applicant pool in Sweden

In the early 1980s, the state took initiatives to encourage Swedish municipalities to vitalise the recruitment of school leaders. Until then most newly recruited school leaders were men already working in the recruiting school. Debates followed. The state also initiated development work in some municipalities, where teachers interested in school leadership could work in “recruitment circles”. To get state grants to finance these circles the municipality had to prove that at least half of the participants were female. In these recruitment circles the participants studied literature about school leader work and met around ten times to discuss the literature. They also shadowed one of the school leaders in the municipality for some days, to get some impressions of the school leader’s perspective.

In 1987 the Swedish parliament accepted a bill requiring municipalities to arrange recruitment circles for teachers and others interested in school leader work. Smaller municipalities were asked to cooperate with each other or with larger municipalities to make the groups of the recruitment circles large enough to serve as a stimulating network. The National Board of Education produced support materials. Since then many teachers have had a good chance to taste the work of school leaders and decide whether they will go for such a job. Many municipalities now have a recruitment pool of teachers interested in going for school leadership. The director of education has been able to give shorter leadership assignments to people from this pool to test their abilities

The use of recruitment circles varies between municipalities. At the moment discussions are being held in different constellations to revitalise the idea. The costs involved are mainly replacement cover for teachers participating in the circles, especially for the period when they act as a school leader shadow. Municipalities consider that it has been a good investment in their educational system. Many more people – particularly women – now apply for school leader positions today compared with the 1980s

The Fast Track Programme in England

Fast Track Teaching is an accelerated leadership development programme run by the National College for School Leadership (NCSL). It is designed for those classroom teachers in the early stages of their careers who have demonstrated the potential to progress rapidly into senior leadership positions. The programme is designed to last up to five years, with the expectation that the Fast Track teacher will achieve their first assistant headship, deputy headship or advanced skills teacher post within four years. Evidence so far suggests that the Fast Track programme has an impact in helping to speed up the rate at which leadership candidates emerge

Source: Swedish National Agency for School Improvement (2007); NCSL website www.ncsl.org.uk/programmes/fasttrack.

Recruitment procedures

There is always a risk associated with appointing candidates before they have demonstrated their ability to perform successfully on the job. In order to reduce that risk, a number of recruitment tools or procedures have been tested in selection processes both inside and outside the education sector. Policy makers can provide selection panels with a choice of recruitment tools or guidelines for the selection process to ensure that all candidates get a fair chance to show their knowledge, skills and capabilities.

Most countries for which specific information is available rely on *interview performance* in order to select candidates for principal appointment (Austria, French

Community of Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, Israel, Northern Ireland, Norway and Sweden). Another traditionally used recruitment procedure is to require candidates to present *work proposals for the school* (in Austria, Chile, Hungary, Slovenia and Spain).

In many countries, there is a growing recognition that it is important to put less weight on mere interview performance. In England, governing bodies are encouraged to give candidates a chance to show their full range of capacities and personal skills through longer selection processes including visits, interviews, presentations and assessment of specific skills required for the job. In Austria recent assessment procedures have relied on modern recruitment mechanisms such as assessment centres and potential analyses (Box 5.4).

Box 5.4 Professionalising recruitment procedures in Austria

Recent policy measures in Austria have led to more competence oriented selection criteria, such as assessment centres and potential analyses. These procedures are partly commissioned to private firms whose involvement has helped to raise the standards in the selection of school leaders. This change has helped to motivate teachers for principalship who previously would not believed they would be recruited. One of the reported drawbacks is that hiring firms or buying recruitment software can make the recruitment process quite costly.

Source: Schratz and Petzold (2007).

Most participating countries report having open recruitment practices. This means that recruitment is open to all candidates meeting the eligibility criteria, posts are widely advertised and there is a public contest for the position. Open recruitment also implies that recruitment is not restricted to staff from a certain school or from a certain geographical area.

However, the country background reports indicate that practice frequently diverges from theory. For example, research in Flemish Belgium has shown that while school leadership posts are nationally advertised, candidates from the concerned school or school board generally have an advantage over external candidates. While not an official criterion, familiarity with the school and the region are generally considered favourably in the selection process (Devos *et al.*, 2005). In Spain, preference is explicitly given to candidates from the same school and in Austria most candidates applying are often from the same school. Such realities restrict the pool of applicants from which recruiters can choose as they may deter qualified candidates from other schools or regions from applying.

At the same time, some governments have actively encouraged teachers from other schools to apply for leadership positions. In Sweden, for example, while before the 1980s more than 75% of newly appointed principals had been selected from the teaching staff of the same school; in the mid 1990s less than 20% of newly appointed leaders came from a school where they were hired as a leader.

Level of decision making on recruitment

Leadership recruitment has been largely decentralised away from central or state governments. In all countries except Australia, Austria, Belgium (French Community)

and France, the decision making power for hiring principals rests either at the local government or at the school board level. Local authorities are responsible for decision making on recruitment in the Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden) as well as in Scotland, Hungary and Chile. The school, school board or committee holds this responsibility in England, Ireland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Portugal, Slovenia and Spain.

However, this data only indicates where decision making is formally located, while actual practices may vary and involve a much larger number of stakeholders. In Austrian federal schools for example, the state education authority holds formal authority to choose the final candidate, but the short list of candidates is prepared by a committee at the school level and reviewed by the regional school board and the final decision is made in consultation with the teachers union, the local community and the school inspector.

While most countries have decentralised decision making on recruitment to the local or school board level, the central or federal states still hold power for decision making in a few countries such as Austria, France and Italy. Central appointment of principals may result in highly standardised recruitment processes and may not allow appointing the candidate best suited to meet local needs. On the other hand, in some countries, such as Italy, it is claimed that central authorities have much better competences and skills to ensure that the recruitment process is conducted in an unbiased, fair and transparent way. However, a recent proposal to the government has suggested that to make candidates fit local needs, school boards should have veto power on candidates proposed by the Ministry (TREELLE, 2007).

The involvement of school boards in recruitment decisions has the major advantage that it allows them to adjust selection procedures to take account of the different needs of their own schools. At the same time, it can raise concerns related to effectiveness and transparency. In many countries those participating in selection panels are not provided with any recruitment training and they may thus not be adequately prepared to run the recruitment process effectively. In England, for example, NCSL (2006a) reports that “the recruitment process for heads is sometimes characterised by variable rigour, the application of instinct and ‘gut feel’, a lack of foresight to future needs, a lack of knowledge about statutory requirements and standards and a rush to advertise spurred by fear of delays in appointment”. It is therefore essential to strengthen the capacities and accountability of those participating in recruitment panels.

One way of ensuring greater transparency in school leader selection is to develop overall guidelines for recruitment processes. In England, the National College for School Leadership has developed guidelines for school governing bodies that define the ideal candidate, offer guidance for the selection procedures and advise about the introduction of chosen candidates into the new environment. In Victoria (Australia), members of the selection panel are also given detailed guidelines outlining the most important criteria of selection and explaining steps to prepare for and conduct the interviews (Box 5.2).

Transparency and fairness in recruitment can be improved by broadening participation in recruitment panels. Some recruitment processes bring in external members, for example from the business world, in order to ensure that the process is as objective as possible (*e.g.* in Flemish Belgium). In Sweden the recruitment panels comprise representatives of the teaching workforce of the school and sometimes (especially in secondary education) representatives of the student body. In Victoria (Australia) and Flanders (Belgium), the representation of principals on recruitment panels has been increased.

5.3 Providing adequate remuneration

The national country background reports prepared for this study indicate that salary levels can have an impact on the attractiveness of school leadership as a profession. Frustration and underperformance may occur when leaders perceive their salaries to be inappropriate and to show a lack of appreciation of their work.

The attractiveness of school leadership as a career is linked to how the responsibility and salary levels of school leaders compare to alternative employment opportunities for potential applicants. In many countries the salaries of educational leaders compare unfavourably with similar grades in public service and lag behind salaries in the private sector. Moreover, the job of the principal in most countries involves a large increase in leadership responsibilities compared to deputy principal and middle leaders, but the salary differences seem rather insignificant.

Comparative overview of salary scales

Figure 5.1 below compares the minimum and maximum basic salaries of principals across countries. The data presented in this section refers to lower secondary education, but in most of these countries, the salaries of principals are the same in primary and lower secondary education (Eurydice, 2005). Among the countries included in the graphs below, only in Belgium, Germany, France, the Netherlands and Finland, the basic salaries of principals do rise significantly with the level of education they manage (Eurydice, 2005). It should also be noted that this data only shows basic salary levels; it does not provide information on additional supplements, benefits or rewards.


Throughout the countries included in Figure 5.1, the minimum basic salaries of principals are in general equivalent to or higher than per capita GDP in each country. However, in the Slovak Republic and Italy, principals' basic salaries are below per capita GDP, at 71% and 87% respectively. On the other end of the continuum, in the United Kingdom, the minimum basic salaries are twice as high as per capita GDP and in Slovenia they are almost twice as high (198%).

In most countries, the salary progression of principals during their career is not exceptional. In the Flemish and French Communities of Belgium, Germany, Poland, the Netherlands and Greece, the percentage increase between the minimum and the maximum salaries is below 30%. Whereas starting salaries of principals are about average in these countries, their salary evolution prospects are limited. Only in the United Kingdom (not including Scotland), the salaries of principals may more than double over their entire career and in Ireland they may almost double (93% increase). In Austria, Finland, France, Italy and Sweden, principals' salaries may increase by 75% or more over their career.

Overall, according to Eurydice (2005), the contrast between the minimum and maximum basic salaries of principals is much less marked than in the case of teachers. This more even salary progress is linked to the facts that starting salaries of principals are generally higher than those of teachers and that their careers tend to be shorter given the additional years of experience required for principalship.

Figure 5.1 Secondary school principal salaries in relation to GDP per capita, 2002/03

*Minimum and maximum basic gross annual salaries of principals
in lower general secondary education (ISCED 2) relative to per capita GDP*



Note: The term minimum salary refers to the basic salary received by principals (single, childless, employed in the capital city) at the start of their careers as school heads. In Denmark, Germany, Spain, Ireland, Austria, Portugal, Finland, Iceland and Norway, the size of schools has a direct impact on the minimum basic salaries of principals in that the higher the enrolment of the school, the higher the minimum basic salary of its principals. For these countries, the minimum basic salary in small schools is indicated. The term maximum salary refers to the salary received by school principals (single, childless, employed in the capital city) on retirement or after a certain number of years of service, without taking into account salary adjustments or financial benefits linked to any criteria other than length of service. In Germany, Spain, Ireland, Austria, Portugal, Finland and Iceland, the size of schools has a direct impact on the maximum basic salaries of principals in that the higher the enrolment of the school, the higher the maximum basic salary of its principals. For these countries, the maximum basic salary in large schools is indicated.

Source: Eurydice (2005), *Key Data on Education in Europe 2005*, Luxembourg.

Leadership salaries in the educational sector often lag behind those of other sectors

This section deals with the attractiveness of educational leadership salaries compared to management/leadership salaries in other sectors. In order to make school leadership an attractive career choice, it is important for policy makers to understand how salaries of educational management staff compare to salaries in other sectors. Although no internationally comparable data is available, some of the country background reports show that school leaders' salaries lag behind salaries for positions of similar responsibility in the private and public sector. In Flanders, the Netherlands and Spain, for example, school leaders' salaries are below those of similar grades in the public service such as managers in a health centre. In Ireland, teacher unions and professional bodies for school leaders have argued that the salaries, benefits and working conditions of school principals and deputy principals compare unfavourably with those of similar grades in the public service.

At the same time, there are some countries where school leaders' salaries have increased over recent times and now compare favourably with management positions in other sectors. In New Zealand, for example, school leaders' salaries are competitive with those from other public sectors and increased more than salaries in other sectors over the past decade and in Slovenia salaries have been aligned with leadership posts in the non-educational public sector since 2006. In England, the earnings of school leaders grew by 19% in real terms between 1997 and 2003, whereas the overall average earnings of public and private sector workers grew by 12% over the same period. In the Netherlands and Flemish Belgium, principal salary scales have recently been adjusted as a response to comparative studies which highlighted the unfavourable pay situation of school leaders compared to management personnel in the private sector (Box 5.5).

Box 5.5 Responding to principals' salary concerns in selected countries

In **the Netherlands**, the Ministry of Home Affairs and Commonwealth Relations monitors the salaries for government employees in relation to those of employees in the private sector. A study by the Ministry found that the salaries of education personnel lag behind those of employees in the market sector. Salaries varied greatly according to age, type of contract and educational level. A new salary structure for school leaders was introduced in the Netherlands in the 2000-02 collective labour agreement aimed at improving career patterns, for example by raising the maximum of the salary scale.

In **Flemish Belgium**, a comparative pay study in 2001 concluded that salaries for management staff in education are far below the average of the labour market. The study also found that additional elements which other management staff receive, such as company cars, expenses and meals, have important value. The pay difference between principals and teachers was small. As a response to this pay study, Flemish primary school principals received a pay increase leading to a greater pay difference between teachers and principals.

Source: Bal and de Jong (2007); Devos and Tuytens (2006).

Principal salaries often do not reflect their workload and responsibilities


A second set of concerns relates to the relative salaries of different school-level professionals. As has been discussed earlier in this report, the principal holds the ultimate responsibility for school and student outcomes, but this is not matched with an adequate pay difference.

Figure 5.2 below shows the percentage difference between the maximum basic salaries of principals and the maximum basic salaries of teachers. In all countries, the maximum basic salaries of principals are higher than those of teachers. However, in more than one-third of the countries and regions, the difference between teachers' and principals' maximum salaries is 20% or less and in another third, the difference is below 40%. However, in Ireland and Iceland, the percentage difference amounts to more than 50% and in Scotland and the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland combined), the maximum basic salary of principals is more than twice as high as the maximum basic salary of teachers.

For some countries not included in this graph, the differences between teacher and principal salaries are also small. In Chile and Korea, principals' basic salaries follow the same pay scale as teacher salaries. In Hungary, principals' salaries are in general only about 10% higher than teacher salaries and in Norway, principals have similar salaries to teachers with high qualifications.

Figure 5.2 Secondary school principal salaries in relation to teacher salaries, 2002/03

Percentage increase between maximum basic gross annual salaries of teachers and of principals in lower general secondary education (ISCED 2), relative to per capita GDP



Note: The maximum basic salary refers to the salary received by teachers or principals (single, childless, employed in the capital city) on retirement or after a certain number of years of service, without taking into account salary adjustments or financial benefits linked to any criteria other than length of service. In those countries where principals' salaries differ between small schools and large schools, the salary of principals in large schools is indicated.

1. The data for Denmark is not internationally comparable; the data stems from the national country background report. The bar for Denmark indicates the percentage difference between average gross annual salaries, not maximum basic gross annual salaries.

Source: Based on data from Eurydice (2005), *Key Data on Education in Europe 2005*, Luxembourg.

Moreover, in some countries, such as Portugal and Korea, the compensation system does not distinguish between teachers, vice principals and principals, with seniority being the main criterion to determine their salary level. This may result in a situation where some principals receive lower salaries than some of the senior teachers whom they lead. It seems important to establish separate salary scales for teachers and school leaders so that school leadership becomes more attractive, especially to younger candidates.

The small salary difference between teachers and principals is one of the reasons why so few teachers are seeking principal positions. The 1998 and 2000 reports from the U.S. Educational Research Service (ERS) found that superintendents perceive insufficient salaries as the most important barrier in applying for principalship. An Australian succession planning survey (Lacey, 2000) also cited salaries as a strong discourager for potential applicants. In Denmark, a 2005 survey of 890 principals has shown that 56% are of the opinion that the difference between the salaries of the head teachers and of their staff is *far too small* and 39% find the salary difference to be *too small* (Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut, 2006).

Salaries related to individual performance

In many OECD countries, school leaders with similar qualifications working at the same level of schooling are paid according to the same salary scale regardless of the working conditions they face and independently of their performance and commitment. Individualised salary scales taking account of commitment and achievement only exist in a few OECD countries including Chile, England, Northern Ireland, Slovenia and Sweden (Box 5.6).

According to OECD (2006), rewards for high performance can be effective for raising motivation when the intervention is understood as a positive feedback. However, when the external intervention related to performance-related pay is perceived by incumbents to be controlling, it may be counterproductive (OECD, 2006). According to Gray *et al.*, (1999) performance-related salaries may impact negatively on collaborative cultures and teamwork. Policies implementing differentiated salary provision may thus be counterproductive in the process of building more cooperative school climates.

These findings suggest that systems which relate salaries to performance need to ensure that principals perceive the process as fair. If a system decides to introduce performance-related pay, it is essential to develop reliable indicators and clear assessment criteria, to prepare and train evaluators and to ensure that assessment procedures take account of the context in which principals are working.

Box 5.6 Individualised salaries in Sweden

School leaders in Sweden receive an individualised salary, which requires that the director of education collects information about the quality of the work that the school leader does. Directors of education try to find indicators by looking at the main results of the learning among the students, listening to teachers and parents and looking at the reception of the students by other schools or by the local working life. To what degree these procedures are systematised varies between the different municipalities and between the school boards that evaluate the school leaders. In some municipalities procedures have been borrowed from business life or from other public financed sectors like health services. Other municipalities create routines in co-operation between the director of education and the school leaders

Source: Swedish National Agency for School Improvement (2007).

Salaries related to school-level factors

Flexible salaries can also provide incentives for school leaders to choose to work in disadvantaged schools or difficult locations. The country background reports reveal that salaries are sometimes related to the level of education, school type or school size, but only in a few cases are they related to school characteristics such as location or socio-economic environment. This is problematic in national contexts where certain types of schools are facing particular difficulties to fill principal positions, such as rural schools in Australia, New Zealand, Ireland and Northern Ireland, urban schools in England and primary schools in Belgium (Flanders), France and the Netherlands.

Some countries have introduced policies to provide salaries linked to school-level circumstances. In France and New Zealand, principals leading “difficult” schools receive higher salaries and in Sweden salaries are labour-market driven, which means that higher salaries are offered in regions facing principal shortages.

Countries with difficulties in attracting principals to particular types of schools should consider introducing more flexible incentive structures, with substantial salary increases for principals in difficult areas. Salaries that are linked to school level factors may provide possibilities to adjust supply and demand through incentives to work in areas perceived as unattractive. They can also contribute to raising school leaders' motivation and to ensuring that all schools are provided with school leaders of similar quality.

Flexibility in rewarding those involved in leadership teams at the school level is also required. In some countries where schools are promoting and practising distributed leadership, special arrangements have been developed to incentivise and reward middle management participation and performance in leadership teams (Chapter 3).

5.4 Professional organisations for school leaders

The issues raised in this chapter are of high relevance for school leaders' work and careers. For workforce reforms to be implemented successfully it is important that school leaders are actively involved in policy formulation and feel a sense of ownership of reform. Through their participation in professional organisations, they can take agency over workforce policy issues and contribute to shaping the conditions in which they work. In their national background reports and in *Improving School Leadership* meetings, many countries have emphasised the importance of involving social partners in order to move workforce reform forward. On the other hand, stakeholder groups should not be able to block important reforms that are mandated through democratic process (OECD, 2005). In order to find the right balance, it is essential to engage in ongoing and open dialogue between school leaders and their representation and policy makers.

The influence of professional organisations on school leadership policy can either be exercised through negotiations with the government educational authorities or through provision of services to school leaders by the professional organisations themselves.

All countries have established one or several teaching unions in which both teachers and school leaders are represented together. In most cases, the teaching unions have a mandate to protect the interests of all education staff – of which teachers obviously form the large majority. In addition to this, all countries except Finland, Portugal and Spain also have specific unions or professional associations in which only school leaders are represented (Annex 5.A2.).

Although the terms union and professional association are used interchangeably in many countries, we use the term *union* for organisations participating in negotiations on issues such as pay, working conditions, workload and overall resources for education and the term *professional association* for other bodies representing the profession, but not participating in employment negotiations. In Korea for example the teaching unions negotiate improvements to the economic and social status of the educational workforce (e.g. salaries and working conditions), whereas the professional association negotiates other policies including training and professional improvements. However, in most countries, this distinction remains rather vague and the mandates of unions and professional associations frequently overlap. Some representative bodies of school leaders take the functions of both professional association and union.

Unions

Many countries have separate unions for school leaders (Denmark, England, France, Hungary, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Norway, Scotland and Sweden), in addition to teaching unions which comprise both teachers and school leaders. The relationships between teaching unions and school leadership unions can sometimes be tense. In Sweden, for example, there is an ideological cleft between the two types of representative bodies. The teaching union holds that teachers and school leaders should belong to the same union as they see the educational sector as a single unit with homogenous interests. On the other hand, the school leaders' union argues that school leadership is a separate profession with separate interests and should therefore be represented in an organisation on its own. Setting up separate principal unions can be seen as a step towards the development of the profession as separate from the teaching profession.

In all countries except Belgium (French Community), France, Hungary, Portugal and Spain, principals' employment conditions are defined by collective agreements reached between the government employing authority and teacher/principal unions. Collective bargaining leads to different outcomes than negotiations by individual principals or government regulations which simply determine principals' salaries and working conditions.

Where collective agreements exist, they are in most cases reached at the central/regional level (in Austria, Chile, Finland, Ireland, Israel, Northern Ireland, Slovenia). In Sweden collective bargaining takes place at the municipal/local level and in Denmark and Norway it takes place both at the central and local level. In Sweden, salaries and working conditions are negotiated between the trade union and the employing school board before a final decision is made on employing a new school leader.

Chile is an interesting case where the teaching union negotiates wages and working conditions with the central government even though the educational workforce is employed by municipalities and private sustainers. The municipalities are organised in a private non-profit organisation which acts as a pressure group demanding that employment conditions of teachers should be negotiated locally with the actual employers. However, the central government has stated that the different resources and management capacities of the municipalities required the centralisation of regulations and interventions in order to defend the political objectives of equity and improvement in education.

In the Netherlands, by contrast, all sectors of education have their own employers' organisations and employer and employee organisations jointly manage the sector management of the education labour market. The educational system is moving towards full decentralisation of the conditions of labour for both primary and secondary education.

Professional associations

Ten of the 22 participating countries/regions have professional associations for school leaders (Australia, Austria, Belgium [Flanders], Belgium [French Community], Chile, Ireland, Korea, New Zealand, Slovenia and Spain). These professional associations vary in their status, mandates and functions. They may play a role in negotiating workforce policy issues with the government, in representing the profession and in supporting and developing the skills of professionals.

In most countries, school leaders' professional associations play a key role in giving voice to the profession and defending common interests and positions. In some countries, professional associations participate in important negotiations with the government on issues other than wages and working conditions. In Spain, for example, the regional professional associations of school leaders are not officially recognised as unions, but they do have a certain amount of prestige and their views are generally taken into consideration by the education authorities. In Slovenia, there are a number of school leaders' associations which participate actively at all levels of education in issues such as education policy, curriculum development and counselling. In other countries, the associations serve more to represent the profession and communicate with the wider educational community.

Moreover, in a number of countries school leaders' professional organisations play a very active role in providing training and development opportunities to professionals. In Ireland, two professional associations have been set up over the past decade to provide advice, support and training for principals. In the Netherlands, the general Association of School Leaders (AVS) has taken the initiative to establish the Netherlands School Leaders Academy, an organisation that stimulates and monitors the quality and professionalism of school leaders in basic education. In Australia, the four Australian principals' associations own a national professional development body, which delivers a range of professional development programmes and initiatives on behalf of the professional associations.

In addition, there are some supranational organisations of school principals working to encourage and promote school leadership at an international level. The International Confederation of Principals, for example, is a global association of school leadership organisations that is promoting the rights and responsibilities of school leaders and their professionalisation.

5.5 Supporting school leaders' career development

Most countries do not provide adequately for school leaders' career development. Traditionally, in many countries school leaders have had lifelong tenure and few opportunities to obtain feedback and possibilities for career development. Principal burnout caused by high levels of stress and long working hours is common, yet many principals remain on the job because there are no attractive alternatives.

Developing better career prospects for school leaders can make the profession more attractive to future applicants, increase the motivation of serving school leaders on the job and bring benefits to the system by using school leaders' knowledge and skills in advisory, consultant or coordination activities.

Employment status and duration

Annex 5.A3. shows that in most countries principals have civil servant status, but more and more countries are beginning to hire principals as salaried employees under general employment legislation. Civil servant status means that principals are employed under conditions applicable to public sector employment in general. Though these conditions vary from country to country, they normally include national legislation or regulations specifying criteria for selection and recruitment, salary and other benefits, as well as career advancement.

The formal duration of appointments to principalship varies among countries and is not related to whether principals are employed as civil servants or on a contractual basis. Overall, it can be said that fixed-term appointments are becoming more common across the OECD.

In a number of countries, principals are employed under fixed-term contracts, but the contracts may be renewable and in fact in many of these principals end up having permanent status. Renewable contracts provide the opportunity to periodically reassess, recognise and acknowledge well performing principals and also to relieve not so well performing leaders.

Countries where principals have tenured positions are also moving towards more systematic assessment of principal performance. The French Community of Belgium, for example, introduced a new Decree in 2007 which prescribes principal evaluations every five years. Principal evaluation involves drawing up a general profile of the school as a whole including its major needs and challenges and the way the principal addresses them.

Appraisal of performance

Performance appraisal of school leaders can play an important role in identifying areas of needed improvement and providing targeted support to develop school leadership and improve practice. While most countries have performance appraisal processes, many report concerns about the scarcity of sound tools and mechanisms to best monitor and assess leaders' performance.

As shown in Annex 5.A4, a large majority of participating countries evaluate school principals and other school leaders through systematic performance appraisal processes. Only 4 countries report that they do not conduct systematic performance appraisals, while 12 countries report that they do. In most of these 12 countries, the performance of both principals and other school leaders is appraised. The processes are required by central authorities in about one-half of the countries and are conducted at the discretion of municipal authorities in the others. Appraisal periods vary greatly. Several countries require that appraisals be conducted no less often than annually. Other countries set a three- or four-year appraisal period.

Appraisal processes are conducted by a range of agents. For the appraisal of the school principal, the school governing body is the responsible agent in nearly half the countries where an appraisal process is in place. In two countries it is the superintendent or local authority that is responsible and in two countries the inspectorate has the responsibility. The central government is the responsible agent in one country. The head teacher or principal is almost always responsible for appraisals of other school leaders.

A set of broadly similar criteria guide the appraisals. Principals are most often appraised on their achievement of predetermined programme and financial objectives and on the overall professional quality of their performance. In some cases, school indicators, student progress and performance and the perceptions of parents, teachers and students are taken into account.

Consequences attached to the review vary. Salary adjustments or bonuses are common rewards for good performance; some countries reward good performance with professional development opportunities. Sanctions for poor performance include withholding of salary increases, development of improvement plans followed by further evaluation, denying permanent contract status and ultimately dismissal.

In view of the nature of the performance criteria and apparent purpose of the appraisals, the annual performance review period seems to be most appropriate. Where neither rewards nor sanctions are linked to appraisals, other incentives such as professional ethic or positive work relationship between leader and appraising body would need to be in place. Wherever possible, the content and results of the appraisal should be aligned with school or larger performance goals and leadership standards.

Most importantly, school leadership appraisal needs to be contextualised. School leaders' length of service, staff composition, geographical location and student populations all need to be taken into account when evaluating leadership quality.

Career development options for school leaders

In Hungary, Slovenia and Spain, incumbents have fixed-term appointments to principalship, but they are employed as tenured teachers in the given school. They may return to their teaching profession after the expiration of their mandate for principalship. However, in many countries, a return to teaching after principalship is considered problematic. In Austria, some principals apply for positions at the level of the inspectorate, but besides this option there are hardly any other promotion opportunities. Not providing options through which school leaders can feed back their experience into the system means wasting a potential resource that could improve the leadership of others.

A number of countries have begun to experiment with ways to make the profession more flexible and mobile, allowing principals to move between schools as well as between leadership and teaching and other professions. In some countries provisions allow for principal rotation. This may provide opportunities for principals to regain motivation by addressing new challenges. It also offers a chance for school leaders to work in a variety of different contexts and to deepen and broaden their knowledge and skills. Moreover, such approaches may increase the spread of new ideas and approaches and provide school leaders with opportunities for more diverse career pathways.

In Sweden, there has been a recent increase of fixed-term appointments combined with a subsequent job guarantee in the municipality. The rationale for this change is that the school leader's job is considered to be highly demanding, often causing high degrees of stress and conflict.

In Flemish Belgium, former principals can take a role as Director of a "community of schools" comprising several neighbouring schools that collaborate on issues such as career guidance for students, course provision and special needs education. Under the leadership of the Director, principals of communities of schools meet regularly to work on common improvement goals. The expertise of the Director can play an important part in making school collaboration work (Day *et al.*, 2008).

In England, the NCSL's Leadership Development Framework (2007) provides a pathway of programmes and standards that extend across a school leader's career. At the last stage of the framework, the pathway proposes a range of development opportunities for experienced school leaders. For example the Development Programme for Consultant Leadership encourages school leaders with at least five years experience to take on a role in facilitating the learning of others in school leadership positions. The programme is based on a client-centred consultancy. An evaluation of the programme found that it was successful in creating roles that provide support for head teachers while at the same time offering the challenges needed to develop the job (Earley and Weindling, 2006).

Moreover, since 2003, consultant leaders have been employed by the Primary National Strategy's improvement programme covering schools in all local authorities. The consultant leaders advise leadership teams, target external support, share best practice and help sustain action to advance teaching quality and higher standards.

Other organisations in England, such as the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust (SSAT), create a wide range of opportunities for experienced school leaders in partnering, training and developing other school leaders in various programmes. All SSAT's leadership programmes are designed and delivered by head teachers. One of these is an 18-month leadership programme for executive heads, which guides heads who will be working with other head teachers and addresses the structural changes needed in a school leadership team to enable this shift. Heads in SSAT's Raising Achievement, Transforming Learning programme to date have worked with over 500 other schools to help those in special difficulties. SSAT also directly employs a number of serving head teachers as part-time Associate Directors, working on projects such as international leadership in education, personalising learning and development and research into advances in education practice.

5.6 Summary conclusions and recommendations

The challenge of leadership is to improve the quality of current leadership and to make it sustainable over time. In most countries, the leadership workforce is ageing and large numbers of school leaders will retire over the next five to ten years. At a time of high demographic turnover in school leaders, education systems need to focus on fostering future leaders and making leadership an attractive profession.

Some evidence indicates that while the heavy workload of principals is in itself a deterring factor to potential applicants, individuals are also discouraged by the fact that this workload does not seem to be adequately remunerated and supported. Other important factors having a negative impact on motivation for principalship are uncertain recruitment procedures and the scarcity of career development prospects for principals. Acting on these levers can contribute to recruit competent people into the profession and provide incentives for high performance for current and future leadership.

Professionalise recruitment

While school level involvement is essential to contextualise recruitment processes, parallel steps should be taken within the system to professionalise procedures. Experience from country practices has shown that such steps may include:

- *Consider broadening eligibility criteria:* National policies could consider whether some circumstances might warrant granting non-teachers eligibility for certain functions within leadership teams. While it should be ensured that pedagogical competences are represented within school leadership, the size and complexity of some schools can also call for competences found in managers and leaders from outside the education sector. Especially as school leadership becomes more distributed it can be shared among several individuals with different backgrounds and areas of specialisation.
- *Plan for leadership succession:* Succession planning is essential to increase the quantity and quality of future school leaders. It is a way to counteract principal shortages and to ensure that there is an adequate supply of qualified personnel to

choose from when the incumbent leader leaves the position. Succession planning involves proactively identifying potential leaders and encouraging them to develop their leadership practices. This can be done by offering training programmes for aspiring leaders and providing opportunities for young teachers to learn more about leadership through close contact with current leaders. It can also be done by including leadership topics in initial teacher training.

- *Provide more elements to evaluate candidates:* Beyond the traditional job interviews, recruitment panels should use a wide range of tools and procedures to assess candidates. Competency profiles or leadership frameworks can define an ideal set of knowledge and skills that candidates should be assessed against (Chapter 2). In addition, reducing the weight put on seniority as a selection criterion can facilitate the emergence of younger dynamic candidates into school leadership.
- *Provide guidelines and training for those participating in recruitment panels:* Those participating in recruitment panels need to have as much a sense of future challenges as future school leaders. It is therefore important to train recruiters appropriately and provide guidelines for the process. Guidelines should encourage panel members to put less weight on interview performance and to use varied recruitment tools to assess a wider range of knowledge, skills and competences.

Focus on the relative attractiveness of school leaders' salaries

The relative attractiveness of salaries for school leaders can influence the supply of high quality candidates. When considering policy options to make school leadership a more attractive career, it is important to compare salaries of school leaders with alternative employment possibilities, both within schools and in different sectors. Five policy options to provide adequate remuneration for school leadership emerge from this chapter:

- *Monitor how salaries of school leadership personnel compare to similar grades in the public and private sectors:* In some countries comparative pay studies have revealed school leaders' unfavourable pay situations. Such data allows readjusting school leaders' salaries and making the profession more competitive with other occupations in attracting the best qualified graduates.
- *Establish separate salary scales for teachers and principals:* In order to attract high quality candidates from among the teaching staff, principals should earn a salary sufficiently greater than teachers' salaries to compensate for the additional workload, exposure and responsibilities. Separating teacher and principal salary scales would help make the profession more attractive, especially to younger teachers.
- *Establish salary scales reflecting leadership structures:* In many countries, deputy and assistant principals show little interest in moving up to principalship because the large increase in workload is not matched by an adequate pay rise. Countries should improve the school level distribution of responsibilities in a leadership team context and/or ensure that principals earn a salary sufficiently greater than other school management staff to compensate for the additional workload.

- *Link salaries to school level factors:* Countries with difficulties in attracting leaders to particular types of schools should consider introducing more flexible incentive structures that allow substantial salary increases for school leaders in difficult areas. Salaries that are linked to school level factors may provide possibilities to adjust supply and demand. They can also contribute to raising school leaders' motivation and to ensuring that all schools have leaders of similar quality.
- *Make a balanced use of performance-related rewards:* Systems relating salaries and benefits to performance need to ensure that principals perceive the process as fair. If a system decides to introduce performance related pay, it is important to develop reliable indicators and clear assessment criteria, to prepare and train evaluators and to ensure that assessment procedures take account of the context in which principals are working.

Acknowledge the role of professional organisations of school leaders

Professional organisations of school leaders provide a forum for dialogue, knowledge sharing and dissemination of best practice both among professionals and between professionals and policy makers. It is unlikely that workforce reform will succeed unless school leaders are actively involved, through their representative organisations, in the development and implementation of reform.

Provide options and support for career development

Providing career development prospects for school leaders can help make school leadership a more attractive alternative for those wanting to enter the profession and avoid principal burn out. This can imply opening up school leadership to further promotion possibilities and greater flexibility. Current country practice provides a wealth of experiences to draw from to develop possible career options for school leaders.

- *Provide alternatives to lifetime contracts through renewable fixed term contracts:* More and more countries are moving towards renewable fixed-term contracts for principals in order to periodically reassess, recognise and acknowledge well-performing principals, as well as to provide incentives for them to continuously develop their skills and improve their practice.
- *Plan and provide opportunities for principals to step up towards new opportunities:* Such opportunities may involve jobs in the educational administration, leadership of federations of schools, or consultant leadership in which experienced leaders provide services to leaders facing difficulties in their own schools. Such approaches can increase the spread of new ideas and approaches, while at the same time providing school leaders with opportunities for more diverse career pathways.

Annex 5.A1

Recruitment of principals, 2006/07, public schools

Country	Level of decision making		Criteria		Procedure
	Level of decision making on hiring the principal	How autonomously is the decision taken?	Eligibility criteria	Selection criteria	
Australia	State government	In full autonomy	Teaching qualification Teaching experience Experience in school-wide leadership and management responsibilities	m	m
Austria	State government or provincial government (depending on type of school)	Within a framework set by the central government	Teaching qualification Teaching experience	Seniority as a teacher. Management/leadership experience Quality of work proposal for the school Vision/values for school leadership Additional qualifications	Interview Presentation of work proposal Assessment centre Potential analysis
Belgium (Fl.)	School boards	m	Teaching qualification	At the discretion of school boards	At the discretion of school boards
Belgium (Fr.)	Provincial / regional authorities	In full autonomy	Teaching qualification Teaching experience	m	Interview "Brevet de chef d'établissement"
Chile	Local authorities	Within a framework set by the central government	Teaching qualification Teaching experience (5 years)	Quality of work proposal for the school	Public contest Presentation of work proposal

Country	Level of decision making		Criteria		Procedure
	Level of decision making on hiring the principal	How autonomously is the decision taken?	Eligibility criteria	Selection criteria	
Denmark	Local authorities	In full autonomy	Pedagogical qualification Teaching experience	Management/leadership experience Interpersonal skills assessed in interview Vision/values for school leadership	Interview
England	School, school board or committee	After consultation with local authorities	Candidate must hold or be working towards NPQH Teaching qualification Teaching experience Knowledge of educational administration assessed in exam Other formal qualifications	At the discretion of school governing bodies At the discretion of local authorities	At the discretion of school governing bodies At the discretion of local authorities
Finland	Local authority	In full autonomy	Teaching qualification Teaching experience Knowledge of educational administration assessed in exam Other formal qualifications	At the discretion of local authorities	At the discretion of local authorities
France (secondary schools)	Central government	After consultation with provincial/regional authorities	Teaching qualification Teaching experience (5 years)	Knowledge and skills assessed in exam and interview	National exam ("concours") Interview
Hungary	Local authorities	After consultation with school	Teaching qualification Teaching experience (5 years) (As of 2015: successful completion of school leadership training)	Quality of work proposal for the school (application document)	Application document with work proposal for the school

Country	Level of decision making		Criteria		Recruitment procedure
	Level of decision making on hiring the principal	How autonomously is the decision taken?	Eligibility criteria	Selection criteria	
Ireland	School, school board or committee	With involvement/ approval of Trustees or Patron	Teaching qualification Teaching experience (5 years)	Management/leadership experience Interpersonal and other skills assessed in interview Vision/values for school leadership Additional academic qualifications	Public competition Interview
Israel	m	m	Teaching qualification, (Master's degree for high school leadership positions) Teaching experience Successful completion of a two-year leadership preparation programme	Management/leadership experience Vision/values for school leadership	Questionnaire Personal evaluation Interview
Korea	Provincial/regional authorities	Within a framework set by the central government	m	m	Promotion or Invitation
Netherlands	School, school board or committee	In full autonomy	None	m	m
New Zealand	School, school board or committee	In full autonomy	Current registration as a teacher	At the discretion of the Board of Trustees	At the discretion of the Board of Trustees
Northern Ireland	School, school board or committee	m	Teaching qualification	Management/leadership experience Vision/values for the school Personal skills and professional knowledge assessed in interview Additional qualification (may include PQH(NII))	Interview (often including presentation of a pre-selected topic)

Country	Level of decision making		Criteria		Procedure
	Level of decision making on hiring the principal	How autonomously is the decision taken?	Eligibility criteria	Selection criteria	
Norway	Local authorities	Within a framework set by the central government	At the discretion of local authorities	At the discretion of local authorities	Interview
Portugal	School, school board or committee	In full autonomy	Management experience or training on school management	Candidates without experience in school management need to have an academic qualification in school management (250 hours)	Election (as of 2008, the school board will designate principals)
Scotland	Local authorities	m	m	m	m
Slovenia	School, school board	In full autonomy	Teaching qualification.	Opinions of teaching staff, local community, parents and Minister must be sought by the school governing body before selection	Presentation of work proposals for the school
			Teaching experience (5 years)		
			Acquired second promotion title of first promotion (5 years)		
Spain	School, school board or committee	Within a framework set by state governments	Headship licence (can be acquired up to one year after starting the post)	Date of application	Presentation of work proposal for the school Assessment of academic and professional merits
			Teaching qualification	Seniority as a teacher	
			Teaching experience as a civil servant teacher (5 years)	Management/leadership experience	
			Current employment as a state school teacher	Quality of work proposal for the school	
			Successful completion of school leadership training or at least 2 years leadership experience	Preference is given to candidates from the school	
Sweden	Local authorities	In full autonomy	Educational experience ("pedagogical insight")	Additional academic qualifications	At the discretion of local authorities Interview

Note: m = Information missing

Source: OECD (2003) Locus of decision making questionnaire results; OECD (2007), Improving School Leadership Country Questionnaires and Background Reports.

Annex 5.A2

Professional associations for school leaders, 2006/07, public schools

Country	Unions for teachers and school leaders	Unions/ Professional associations for school leaders	Are employment conditions defined by collective agreement?
Australia	Yes	Yes, professional associations.	m
Austria	Yes	Yes, professional associations for certain school types.	Yes, at the central/regional government level.
Belgium (Fl.)	Yes	Yes, professional associations.	Yes
Belgium (Fr.)	Yes	Yes, professional associations.	No
Chile	Yes	Yes, professional associations.	Yes, at the central government level.
Denmark	Yes	Yes, separate unions.	Yes, at the municipal authority level and at the state level.
England	Yes	Yes, separate unions.	Yes (some conditions covered).
Finland	Yes	No	Yes, with a central framework agreed at central/regional level (incumbent act and contracts of employment act).
France	Yes	Yes, separate unions (for secondary school leaders only).	No
Hungary	Yes	Yes, separate unions.	No
Ireland	Yes	Yes, professional associations.	Yes, at the central government level.
Israel	m	m	Yes, at the central government level.
Korea	Yes	Yes, professional associations.	
Netherlands	Yes	Yes, separate unions.	Yes, between the employer and employee organisations of the different sectors of education.
New Zealand	Yes	Yes, professional organisations.	Yes
Northern Ireland	Yes	Yes, separate unions.	Yes, at government level with some detail negotiated with the relevant employing body.
Norway	Yes	Yes, separate union.	Yes, with a central framework agreed at the central/regional level and details negotiated at more localised levels.
Portugal	Yes	No	No
Scotland	Yes	Yes, separate unions.	
Slovenia	Yes	Yes, professional associations.	Yes, at the central government level.
Spain	Yes	Yes, professional associations	No
Sweden	Yes	Yes, separate union.	Yes, at the municipal/local level.

Note: m = Information missing

Source: OECD, *Improving School Leadership* Country Questionnaires and Background Reports.

Annex 5.A3

Employment status and duration, 2006/07, public schools

Country	Employment status of principals		Can principals be employed on fixed-term contracts?	
	Civil servant	Salaried employee	Principals with civil servant status	Principals with salaried employee status
Australia	m	m	m	m
Austria	Yes	No	No	a
Belgium (Fl.)	Yes	No	No	a
Belgium (Fr.)	Yes	No	No	a
Chile	No	Yes	a	Yes (5 years)
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
England	No	Yes	a	Yes
Finland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
France	Yes	No	No	a
Hungary	Other (public employee)	No	Yes (5-10 years)*	a
Ireland	Other (public servant)	No	No	a
Israel	Yes (after 3 years)	Yes (for the first 3 years)	Yes (in high schools only)	Yes
Korea	Yes	No	Yes (4-8 years)	a
Netherlands	Other (public servant)	No	No	No
New Zealand	No	Yes	a	No
Northern Ireland	No	Yes	a	No
Norway	No	Yes	a	Yes (but most are permanent)
Portugal	Yes	No	Yes (3 years)	a
Scotland	No	Yes	a	Yes (but most are permanent)
Slovenia	Yes	No	Yes (5 years)*	a
Spain	Yes	No	Yes (4 years)*	a
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes	Varies

Note:

* = The assignment for principalship is for a fixed-term period, but principals are employed as tenured civil servant teachers. They may return to teaching after expiration of their mandate for principalship.

a = not applicable

m = information missing

Source: OECD, *Improving School Leadership Country Questionnaires and Background Reports*.

Annex 5.A4. Performance appraisal of school leaders, 2006/07, public schools

Country	Target group	How offered	Frequency	Responsible for appraisals	Criteria	Performance rewards	Response to underperformance
Austria	1 (Only in vocational schools)	m	m	m	m	m	m
Belgium Fl.	1,2	As part of a central / regional performance evaluation system.	Every 4 years	School governing board	Achievement of local performance standards	Professional development opportunities	Further evaluation and dismissal
Belgium Fr.	a	None	m	m	m	m	m
Denmark	1,2	At discretion of municipality. In secondary schools, based on a results based contract between the individual school and the principal	At the discretion of the municipality or individual school	At the discretion of the municipality or the individual school	At the discretion of the municipality or the individual school. For principals in secondary schools, criteria defined in results-based contract	At the discretion of the municipality (or individual school). For principals in secondary schools: Monetary rewards (performance-based extra pay at the end of the year)	At discretion of municipality in primary schools. At discretion of individual school in secondary schools
England	1,2	Based on national arrangements	Annually	Governors for principal appraisal; line manager (usually head) for appraisal of other school leaders	May be linked to pupil performance; others determined at previous appraisal	m	Varies; but unlikely to be other than improvement plan or increment withheld
Finland	a	None	m	m	m	m	m
Hungary	1,2	At the discretion of local authority for principal appraisal (formal, often ignored); at the discretion of principal for other school leaders	No fixed period	Local educational authority for principal appraisal. Principal for appraisal of other school leaders	Predefined school objectives, Student progress and performance (a criterion supported by educational policy, but not yet widely used)	Monetary rewards (as bonus from the school budget)	Salary increment withheld, improvement plan

Country	Target group	How offered	Frequency	Responsible for appraisals	Criteria	Performance rewards	Response to underperformance
Ireland	1,2	As part of a central performance evaluation system	No fixed period	Inspectorate	Achievement of predefined school objectives. Teachers/parents/students perceptions	No reward system	Further evaluation
Israel	1	As part of a municipal performance evaluation system	In most cases once a year, more if need arises	Superintendent and municipal/local authority	Achievement of regional and municipal/local performance standards	No reward system	Supervision, Further evaluation, Improvement plan
	2	At the discretion of the principal	As above	Principal	Achievement of regional and school-based performance standards	As above	Supervision, Further evaluation, Improvement plan. If these do not work, dismissal process
Netherlands	1,2	At the discretion of the school governing board	m	m	m	m	m
New Zealand	1	As part of the Board of Trustees' requirements to central government	At least annually	School's Board of Trustees	Boards establish a performance agreement with the principal and the principal is measured against the objectives contained therein (boards are required to use the interim professional standards for principals and to have a policy regarding performance appraisal)	Primary schools: monetary award after 3 years service at current grade or higher if incumbent has been appraised and has met interim professional standards (additional \$2000 per year). Secondary schools: No financial incentives linked to performance	Formal competency process as specified in their collective agreement
	2	As above	Annually	Principal	Follows a process agreed between principal and the other school leadership personnel (principals are required to use the professional standards for deputy principals/associate principals and teachers)	Salary progression is subject to successful appraisal	As above

Country	Target group	How offered	Frequency	Responsible for appraisals	Criteria	Performance rewards	Response to underperformance
Northern Ireland	1,2	Yes as part of the NI Performance Review and Staff Development Scheme	Annually	School Board of Governors (through the principal for other school leaders)	1. Leadership and Management, Personal Development, Curriculum and pupil development 2. Professional practice, Personal Development, Curriculum and pupil development	Success in annual review(s) is used in incremental advancement on a leadership salary scale	A support mechanism is put in place by the employing body; failure to improve may lead to dismissal
Norway	1	At the discretion of the municipal/local educational authority	m	Municipal / local educational authority	At the discretion of the municipal/local educational authority	a	Improvement plan
Portugal	1	None (but as of 2008, they will be evaluated by the Inspectorate)	m	m	m	m	m
Slovenia	1	At the discretion of the school governing board	Annually	School governing board	Achievement of predetermined school programme, Achievement of annual financial plan, Overall professional quality of performance, Developmental attitude of the institution	Salary increase	Salary increment withheld
Spain	1	As a part of a regional performance evaluation system	Every 4 years	Regional educational authority. Inspectorate	Achievement of pre-defined school objectives. Perceptions of teachers, parents, perceptions	Salary increase	Permanent contract not granted
Sweden	1,2	As a part of a central evaluation system	Every 3 years	Central educational authority	Achievement of performance standards, Achievement of pre-defined school objectives, Student progress and performance, Teacher/parent/student perceptions	Salary increase	Improvement plan and further evaluation

Note: a = not applicable; m = information missing

Target group:

1. Principal: the school head teacher, director or administrator who holds the highest leadership position within an individual school.
2. Other school leadership personnel: school level professional personnel (other than the principal) whose primary or major responsibility is for school leadership, management and administration. It includes assistant principals, assistant head teachers and other leadership/management staff with similar responsibilities.

Source: OECD, Improving School Leadership Country Questionnaires and Background Reports.

References

- Bal, J. and J. de Jong (2007), “Improving School Leadership - OECD Review, Background Report for the Netherlands”, prepared for the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, Netherlands, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Beaudin, D., J. Thompson L. and Jacobson (2002) *The Administrator Paradox: More Certified Fewer Apply*, American Education Research Association, New Orleans.
- Begley, P., G. Campbell Evans and A. Brownridge (1990), *Influences on the Socializing Experiences of Aspiring Principals*, Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society for Studies in Education.
- Bryk, A and B. Schneider (2004), *Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for Improvement*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, NY.
- Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut (2006), *Undersøgelse af skoleledelse i folkeskolen*, Questionnaire survey of headteachers, cited in Pluss Leadership A/S, with Professor Molin, J. (2007), “Improving School Leadership National Background Report, Denmark”, A report prepared for the Ministry of Education, Denmark, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Day C., J. Moller, D. Nusche and B. Pont (2008), “The Flemish (Belgian) Approach to System Leadership”, a case study report for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership and in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- DEECD (2007), *Principal Selection*, Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, Victoria, Australia, available at www.eduweb.vic.gov.au/edulibrary/public/hr/policy/Prin_selection_policy.pdf.
- Devos, G., N. Engels, A. Aeltermann, D. Bouckenoghe and G. Hotton (2005), *Het Welbevinden en Functioneren van Directies Basisonderwijs*, OBPWO-project 03.06.
- Devos, G. and M. Tuytens (2006), “Improving School Leadership - OECD Review. Background Report for Flanders”, a report prepared for the Flemish Ministry of Education and Training, Belgium, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership
- Earley, P. and D. Weindling (2006), “Consultant Leadership – A New Role for Head Teachers?” *School Leadership and Management*, 26(1).
- ERS (Education Research Service) (1998), “Is There a Shortage of Qualified Candidates for Openings in the Principalship? An Exploratory Study”, prepared for NASSP and NAESP, Arlington, VA.
- ERS (2000), “The Principal, Keystone of a High Achieving School: Attracting and Keeping the Leaders We Need”, Arlington, VA.
- Eurydice (2005), *Key Data on Education in Europe 2005*, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.

- Frey, B. (1997), “On the Relationship between Intrinsic and Extrinsic Work Motivation”, *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 15.
- Fullan, M. (2005), *Leadership and Sustainability: System Thinkers in Action*, Sage Publications Ltd., Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Gray, J., D. Hopkins, D. Reynolds, B. Wilcox, S. Farrell, D. Jesson (1999), *Improving Schools: Performance and Potential*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Gray, N., M. Macpherson, B. Mulford, J. Williamson. (1995), *Australian School Principals: Profile 1994*, Australian Principals Associations Professional Development Council, Adelaide.
- Gronn, P. and K. Lacey (2004), “Positioning Oneself for Leadership: Feelings of Vulnerability among Aspirant Principals”, *School Leadership and Management*, 24(4).
- Hargreaves, A. and D. Fink, D (2006), *Sustainable Leadership*, Jossey Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Hargreaves, A., G. Halász and B. Pont (2008), “The Finnish Approach to System Leadership”, a case study report for the OECD *Improving School Leadership* activity, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership and in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- Harris, B (2007), *Supporting the Emotional Work of School Leaders*, Paul Chapman, London.
- Hopkins, D. (2008), “Realising the Potential of System Leadership”, in Pont, B., D. Nusche and D. Hopkins (eds.), *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*, OECD, Paris.
- IPPN (Irish Primary Principals’ Network) (2006), “The Challenge of Recruiting and Retaining School Leaders”, Report prepared for the Joint Committee on Education and Science, 30 November 2006.
- James, C.R., M. Connolly, G. Dunning and T. Elliott (2006) *How Very Effective Primary Schools Work*, Routledge, London.
- James, C. and D. Whiting, D. (1998a), “The Career Perspectives of Deputy Headteachers”, *Educational Management and Administration*, 26(4), 353-62.
- James, C. and D. Whiting (1998b), “Headship? No Thanks”, *Management in Education*, 12(2).
- Johnson, S., J. Berg, M. Donaldson (2005), “Who Stays in Teaching and Why: A Review of the Literature on Teacher Retention”, Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA.
- Kimball, K. and K.A. Sirotnik (2000), “The Urban School Principalship: Take This Job and...!”, *Education and Urban Society*, 32(4).
- Lacey, K.A. (2000), *Survey on Succession Planning*, Victorian Department of Education, Melbourne, Australia.
- Lacey, K.A. (2002), “Factors that Impact on Principal-Class Leadership Aspirations”, Doctoral Thesis, Department of Education Policy and Management, University of Melbourne, Australia.

- Leithwood, K and B. Beatty (2008), *Leading with Teacher Emotions in Mind*, Corwin Press, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- NCSL (National College for School Leadership) (2006a), *Recruiting Headteachers and Senior Leaders: Overview of Research Findings*, National College for School Leadership, Nottingham, UK.
- NCSL (2006b), *Leadership Succession: An Overview. Securing the Next Generation of School Leaders*, National College for School Leadership, Nottingham, UK.
- Norton, M.S. (2003), “Let’s Keep our Quality School Principals on the Job”, *High School Journal*, 86(1).
- OECD, (2005), *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2006), “The Teaching Workforce: Meeting Aspirations and Enhancing Motivation”, *Education Policy Analysis 2005-2006*, OECD, Paris.
- Pounder, D.G. and R.J. Merrill (2000), “Job Desirability of High School Principalship: A Job Choice Perspective”, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(1).
- Pritchard, A. (2003), *Issues Concerning Succession Planning for the Principalship in Western Australian Catholic, State and Independent Schools*, University of Western Australia/APAPDC.
- Reeves, J., L. Moos and J. Forrest (1998) “The School Leader’s View”, in MacBeath, J. (ed.), *Effective School Leadership, Responding to Change*, Paul Chapman, London, pp. 32-59.
- Schratz, M. and K. Petzold (2007), “Improving School Leadership, Country Background Report for Austria”, a report prepared by the Department of Teacher Education and School Research, University of Innsbruck for the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, the Arts and Culture, Austria, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- Su *et al.* (2003), “Professional Preparation and Development of School Leaders in Australia and the USA”, *International Education Journal*, 4(1), 2003.
- Swedish National Agency for School Improvement (2007), “Improving School Leadership, Background Report Sweden”, available at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.
- TREELLLE (2007), “Quale Dirigenza per la Scuola dell’Autonomia? Proposte per una Professione Nuova”, *Quaderno n.7*, Dicembre 2007, Genoa, Italy.
- Whitaker K. (1996), “Exploring the Causes of Principal Burnout”, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34(1).
- Whitaker, K. (2001), “Where Are the Principal Candidates? Superintendent Perceptions”, *NASSP Bulletin*, 85(625).
- Whitaker, K. (2002), “Principal Role Changes and Influence on Principal Recruitment and Selection, An International Perspective”, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(1).

About the authors

Beatriz Pont completed an M.Sc. in International Affairs at Columbia University, was a research fellow at the Institute of Social Science in Tokyo University and has a B.A. in political science from Pitzer College, Claremont, California. A Policy Analyst in the Education and Training Policy Division of OECD's Directorate for Education, Beatriz was Project Leader for the *Improving School Leadership* activity. With the OECD since 1999, she has worked on issues including equity in education, adult learning and adult skills and ICT in education. Previously Beatriz was a researcher on education, training and active labour market policies at the Economic and Social Council of the Government of Spain and also worked for Andersen Consulting in Barcelona. She is currently working as Project Co-ordinator on an OECD-wide initiative on the Political Economy of Reform. (beatriz.pont@oecd.org)

Deborah Nusche is a Policy Analyst in the Education and Training Policy Division of the OECD Directorate for Education. She has an M.Sc. in International Affairs/Development Studies from the *Institut d'Études Politiques de Paris (Sciences Po)* and previous work experience with UNESCO and the World Bank. With the OECD since 2007, she has worked on issues of school leadership and learning outcomes assessment. Deborah is currently working on the OECD Thematic Review of Migrant Education. (deborah.nusche@oecd.org)

Hunter Moorman is a consultant in leadership, education reform and organisation development. He is now retired from the Institute for Educational Leadership in Washington, DC, where he was Director, Education Policy Fellowship Program and Senior Associate, Leadership Programs. Previously Hunter was a senior civil servant with the U.S. Department of Education, where he directed national education research programs, led a program of school improvement networks and managed a national leadership development program. He has a certificate in Organisation Development from Georgetown University, a M.P.A. from The George Washington University and a B.A. in Government from Harvard College.

OECD PUBLICATIONS, 2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16
PRINTED IN FRANCE
(91 2008 05 1 P) ISBN 978-92-64-04467-8 – No. 56157 2008

Improving School Leadership

VOLUME 1: POLICY AND PRACTICE

As countries strive to reform education systems and improve student results, school leadership is high on education policy agendas. But in many countries, the men and women who run schools are overburdened, underpaid and near retirement. And few people are lining up for their jobs.

What leadership roles contribute most to improving student learning? How best to allocate and distribute leadership tasks? How to develop the right skills for effective school leadership? How to make the profession attractive to high-quality candidates?

This book is based on an OECD study of school leadership practices and policies around the world. Offering a valuable cross-country perspective, it identifies four policy levers and a range of policy options to help governments improve school leadership now and build sustainable leadership for the future.

Companion Volumes

Improving School Leadership Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership examines innovative approaches to sharing leadership across schools in Belgium (Flanders), Finland and the United Kingdom (England) and leadership development programmes for system improvement in Australia and Austria.

Improving School Leadership: The Toolkit is designed to support policy makers and practitioners to think through reform processes for schools and education systems in their national context. It is available as a free download at www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership.

Effective school leadership is viewed as key to education reform worldwide. These books will be of interest to policy makers, school boards, school administrators, principals, teachers and parents.

The full text of this book is available on line via this link:

www.sourceoecd.org/education/9789264044678

Those with access to all OECD books on line should use this link:

www.sourceoecd.org/9789264044678

SourceOECD is the OECD online library of books, periodicals and statistical databases.

For more information about this award-winning service and free trials ask your librarian, or write to us at SourceOECD@oecd.org.