EMSSA Leadership Development UK
Jan Arend Brands[1]
Version 2
04-02-2009

The situation in the UK
The recent history of Leadership Development in the UK is well-decribed by a major player, Ray Bolam. His article is part of a special issue of Educational Management Administration and Leadership (2004) about the National College for School Leadership. The NCSL was established in 2000 and started its activities in 2002 and from the beginning had a huge annual budget (in 2007 more than 110 million GBP).

Three historical phases
Bolam reviews three historical phases of leadership development in England and Wales, in order to show how the idea of a national college developed and became viable.

Phase 1: Ad hoc provision. Starting in the late 1960s and the early 1970s with initiatives from Local Educational Authorities, universities and Her Majesty's Inspectorate.

Phase 2: Towards Coherence and Coordination. Government funding of a National Development Centre (NDC) for School Management Training that coordinated 40 Higher Education-based regional centres (1983-1988). To support the radical and extensive educational reforms the government later funded the School Management Taskforce (1989-1992) that worked collaboratively with regional consortia of LEA's to promote more effective control over management training by schools and more accessible provision of flexible and practical forms of training and support.
In the mid 1990s the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) introduced a comprehensive structure for leadership development of which the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) for this research is the most interesting

Phase 3: A National College. The NCSL was launched by Prime Minister Tony Blair in 2002 and presented a Leadership Development Framework of 5 stages of which NPQH was meant (together with another program) for the entry into headship.

Major publications from the last years

Title	Author or organisation	Year
Committee on the Organisation, Staffing and Management of Schools (COSMOS)	DfES	1984
The National Development Centre for School Management Training	Bolam	1986
Management Development for Headteachers: Retrospect and Prospect	Bolam	1987
Developing School Management: The Way Forward	SMTF DfES	1990
Effective Management in Schools: a report for the Department for Education and Skills. The School Management Task Force Professional Working Party	Bolam et al, HMSO	1993
The National Standards ('Rainbow Pack')	TTA	1998
Educational Management: Re-defining Theory, Police and Practice	Bush et al	1999

---

[1] This paper is written to support LEAD-link in the development of new training courses on educational leadership and management. LEAD-link is a Sub-Saharan African network of organisations each having a leading role in the field of Educational Management Development in their respective countries (Sudan, Uganda, Tanzania, Zambia, Malawi, South Africa, Swaziland, Mozambique). The complete set of papers can be found on the website of LEAD-link. (http://lead-linknetwork.org/) and on the site of Jan Arend Brands (www.freeman.nl).
EMSSA is short for Educational Management Sub-Saharan Africa.

The Development of School Leadership Preparation Programmes in England and the USA	Brundrett	2001
Establishing the Current State of School Leadership in England	DfES	2002
A Systematic Review of the Impact of School Leadership and Management on Student/Pupil Outcomes	Bell et al	2003
Follow-up research into the state of school leadership in England	Stevens et al, DfES	2003
The development of management and leadership capability and its contribution to performance: the evidence, the prospects and the research need Research	Burgogneet al, DfES.	2004
'End to End Review' of School Leadership Policy and Delivery	DfES	2004
National Standards for Headteachers.	DfES	2004
Distributive leadership and school improvement, leading or misleading. (B)ELMAS	Harris	2004
Distributed Leadership	MacBeath et al, NCSL	2004
Independent Study into School Leadership	PriceWaterhouseCoopers LLP	2007
Redesign of NPQH: Advice to Secretary of State	NCSL	2007
Corporate Plan 08/09	NCSL	2008

The National College for School Leadership
The Colleges goals as formulated in 2006 and reinforced in 2008 are:
• develop excellent school leadership to transform children's achievement and well-being
• develop leadership within and beyond the school
• identify and grow tomorrow's leaders
• ensure a fit-for-purpose, national college

That is somewhat different from the goals of 2002:
• provide a single national focus for school leadership development, research and innovation
• be a driving force for world-class leadership in our schools and the wider community
• provide support to and be a major resource for school leaders
• stimulate national and international debate on leadership issues.

The focus not any longer is on school leadership as such but on the much-needed effects of school leadership on children. The focus is less on NCSL (providing a single national focus) but more on the development of leadership. NCSL 'just' has to be a fit-for-purpose organisation.

A positive judgment on the NCSL
Levine is his very critical report of 2005 on the situation in the USA presented the NCSL as the most promising example of a strong program. A program not to be found in the USA. His verdict was:

Criteria for Excellence Applied to the National College for School Leadership

Criteria	Generally satisfies criterion	Explanation
Purpose is explicit, focusing on the education of practicing school leaders Goals reflect needs of today's leaders, schools, and children Success tied to student learning	Yes	No program we saw or heard about has more explicit and well-articulated purposes, goals, and criteria for success. They are rooted in the needs of leaders and schools as defined by the leaders themselves,

		the practitioner community, policy makers, academics, and government officials.
Curriculum is rigorous, coherent, and organized to teach the skills and knowledge needed by leaders at specific types of schools and at the various stages of their careers	Yes	The curriculum mirrors goals and purposes. It is built around the needs of leaders at five different career stages, with efforts to tailor the programs to the personal differences of leaders and the specific needs of their schools.
Curriculum integrates the theory and practice of administration	Yes	In every respect the curriculum is integrated, from pedagogy and locations for instruction to instructors and program content.
Faculty composed of scholars and practitioners expert in school leadership, up to date in their fields, intellectually productive, and rooted in the academy and the schools Number of professors and fields of expertise aligned with curriculum and student enrollment	Yes	This is a faculty that combines practitioners and academics in research and teaching. Not infrequently staff members straddle both worlds. When practitioners teach, they are trained by the college, which maintains control over the curriculum they teach. This would certainly not be to the taste of many professors at traditional universities, but it serves to balance academics and practice.
Admissions criteria designed to recruit students with the capacity and motivation to become successful school leaders	Yes	NCSL enrolls only sitting or aspiring school leaders and offers programs specifically targeted to career stages.
Graduation standards are high and the degrees awarded are appropriate to the profession	Not Applicable	NCSL does not award degrees. The college seeks partnerships with universities so that their students can earn degrees and credits for their NCSL work. Early research indicates that heads who attend specific programs foster higher levels of achievement in their students than do heads of comparison schools.
Research of high quality, driven by practice, and useful to practitioners and/or policy makers	Yes	No educational leadership program does a better job of bridging research and practice; practice drives research and research fuels practice.
Resources adequate to support the Program	Yes	This is the upscale version of education for school leaders. NCSL is very well funded.
Continuing self-assessment and performance improvement	Yes	NCSL is unrivaled in this regard.

Discussions about the NCSL
The judgment of Levine not yet reflected the discussions in the UK about the goals and functioning of the NCSL. One of the main points of those discussions was whether the NCSL in practice provided just one model of leadership[2]. It was another way of saying that

---

[2] See Crow p 297. He links the comments on a single notion of leadership (development) with comments on rigid narrow notions of standards (Gronn – hero paradigm, designer leader; Glatter – bureaucratic apparatus). 'The complex nature of work suggests that the NCSL should explore in conceptual diversity as well as contextual diversity in understanding school leadership. Acknowledging leadership conceptions that move beyond scientific management and corporate models of leadership

the NCSL coordinated and controlled all training, neglecting the knowledge and skills of former organisations that had provided or still were providing training.
What follows just concentrates on the 'one model of leadership'. It is evident from the Corporate Plan 08/09 of NCSL that the underlying message is heard in the sense that in the Plan it is highlighted in many places with how many organisations NCSL cooperates.

Already in 2001 the National Association of Head Teachers warned that the new NCSL must not patronise or try to control them. The comments were recognized by the chief executive of NCSL. She stated in 2002: The college is not about prescriptions or blueprints (Mulford 2004, p 315 and 319). And Southworth (Director of research) in 2004 stated: 'The college tries hard not to not to avoid prescribing any one approach (P 346)

Discussions went on. These discussions on the 'one model of leadership' were one of the reasons for the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) to commission in April 2006 PrivewaterhouseCoopers LLP to undertake an independent research study on school leadership. The main aims of the study were to provide a comprehensive and independent account of existing, emerging and potential models of school headship and the wider leadership team that are effective in raising standards for all pupils.

PwC LLP was able to define a set of models of school leadership. These models however do not define different styles of leadership. The models rather define different tasks in different situations in which heads are working.
The models are:
• Traditional leadership models;
• Managed leadership models;
• Multi-agency managed leadership models;
• Federated leadership models;
• System leadership models.
Furthermore it is remarkable to see that transformational or instructional leadership in the report are only mentioned once each. Distributed leadership 58 times)

Not surprisingly Key Finding 18 (the concluding one just before the Recommendations – p xii) was:
'Based on the above analysis, it is clear from the research that a 'one size fits all' approach will not be acceptable or appropriate for the sector and would not in any case be practical given the high level of school autonomy that exists. **Schools cannot be compelled to adopt new models but they can be invited and encouraged to review their current arrangements and be offered examples of alternative ways of organising themselves**. A key aspect of the recommendations we make is that information about these (and other) models should be disseminated throughout the sector, and schools should be encouraged to consider them as a potential way of responding to their new challenges'. (Bold from this author).

The recommendation directly relevant for this study is:
'Adopting a new approach towards leadership qualifications and programmes; NPQH and Head for the Future, focusing on a range of aspects including: sharing with professionals from other sectors and wider accreditation of prior learning (number 6 of 14 recommendations. (p xiii)
(Some other recommendations will be dealt with under Leadership later.)

Recommendations for a new NPQH
The recommendations on NPQH are detailed on page 151:
'Building on the ongoing review of NPQH, the DfES and NCSL should give consideration to reforming key aspects of NPQH and Head for the Future (formerly LPSH), in particular:
• Content; ensuring that the key needs articulated by school leaders in this research are given further prominence, in particular financial management, extended services and the associated implications for team working and people management;

---

to reflect more social justice and educative leadership models will contribute to helping leaders meet the needs of a more complex and diverse environment for learning' (p 300)

- Delivery; modernising the delivery vehicle to include, for example, e-learning solutions; a greater element of modularisation and tailoring to individual need; cross-sectoral inputs and participation; and less emphasis on what often comes across as a formulaic 'tick box' approach;
- Accreditation; ensuring that NPQH is fully 'joined up' with the outputs from secondments, exchanges and other CPD initiatives, so that participation in these initiatives can provide significant accreditation towards modules of NPQH. Ensuring also that this is the case, and understood to be so, in relation to relevant elements of other professional qualifications including, for example, Masters degrees and MBAs;
- Positioning; ensuring that NPQH and Head for the Future are widely understood across the sector, not as one-off exercises, but rather part of an ongoing development process;
- Constituency; ensuring that leadership training for support staff and senior support staff leaders (e.g. the Bursar Development Programme, delivered by NCSL) is accepted across the sector as being as important as leadership training for teachers; and
- Mentoring and support; promoting ongoing mentoring and support programmes in order to increase the successful number of NPQH candidates who take up headship or other leadership positions in schools.'

Remarkable: The content only features in the first recommendation.

National Standards for Headteachers (2004)
Work of the NCSL (in relation with many organisations) on the new NPQH is partly based on new National Standards for Headteachers.

The Core Purpose of the Headteacher (p 3)
The core purpose of the headteacher is to provide professional leadership and management for a school. This will promote a secure foundation from which to achieve high standards in all areas of the school's work. To gain this success a headteacher must establish high quality education by effectively managing teaching and learning and using personalised learning to realise the potential of all pupils. Headteachers must establish a culture that promotes excellence, equality and high expectations of all pupils.

The headteacher is the leading professional in the school. Accountable to the governing body, the headteacher provides vision, leadership and direction for the school and ensures that it is managed and organised to meet its aims and targets. The headteacher, working with others, is responsible for evaluating the school's performance to identify the priorities for continuous improvement and raising standards; ensuring equality of opportunity for all; developing policies and practices; ensuring that resources are efficiently and effectively used to achieve the school's aims and objectives and for the day-to-day management, organisation and administration of the school.

The headteacher, working with and through others, secures the commitment of the wider community to the school by developing and maintaining effective partnerships with, for example, schools, other services and agencies for children, the LEA, higher education institutions and employers. Through such partnerships and other activities, headteachers play a key role in contributing to the development of the education system as a whole and collaborate with others to raise standards locally.

Drawing on the support provided by members of the school community, the headteacher is responsible for creating a productive learning environment which is engaging and fulfilling for all pupils.

The key areas (p 4)
'The Standards are set out in six key non-hierarchical areas. These six key areas, when taken together, represent the role of the headteacher.
- Shaping the Future
- Leading Learning and Teaching
- Developing Self and Working with Others

- Managing the Organisation
- Securing Accountability
- Strengthening Community

Within each of these key areas, the knowledge requirements, professional qualities (skills, dispositions and personal capabilities headteachers bring to the role) and actions needed to achieve the core purpose are identified. Whilst particular knowledge and professional qualities are assigned to one of the six key areas, it is important to emphasise that they are interdependent and many are applicable to all key areas. Headteachers will attach relative importance to the actions, and add others, as they define the strategic and operational priorities within their own diverse contexts.

Effective headteachers are responsive to the context of the school and maintain an overview that integrates their work into a coherent whole.'

The changes in NPQH (2007)
The redesign of NPQH is outlined in paragraph 3 of the 'Advice to Secretary of State'. 'The revisions are designed to deliver personalised provision to meet the needs of school leaders and the diverse contexts in which they work. We recommend the model has the following features:
3.1 A pre-entry stage to:
- create an appetite for headship
- enable individuals to make decisions about their readiness for headship
- encourage serving headteachers and governors to support aspiring headteachers
- encourage individuals from diverse backgrounds to aspire to headship
3.2 A more robust and rigorous entry assessment and development process to:
- take more account of individual's prior learning (APL)
- allow those not currently in schools or in education to access NPQH, including non QTS
- recruit only those genuinely seeking headship - through sharper focus on motivation
- recruit individuals who demonstrate capability and readiness for headship
- identify a personalised development pathway for successful applicants as "trainee headteachers"
- provide developmental feedback to unsuccessful applicants
3.3 A more personalised approach for trainee headteachers to enable them to:
- improve and further develop strategic leadership expertise – building on strengths as well as addressing weaknesses
- develop key management skills (e.g. finance and budgeting skills; performance management)
- engage in leadership learning to meet contextualised development needs
- focus on particular areas of need (e.g. learning and teaching for non-educational participants)
3.4 A core offering of key experiences critical for future headteachers through:
- access to leadership and management materials, for example, use of data for school improvement; management and development of staff; financial management
- learning in self directed peer groups promoting collaborative, distributed leadership
- placements or work shadowing in different educational or work contexts
- challenge workshops and access to master classes
- engagement with the national policy and international research evidence
3.5 A streamlined graduation process to:
- enable individuals to demonstrate their professional knowledge, understanding and leadership effectiveness
- confirm immediate readiness for headship
- provide governing bodies with sufficient high quality applicants
- link to leadership development provision in early headship
- offer mentoring support, where appropriate, prior to headship
- provide work at masters level to accredit to higher degrees
3.6 A capacity-building approach that:
- requires serving headteachers to give NPQH colleagues support, challenge and feedback through the NPQH process
- draws on the expertise of highly effective headteachers by engaging them with:

   o providing placements and work shadowing for other trainee heads
   o coaching trainees beyond their own school
   o serving on the graduation panel'
(Redesign of NPQH: advice to Secretary of State April 2007 Page 2 of 5)

Again not much is said on the content (3.3), although from what is said it is clear that the content should fit the situation of the headteacher and his personal and particular needs. So, not a 'one size fits all' approach. It seems safe to assume that the content will reflect the core purpose of and key areas of the Headteacher Standards.

In the press
It is interesting to see how the Times Educational Supplement of 4 april 2008 describes the need for change:
'In just over 10 years, 30,000 people have studied for the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH). Plenty have relished the chance to mix with colleagues from around the country, bond and share ideas. Many have complained of its bureaucratic, tick-box approach to running a school. Unfortunately, only 10,750 have become heads. ... The apparent lack of success in converting NPQH graduates into heads has led Steve Munby, chief executive of the National College for School Leadership (NCSL), to overhaul the programme'.

And:
'The redesigned course will have a greater focus on the big-push initiatives of the day, including Every Child Matters (ECM), the 10-year Children's Plan, personalised learning, Building Schools for the Future, and 14-19 education'.

Conclusion on the situation in the UK and the new NPQH:
The changes proposed to have a better initial training are mainly about selection, the kind of learning and the organisation of the learning process much less about the content. It looks as if content is not a real issue, as if there is consensus about the content.

Regarding the content of the NPQH training: One can expect that content (as defined in materials to acquire knowledge, skills and dispositions) will be according to the 6 key areas of the role of the headteacher.

However whether the first key area 'Shaping the Future' has to be firmly in line with the big-push initiatives of the day will initiate interesting discussions. The positive side of 'being firmly in line' is that educational leadership is not 'empty' as in transformational leadership, the negative side might be that there is hardly any leeway for the headteacher to define another future and means to reach that future than is defined in e.g. ECM. If so it does not make much sense to talk about e.g. strategic leadership.
(More on this in the chapter on Leadership e.g. Bottery; Reports from the Front Line: English Headteachers' Work in an Era of Practice Centralization).

Questions for the curriculum development of the Sub-Saharan African head teacher course
- Should the content cover different models and/or styles of leadership or should there be a focus on a preferred model/style?
- How much variation is wanted/needed in the content of the curriculum? On which topics?
- Can/should different providers offer different approaches to leadership?
- Should the content be firmly in line with the educational policies of the government?