
Independent Study into School Leadership

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

Introduction

In November 2005, the School Teachers' Review Body (STRB) published its Fifteenth Report in which it recommended an independent study to examine the roles, responsibilities, structures and reward systems for school leaders in England and Wales. Following this, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) commissioned PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PwC) in April 2006 to undertake an independent research study on school leadership.

School leadership in England and Wales is generally of high quality and has been improving consistently since the mid-1990s; and it is second only to classroom teaching as an influence on pupil learning (Leithwood et al., 2006). In this context, 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.

Key findings

- The role of school leaders has become more challenging in recent years, and the complexity and range of tasks they are required to undertake has increased significantly;
- The *behaviours* of school leaders have a greater impact on pupil performance than school *structures* or leadership models,¹ and there is broad clarity about the roles and responsibilities that school leadership teams are now expected to fulfil;
- School leaders would welcome further support in order to help them meet all the demands that are currently being placed on them, particularly in relation to the requirements of the Every Child Matters agenda;
- There is a clear need for school leaders to develop staff, nurture talent and related to this, distribute leadership throughout the organisation. School leaders generally believe that they are doing this well, but the feedback from teachers and support staff suggests that this is not the case;

¹ This became clear not only from the literature (e.g. Leithwood et al., (2006) *Seven strong claims about successful school leadership*. Nottingham: NCSL; Spillane (2006) *Distributed leadership*. California: Jossey-Bass; Fenlon (2003) 'The public spirit in mastering leadership' in *Mastering Leadership* Financial Times, PricewaterhouseCoopers), but also from our school visits, focus groups with teachers and support staff, and interviews with private sector organisations.

- A range of new leadership models have begun to emerge, mainly as a response to key new policy imperatives. Generally, there has been a shift away from the traditional model of a headteacher supported by a deputy and/or assistant head. The new models have a range of features including:
 - The formal involvement of other agencies and a range of non-teaching professionals in leadership teams;
 - Flatter management-style structures;
 - Formal and informal collaboration between schools and other providers; and
 - 'System' leadership involving working beyond the boundaries of the institution.
- There is a need for further evaluation work to be conducted on the effectiveness of these models. However, based on the current research, all the models can be shown to have, in different ways, a positive impact on pupil performance;
- There is a persistence in many parts of the sector of the 'hero head' model, in which headteachers are responsible and accountable for everything. This approach to leadership is not consistent with the new and emerging models and has acted as a constraint on distributing leadership responsibilities; and
- Although a 'one size fits all' approach is not appropriate for the sector, schools should be invited and encouraged to review their current leadership arrangements in order to assess the extent to which the new models of leadership can help them address their challenges.

Methodology

The project management group for the study consisted of officials from the DfES, the National College for School Leadership (NCSL), with an observer from the secretariat to the STRB. The study was based on an intensive programme of quantitative and qualitative research involving the following key elements:

- An extensive review of existing academic and policy literature on leadership in education, other parts of the public sector and the private sectors, both nationally and internationally;
- Qualitative research in 50 schools throughout England and Wales, mostly conducted in the summer term of 2006. We visited 19 primary, 24 secondary and two special schools as well as two Pupil Referral Units and three nurseries. The visits involved interviewing the headteacher and a number of other teaching and non-teaching members of the senior leadership team in the schools. In addition, most of the visits included interviews with teachers, multi-agency staff, governors and parent representatives. On average, seven interviews in total were undertaken in each school;

- An extensive consultation exercise with key stakeholders including officials in the DfES, the NCSL, the Workforce Agreement Monitoring Group (WAMG),² other unions and professional associations, local authority officials and leaders from other public and private sector organisations. In total, around 50 meetings and face-to-face interviews were undertaken. The study team convened two meetings of a wider stakeholder Reference Group, and seven stakeholder bodies provided written submissions to the study team;
- Ten focus groups with teachers and support staff with an average of eight participants in each group. The groups were held in five locations throughout England and Wales with five groups undertaken for teaching staff and five for support staff; and
- A major postal and on-line survey which resulted in a final achieved sample of 3,260 school leaders including headteachers, members of the Governing Body, and teaching and senior support staff members of the senior leadership team (see Table below). Questionnaire packs (containing a questionnaire for each of the four target groups) were sent to 3,753 schools and at least one response was achieved from 40% of these schools.

Survey group	Achieved sample
Headteachers	1,286
Governors	531
QTS members of the senior leadership team	1,107
Senior support staff on the senior leadership team	336
ALL	3,260


Main findings

Overall assessment of school leadership

School leaders in England and Wales have a lot to be proud of. Existing survey work shows that, when compared to other professions, people in wider society think that headteachers provide particularly good examples of leadership.³ They have led the implementation of a series of major national initiatives in the last three years, during which time levels of pupil performance have continued to improve and are currently at an all time high; and seeing children achieve, according to our research, is the single most important aspect of the job that gives school leaders greatest satisfaction.

² The members of the Workforce Agreement Monitoring Group are as follows: The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL), Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL), the GMB, National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers (NASUWT), National Assembly for Wales (NAW), National Employers' Organisation for School Teachers (NEOST), Professional Association of Teachers (PAT), Transport and General Workers Union (TGWU) and UNISON.

³ Survey commissioned by the NCSL in 2003 and conducted using face-to-face interviewing techniques by MORI, see <http://www.ipsos-mori.com/polls/2003/ncsl.shtml>



Ofsted estimates that around three quarters of school leaders in England are doing a 'good', 'very good' or 'excellent' job, at leading and managing their schools;⁴ similar figures apply to Wales. The quality of school leadership has also been improving consistently since the mid 1990s when, according to Ofsted, only around one half of school leaders were ranked as 'good', 'very good' or 'excellent'.⁵ Alongside all of this, Government has made a huge investment in maintaining and developing school leadership, through the creation of the NCSL and the associated development of the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH). In general terms, therefore, there is a very positive story to tell around the quality of leadership in our schools.

There is, however, no room for complacency: firstly, having one fifth of school leaders rated as 'unsatisfactory' is unacceptable. Secondly, there was an apparent drop in the leadership quality ratings in the most recent Ofsted Annual Report (November 2006).⁶ Thirdly, and most importantly, the social and policy landscape has changed completely, so that what school leaders are expected to do now and in the future is significantly different from what it was even a few years ago.

Roles and responsibilities of school leaders

There is a clear sense amongst school leaders that their role has become more challenging, and that the complexity and range of tasks they are required to undertake has increased greatly in recent years. This is due in large part to a number of inter-related policies and initiatives that impact on the role of school leaders including Every Child Matters (ECM), workforce remodelling, and the 14-19 agenda. Implementation of these initiatives requires a new set of skills including greater collaboration between schools, and partnership working across the children's services sector and beyond.

There is a reasonable degree of clarity about the roles and responsibilities that school leadership teams are now expected to fulfil. These are articulated clearly in, for example, the *School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document* (STPCD), as well as the DfES's *National Standards for Headteachers*. They were also described clearly and consistently to the study team by the many school leaders we interviewed or surveyed as part of the research. Generally, the roles and responsibilities of school leaders cover a range of strategic and operational areas including: setting the strategic direction and ethos of the school; managing teaching and learning; developing and managing people; and dealing with the requirements of the accountability regime.

⁴ *The Annual Report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools 2004-05*. London: Ofsted

⁵ In the most recent Ofsted annual report published in November 2006, leadership quality ratings dipped across all sectors with the exception of special schools. It should be noted however that direct comparisons cannot be made with previous years given changes to Ofsted's inspection regime in 2005-06.

⁶ *The Annual Report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools 2005-06*. London: Ofsted

However, although there is broad clarity about what school leaders (including the headteacher and other members of the senior leadership team) are supposed to be doing, the evidence also suggests that many school leaders are struggling to meet all the demands currently being placed on them. The following Table summarises some of the key findings from our research in this regard.

Key findings in relation to school leaders' roles and responsibilities

Roles and responsibilities* <i>i.e. the key activities school leaders should be performing</i>	Findings <i>i.e. the evidence on the extent to which school leaders are currently meeting the demands being placed on them</i>
Strategic direction and ethos	Many headteachers recognise themselves that they are struggling to create sufficient time to engage effectively in the various strategic issues they are required to deal with. Part of this is driven by the sheer volume of operational delivery issues that school leaders now have to address. However, there was also a sense in which the data suggested some school leaders were more comfortable with an operational role rather than a strategic one.
Teaching and learning	There is a widespread recognition across the sector that an essential role of school leaders is to promote and develop the quality of teaching and learning delivered in the school. Many school leaders expressed their frustration that the current environment does not allow them to be as involved in this area as they would like. This is reflected in the fact that, in order to enable them to devote sufficient time to leadership and management, school leaders themselves teach a lot less than they used to; for example, just over one quarter of primary and secondary heads do not teach at all in timetabled lessons, and most of the rest teach for less than five hours per week.
Developing and managing people	Developing people and nurturing talent is a key strategic leadership issue facing all types of organisations across different sectors. Within the schools context, the international literature shows one of the most important ways in which school leaders contribute to teaching and learning is through their impact on the motivation, development and well-being of staff. Our evidence shows that many school leaders have embraced these challenges in relation to people development well, but also that there is more to be done, at both institution and system level. For example, when headteachers were asked what their priorities should be going forward, as well as what their future skills needs were, staff management, recruitment and retention appeared quite far down the list. Whilst this is understandable given their other commitments, it nevertheless suggests that many school leaders may not have embraced the people agenda as fully as has been the case in other sectors (e.g. in the private sector where it is one of the bedrocks on which all current thinking on leadership is based).

Roles and responsibilities* <i>i.e. the key activities school leaders should be performing</i>	Findings <i>i.e. the evidence on the extent to which school leaders are currently meeting the demands being placed on them</i>
Networking and collaboration - between schools and with other agencies	<p>Given the new policy imperatives, collaboration and networking with other schools and other agencies ought to become the rule for schools, not the exception. For example, as outlined in the DfES <i>Extended Schools Prospectus</i> (2005), by 2010 all schools should be offering a core set of extended services including childcare, parenting support and other specialist services (e.g. speech therapy, mental health services). This raises the need for school leaders, irrespective of which leadership model they are working within, to collaborate effectively with other agencies to secure the delivery of these services. The research has shown that this has driven some schools to restructure in such a way as to formally recognise the importance of inter-agency collaboration, i.e. by including professionals from other agencies on the leadership teams. And our expectation, based on the research findings, is that this will become more common in other schools going forward. More generally, all of this means that school leaders now have to be much more outward looking than they used to be, and this has clear implications around the need for a range of 'softer' inter-personal skills around networking and communication. Our research shows that most school leaders recognise and accept the new requirements being placed on them in these areas, but that many are struggling to respond, and most recognise the need for training and support. Indeed, the development and management of extended services was the single most important future training requirement highlighted by headteachers in our survey research.</p>
Operations	<p>As outlined above, the evidence suggests that many school leaders are too involved in operational and delivery matters and that this has been, to some extent, at the expense of embracing their more strategic imperatives. The research has generated numerous stories of headteachers, for example, unblocking toilets, filling dishwashers and supervising pupils before and after school. Sometimes such behaviours can be appropriate, and they are often driven by resources, particularly in the primary sector, where the opportunities for delegating such tasks can be limited. But these ties to the operational space also seem to be related, based on our interpretation of the evidence, to a mindset amongst some school leaders which is often more comfortable with an operational than a strategic role.</p>

Roles and responsibilities* <i>i.e. the key activities school leaders should be performing</i>	Findings <i>i.e. the evidence on the extent to which school leaders are currently meeting the demands being placed on them</i>
Accountability	Tasks related to accountability were the most time consuming of all the tasks undertaken by headteachers. In this context, the word 'initiavitis' was often used by the leaders we spoke to as a way of expressing their frustration with the number of policy initiatives they were having to deal with, the apparent inconsistencies between them and the lack of resources to deal with them. Although we recognised the strength of this feeling, at the same time it seemed to us to reflect a wish for a stability and consistency which cannot be delivered and which is not enjoyed by any other organisation in the public or private sector. We know from other sectors that change, diversity and complexity are inevitable features of the current and future environment and that leaders need to accept and embrace this. School leaders can, however, legitimately expect such change to be managed coherently and in a joined-up manner by Government and other agencies.

Note:* The key areas highlighted in this column are broadly consistent with those outlined in the STPCD and the *National Standards for Headteachers* and they are also consistent with the key roles and responsibilities highlighted to us by school leaders themselves in our survey.

The evidence presented above relates to the roles and responsibilities of school leadership teams, not just the headteacher. In this context it is worth noting finally that the research examined specifically the role of assistant heads and deputy heads, and found that there was little difference between them. The deputy role was generally more focused on a range of management responsibilities, whereas the assistant role had a greater focus on pupil well-being and implementing new initiatives. Overall, however the lack of a clear and consistent separation between the roles suggested that the distinction may no longer serve any valid purpose.

Characteristics of effective school leaders - distributing school leadership

An important aspect of this study involved identifying leadership models that are effective in terms of raising standards of pupil achievement. A key element of this relates to the characteristics of effective leaders, i.e. the attributes and behaviours exhibited by successful leaders, irrespective of the organisational model or structure within which they are operating. Indeed, a strong message from the literature on leadership in the private sector and from our qualitative research is that, although corporate structures matter, they do not matter as much as the behaviours exhibited by the leaders of the organisation.⁷ A similar message emerges from our research; the behaviours of school leaders have a greater influence on pupil performance than school structures or models.

⁷ For example, Feiner, M. (2003) 'Laws of leadership' in *Mastering Leadership*. Financial Times, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP.

A considerable amount of research has been conducted nationally and internationally into the key behaviours and characteristics that underpin effective school leadership and an overview of the key findings from this literature is shown in the following Table.

Effective school leadership – overview of findings from research evidence

- School leadership is second only to classroom teaching as an influence on pupil learning;
- Almost all successful leaders draw on the same basic repertoire of leadership practices (the main elements are: building vision, developing people, redesigning the organisation, managing teaching and learning);
- The ways in which leaders apply these basic leadership practices, not the practices themselves, demonstrate responsiveness to the contexts in which they work;
- School leaders improve teaching and learning indirectly through their influence on staff motivation, commitment and working conditions;
- School leadership has a greater influence on schools and students when it is widely distributed;
- Some patterns of distribution are more effective than others; and
- A small handful of personal traits explain a high proportion of the variation in leadership effectiveness.

Source: *Seven strong claims about effective school leadership*, Leithwood et al., National College for School Leadership, 2006.

Perhaps one of the strongest themes to emerge from this existing literature on effective school leadership (as well, incidentally, as studies on leadership in the private sector), relates to the importance of developing staff, nurturing talent and, related to this, 'distributing' leadership throughout the organisation. Within the schools context, distributing leadership is a potential means of ameliorating some of the workload issues which are currently being faced by school leaders, by making the role more attractive and the size of the job more deliverable. But distributed leadership is about much more than just sharing out tasks. Rather, it also encompasses a shared approach to strategic leadership, in which professionals throughout the organisation are genuinely engaged and can influence its culture, ethos and strategic direction, albeit to an extent that is commensurate with their position.

Our research suggested a general consensus amongst school leaders, staff and other stakeholders about the need for distributed leadership in schools. Generally, everyone we spoke to agreed with the principles underpinning the distributed model. The vast majority of school leaders (e.g. 95% of secondary heads and 85% of primary heads) felt that leadership responsibilities were distributed, at least to some extent, in their own schools. However, there was also a strong message from our research that many teaching and support staff did not feel engaged and involved in a way that was consistent with the existence of distributed leadership in schools. Staff generally had a clear view on the behaviours and traits that made an effective leader (see Box below) but, based on the focus groups we conducted, we were left with the impression that these attributes were not seen by staff as being as prevalent amongst school leaders as they needed to be. In addition, the sense that we got from our fieldwork visits, where many school leaders were clearly over-stretched and taking on a large range of delivery-related responsibilities, also seemed inconsistent with the widespread existence of distributed leadership. A key finding from the research, therefore, is that there is a need for broader and deeper distributed leadership in schools.

Views from teachers and support staff on effective leadership behaviours

Effective leaders...

- Adopt an open, consultative and non-hierarchical approach - distribute leadership responsibilities effectively;
- Are approachable and visible throughout the school;
- Communicate effectively with all staff;
- Take performance management of staff seriously, and provide clear development pathways for staff; and
- Understand classroom practice as well as the role of the school in the wider community.

Source: Focus groups with teachers and support staff conducted as part of this research.

Some of the barriers to distributing leadership that we identified included the persistence of the traditional 'hero-head' perception amongst heads themselves and their staff, coupled with parental and community expectations of an ever-present, ever-available head. In addition, there are a number of legislative, accountability and resource-related barriers that prevent heads distributing leadership further.

Models of school leadership

An important part of the present research involved examining different models of school leadership, and identifying the aspects of those models that have a positive impact on pupil performance. The evidence shows that although leadership behaviours are generally more important than leadership models, the development of new models can be one of the conduits through which the right leadership behaviours are fostered. We have framed our analysis of this in terms of the following five broad types of leadership models:

- **Traditional model** - here the leadership team is comprised exclusively of qualified teaching staff and typically includes a headteacher supported by deputy and/or assistant heads. In our research, this model predominated in the primary sector but was also common, albeit to a lesser extent, in secondary schools;
- **Managed model** - this model moves away from the traditional model towards a flatter management-style structure in which specific roles are allocated on the senior leadership team for senior support staff, for example, directors of finance and/or HR. This model tends to be found more often in the secondary sector with almost half of heads stating that they had one senior support staff member on the leadership team and a further 8% stating they had two senior support staff members;
- **Multi-agency managed model** - this model is a natural progression from the managed model and is, in a sense, borne out of the imperatives of the ECM and 14-19 agendas. Like the managed model it involves a flatter, management-style structure, but is more outward-looking and inter-agency focused. It can manifest itself in a wide variety of ways, but generally will involve teaching staff and professionals from other agencies working together as part of school leadership teams. This model remains the exception rather than the rule but, as outlined above, our expectation is that more schools are likely to move in this direction as a key way of responding to the ECM and 14-19 agendas;

- **Federated model** - this model is characterised by varying degrees of collaboration between schools and sometimes between schools and other providers, for example: 'whole town' approaches to schooling; shared strategic governing bodies, with executive heads overseeing several schools; and federations between schools, Further Education and work-based learning providers. In our survey, almost one in ten headteachers reported some sort of formal federation arrangement, and the majority of schools reported informal collaborations with other schools; and
- **System leadership model** - this model embraces all the different roles that heads can assume beyond the boundaries of their own school i.e. those that contribute to the wider educational system at a local, regional or national level. It includes, for example National Leaders of Education assuming roles that include providing advice to Government and 'virtual heads' responding to schools facing specific challenging circumstances.

It is important to note that these models are, by definition, very broad and as such they are not mutually exclusive. For example, some schools may sit across the boundaries of the models, e.g. schools adopting a multi-agency model in order to address the ECM agenda, but doing so within the context of a federation with other schools. Notwithstanding this, many of the stakeholders we have spoken to have recognised and validated our categorisation of models in this way, as a way of bringing a degree of order and clarity to what is a very complex situation on the ground.

Effectiveness of leadership models

Our terms of reference required us to examine the effectiveness of the different models in terms of raising pupil achievement. Before doing so, it is important to state that it is beyond the scope of the current study to undertake a formal longitudinal evaluation of each of the models, similar to other evaluations that the DfES has commissioned (e.g. on Academies and Building Schools for the Future). Rather, our work on effectiveness aims to identify some of the key elements of the models which, based on the qualitative and quantitative evidence collected, can be shown to have a positive (or negative) impact on pupil performance. Within this context, the following Table provides an overview of the key findings from the research in relation to the effectiveness of each of the five models in terms of raising standards of achievement.

Effectiveness of leadership models in raising standards – overview of key findings

- **Traditional model** - this model has been, and in some contexts can continue to be, an effective model for raising pupil standards. Its key strengths in terms of raising standards relate to its clear focus on teaching and learning, its clarity and acceptance by pupils, teachers and stakeholders and its clear lines of accountability. However, our research suggests that its success may be less to do with the model itself and more to do with the behaviours of the school leaders that underpin the model. In particular, and in line with the findings from other research, the evidence suggests that where this model has worked well it is because, *inter alia*, school leaders have been distributing their leadership responsibilities effectively throughout the organisation and have a strong strategic focus on developing their people. The evidence also suggests, however, that the current policy environment is placing significant stress on the sustainability of this model and that schools may need to begin to move away from it in order to ensure that pupil standards and pupil welfare are protected.
- **Managed model** - the move towards this model has been one of the first steps taken by many schools in order to overcome the tensions associated with running a traditional model in the current policy environment. In taking these steps, a number of schools have found that this model has enabled them to allocate key roles and responsibilities more effectively. In doing so, they have ensured that headteachers have more time to focus on developing teaching and learning and, more generally, that the leadership resource is more effectively utilised. The evidence also suggests that in many of the situations in which this model has emerged, there is often a corresponding commitment amongst the school's leadership to the principles and practice of distributed leadership and the strategic development and involvement of all teaching and support staff. In other words, there is a sense in which the structural configuration of the school is consistent with and has often been driven by some of the key behaviours and attitudes amongst school leaders that we know have a positive impact on pupil attainment. Co-headship, which splits leadership responsibilities between two or more people through job-share arrangements for example, is a distinct sub-set of the managed model. The success of the co-headship model is inextricably linked to the quality and sustainability of the personal relationships between those involved. However, the evidence from this study along with other international evidence, shows that it can be an effective solution to current leadership challenges.
- **Multi-agency managed model** - in terms of raising standards of pupil achievement, the most important element of this model relates to its formal recognition of the links between children's educational outcomes and their social outcomes. The majority of primary and secondary heads in our survey accepted the strong link between the provision of extended services and pupils' motivation, well-being and educational achievement. It is possible, of course, for extended services to be provided within the context of a different model. Nonetheless, the evidence suggests that, in some contexts, there are clear benefits associated with schools formally adopting this kind of a multi-agency model. For example, having nurses, social workers and/or psychologists working on the school site, although not without its difficulties, can generate significant efficiencies that ultimately contribute positively to pupils' educational achievement. For example, we have seen some examples of the presence of such professionals on site ensuring that pupils' wider social needs are dealt with in an holistic and timely manner.

- **Federated model** - this model can be shown to have a number of key benefits which, ultimately, impact positively on pupil performance, for example: greater capacity through more distributed leadership; economies of scale achieved through pooling resources; smoother transitions of pupils between phases; and improved progression opportunities for all members of the school workforce. The benefits of this can be manifested in the primary school sector where groups of schools are able to share resources and access services that would not be viable for individual schools. But they can also be apparent in the secondary sector where inter-school (and school-college) arrangements can improve the range and quality of the curriculum on offer to pupils.
- **System leadership model** - the effectiveness of these models in terms of raising pupil attainment needs to be understood in a rather more general sense than the other models. This is because a number of the models in this category are system-wide and not tied to individual institutions. There are, however, clear potential benefits at local, regional and national level that have been shown to impact positively on pupil attainment. Much of the evidence on this has been collated and/or commissioned by the NCSL, for example, the evidence on executive heads supporting failing schools and thereby improving pupil performance.

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.

Recommendations

Based on our interpretation of these findings, a number of recommendations have been outlined which, if taken together, have the potential to transform the face of school leadership in England and Wales and ensure that leaders are equipped to embrace and deliver for the future. Implicit in these recommendations is the premise that it is incumbent on everyone involved - school leaders, teachers and support staff, their professional associations and unions, the DfES its partners and agencies and people in wider society - to play their part in bringing about this change. The key recommendations to emerge from the research can be summarised as follows:

- **Diversifying leadership models;** proactively promote new and emerging leadership models; develop a national programme to support schools seeking to move towards new models; and remove the key legal and regulatory barriers to the development of new models;
- **Distributing responsibility with accountability;** review policy and practice in relation to accountability in order to facilitate greater distributed leadership. This will involve, *inter alia*: a review of legislation and regulation in relation to accountability in schools; further communicating the flexibilities in relation to accountability afforded under the 2002

Education Act; and extending the provision of training and licensing to leaders who do not have Qualified Teaching Status (QTS);

- **Reviewing governance;** consider further the interaction between leadership and governance, addressing issues including: the size and composition of governing bodies, the implications of multi-agency working in schools, and the *modus operandi* for pro-bono contributions from the private sector;
- **Streamlining policy;** review the mechanisms currently in place for limiting the bureaucratic burden on schools; conduct a regular mapping exercise of existing and future regulations; and provide greater clarity around which aspects of policies and requirements on schools are mandatory and which are optional / advisory;
- **Developing people, diversity and succession planning;** promote suitably qualified professionals from outside the schools sector taking on school leadership roles; encourage shortening the time from QTS to headship; and develop a pilot initiative involving the rotation of leaders at periodic intervals around a cluster of schools;
- **Adopting a new approach towards leadership qualifications and programmes;** reform NPQH and Head for the Future, focusing on a range of aspects including: sharing modules with professionals from other sectors and wider accreditation of prior learning;
- **Mainstreaming innovative, experience-based Continuous Professional Development (CPD) activities;** build leadership capacity in the sector by promoting and mainstreaming a series of innovative, experience-based CPD activities including secondments into business or the public sector and cross-sectoral mentoring programmes. Also encourage Children's Trusts to develop training that brings together senior leaders from education, health, social services and other relevant agencies;
- **Developing system-wide e-learning solutions;** do this in order to address some of the key training needs identified in this study, and as part of a wider 'blended' approach to learning;
- **Ensuring that the existing reward system works better,** i.e. we are not recommending radical changes to the existing reward system. We do not think that any of the new models of school leadership could not be accommodated within the existing broad framework, and our main recommendation relates to modifying the existing system, not changing it radically;
- **Rewarding new roles and individual performance;** modify the existing reward system in a number of areas including:
 - Examining how salary ranges for executive heads and chief executives can be best determined, and also how the salary range of heads should be adjusted where they report to an executive head;
 - Reviewing the ways in which non-QTS senior support staff are rewarded in order to promote effective recruitment and retention; and

- Providing further guidance and training to headteachers, governors and local authorities, on how to reward leaders most effectively.
- **Maintaining the integrity of the reward system;** review a number of aspects of the existing system including: pay differentials between heads, deputies and assistants; the different weightings of pupil numbers set out in the School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document (STPCD); and whether there should be a distinction between the pay scales for deputies and assistants;
- **Role of parents and learners;** provide support to school leaders in the use of low burden ways to seek and respond to the voice of the users of their services, in particular, learners and parents;
- **Winning hearts and minds;** develop a communications campaign in order to challenge the conventional wisdom (e.g. around 'hero heads'), explain the benefits of new leadership models, and enlist new entrants into the talent pool from diverse backgrounds; and
- **Measuring and managing the change;** ensure the national steering arrangements for school leadership reform are based on up-to-date, insightful management information, and that there is clear ownership of all recommendations being taken forward as a result of this study.

Additional Information

Copies of the full report (RR818A) and the technical report (RR818B) - priced £4.95 - are available by writing to DfES Publications, PO Box 5050, Sherwood Park, Annesley, Nottingham NG15 0DJ.

Cheques should be made payable to "DfES Priced Publications".

Copies of this Research Brief RB818 are available free of charge from the above address (tel: 0845 60 222 60). Research Briefs and Research Reports can also be accessed at www.dfes.gov.uk/research/ and www.teachernet.gov.uk/publications

Further information about this research can be obtained from David Churchill, Area 3S, DfES, Sanctuary Buildings, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BT.

Email: david.churchill@dfes.gsi.gov.uk

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education and Skills.