Chapter 19
School Leadership in the United Kingdom: A Policy Perspective

Jim O'Brien

Introduction

The importance of leadership for effective schools is widely acknowledged internationally in the research literature and by politicians and policymakers. National systems invariably have differing priorities and emphases, but there has been almost a global movement adhering to the view that school leadership is the critical answer to the imperative of raising standards and student achievement. The UK, where successive governments in the past two decades have sought through policy intervention to raise standards and student achievement, is no exception. However, the governance of education has changed dramatically especially since 1997 with the election of "New Labour" and their promise of devolution, and will no doubt do so again with the emergence of a Conservative/Liberal Democrat coalition government in May 2010 faced with an unprecedented national budget deficit. Few services will escape the substantial cuts in public services envisaged being necessary over the next few years and undoubtedly, even with promised budget protection, education and schooling will have to respond. For example, in Scotland, with a population of just over 5 million, the continuing existence of 32 local authorities each separately responsible for the education budget in that district immediately looks to be untenable and collaboration between or merger of such authorities seems probable. While this chapter focuses on UK developments, it is written from the perspective of someone who has always worked and researched in the Scottish context and many examples used will inevitably originate from there, especially given the resurgence of interest in the "distinctiveness" of Scottish education (Bryce and Humes 2008).

J. O'Brien (✉)
The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
e-mail: Jim.OBrien@ed.ac.uk

T. Townsend and J. MacBeath (eds.), *International Handbook of Leadership for Learning*, Springer International Handbooks of Education 25,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-1350-5_19,

The United Kingdom: The Impact of Devolution

Policy for the education system in England remains at Westminster. However, the re-establishment of Scotland's Parliament at Holyrood in Edinburgh, the setting up of a Welsh Assembly in Cardiff and the recent restoration of powers to the Northern Ireland Assembly at Stormont mean that there are now four clearly separate education systems within the UK (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales). Formal devolved responsibility for education of powers over educational policy in the four jurisdictions has resulted in greater scope for divergence and material difference. However, an increasingly important research by-product of this development has been the enlarged scope for "home" comparative investigations (Raffe et al. 1999; Phillips 2003) into policy and structures as they evolve in each country.

Due to the political situation in Northern Ireland, British mainland political parties have traditionally not stood for election there and the province has its own school system where pluralism, community relations, equality and diversity in education policy are critical to the future of the system and currently a consultation on such matters is in place (http://www.deni.gov.uk/index/20-community-relations-pg/community_relations-consultation.htm, accessed September 2010).

Wales, where education policy and the schooling system have long been closely linked to England, especially more recently in relation to the National Curriculum, is increasingly taking on a Welsh perspective at all levels (Daugherty 2006; Egan and James 2003; National Assembly for Wales 2001; Welsh Assembly Government 2006). Education as the major devolved area provides opportunities to assert a degree of distinctiveness as Rees (2007: 8) indicates,

> When the First Minister, Rhodri Morgan, in a speech to the National Institute for Public Policy Research at the University of Wales, Swansea, in December 2002, wished to demonstrate his claim that there was "clear red water" between the policies of his administration and those of New Labour in Westminster, it was to educational initiatives that he frequently turned.

Research consideration of the impacts of parliamentary devolution in Wales on education policy is developing. As Raffe (2004) has argued in Scotland, Rees (2007) points out that parliamentary devolution has created circumstances in which Welsh education policies have become increasingly distinct from those of the other UK jurisdictions. He suggests that while the British system retains significant influence the distinctiveness of the Welsh system is characterised by the continuation of well-rooted values and social democratic policy themes that are in marked contrast to the radical developments promoted since 1997 by "New Labour" in England.

Historically, Scotland has always had its own separate and distinctive education system. Since devolution, the Scottish Executive [Government] and the Scottish Parliament have developed a series of educational initiatives including a national debate about education and its purposes (Scottish Executive Education Department [SEED] 2003), agreement on the national educational priorities for schooling, re-emphasised in *Ambitious, Excellent Schools* (SEED 2004), initiatives include the introduction of new community schools (Sammons et al. 2003), and enhanced

teacher conditions of service (SEED 2001a, b), an emphasis on professional renewal, school re-culturing and the professional learning or continuing professional development (CPD) of teachers and school leaders. While the success or otherwise of many of these initiatives has been limited or unproven to date, and is subject to political vagaries with the emergence of the Scottish National Party as the governing party in the Holyrood Parliament, they have demonstrably evidenced that things are done differently in Scotland.

The English education system continues to look to Westminster for policy and governance and devolution has resulted in the anomaly of non-English-based MPs still being able to vote on such matters. There have been muted attempts to devolve some policy responsibilities to the English regions but so far without great enthusiasm. Partially as a result of its size and historical relationship with other parts of the UK, invariably school policy priorities and initiatives in England have an influence on developments elsewhere. However, many policy proposals have been mediated even before the onset of devolution. These include, for example, Prime Minister Thatcher's attempts in the late 1980s to promote new school governing bodies in Scotland – School Boards – and the associated "opting out" of local authority control by individual schools; policies which have been abandoned in the case of School Boards, while the Scots have failed to see any merit in schools removing themselves from local authority control although recently there have been some signs that experimentation with a form of greater devolved powers to schools themselves may be gaining some support.

Influences on School Leadership Policy

Since Prime Minister Callaghan's 1976 Ruskin College speech on the need to raise the quality of schooling and to improve educational standards if the UK was to compete economically as a nation, successive governments have strived to raise standards of achievement in British schools. Day (2002, 2005) provides interesting insights into the influences on school leadership policy as he "charts the changes over the last 20 years of government policies and the effects of the new performativity agendas upon school principals" (2005: 393). While writing about leadership in England and Wales, much of his identification of pressures on the system, and how these influence the nature of school leadership, holds true in the rest of the UK although similar changes may not have been so overt or have plainly not been adopted, e.g. in Scotland collaboration between schools has continued to be a priority and the creation of a quasi-market associated with schools and raising standards has failed to take hold.

Clearly the autonomy of teachers has been eroded *inter alia* by the centrally determined establishment of stringent forms of public accountability and quality assurance of teaching through teacher appraisal and pay-related threshold arrangements, national testing of school students at key stages and the development of national *curricula* and national prescriptive policies such as the "Literacy Hour",

combined with the introduction of decentralised school-based financial management and greater powers for school governing bodies allied to increased parental choice. As Day notes in an earlier article (2002: 677) "what has happened to education is one outcome of a larger ideological debate on the costs and management of the public services in general". Day cites Whitty et al. (1998: 65), who describe this process as "a struggle among different stakeholders over the definition of teacher professionalism and professionality for the twenty first century…".

This approach initially promoted by the "New Right" has developed into the dominant discourse in schooling. In England, especially, the key to these changes is increased indirect rule from the centre and the promotion of a target culture of school development and improvement plans; clear prescription of the curriculum; acceptance of, and compliance with, teacher standards; external inspection of school standards and the publication of reports and league tables (often described as a "naming and shaming" agenda) plus control of teacher professional identity aligned to technicist or instrumental competences. Overall, such measures mean that to all intents and purposes teachers have been shorn of professionalism.

The situation in Scotland was similar but somewhat different given the nature of the relationship between Scottish schools and the State. In earlier writing (O'Brien et al. 2008: 3), it was suggested that sociological and historical research (McPherson and Raab 1988; Paterson 2000) indicates that the "relationship between state and schooling developed in Scotland alongside the adoption of universalist welfare values in school education since 1945". Such research suggests that Scotland achieved acceptance of extensive "managed" centralisation, in which much of the power and control lay hidden behind national "guidance", and/or agencies such as the Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum [now Learning Teaching Scotland] and Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools – interestingly it is now proposed that these two bodies merge. Additionally, the separation of strategic policy (national government) and provision (local authorities) meant that neither local nor national government regarded itself as responsible for failures of policy or in respect of implementation of school and teacher policy. Equally, a limited, and limiting, model of teacher professionalism was unmistakable viz. teachers were viewed as employees responsible for implementing policy decided elsewhere. Despite this, the various disputes in Scotland between teachers, employers and government over national policy direction (e.g. the rejection of a form of national testing achieved by an alliance of teachers and parents) demonstrate the continuing struggle for power and control among key players in the system. Scotland, in the 1990s was not immune to "a simplistic managerialist mindset" evidenced by the then national UK government whose reforms were "aimed at transforming educational practice and designed to make the teaching profession more accountable (and, so the thinking went, schools would therefore be more effective) through greater control" (O'Brien et al. 2008: 3). The accountability agenda in Scotland at this time is illustrated by the introduction of teacher appraisal (subsequently mediated into the less intimidating staff development and review); national testing in primary schools (although, as noted previously, the original intent was defeated); strict curriculum guidance, reinforced by an external inspection system looking for

teacher compliance although it could be claimed that this was countered with the promotion of school self-evaluation (SEED 2002a, b) and opportunities for parents to become involved in school governance through School Boards (with the consequent unsuccessful opportunity to "opt out" of local authority control). However, unlike other parts of the UK, Scottish civic society (Paterson 2000) exercised greater power, underpinned by a strong civic consensus, and actively resisted the wholesale "marketisation" of public schooling. In Scotland the ideals of public schooling as a force for good remained strong. This was evinced by the teaching profession and their employers sharing the twin ideals that public schooling exists to equalise opportunity and to counter disadvantage.

Post devolution in 1999, increased funding allocations to schools especially in relation to early intervention paralleled a clear commitment to local empowerment through experimentation with "new community" or "full-service" schools (Sammons et al. 2003). The agreed national priorities in education moved beyond academic attainment into areas such as "values and citizenship" and "inclusion and equality". The implied increased emphasis on the emotional development of the whole child and less on the acquisition and progression of formal cognitive skills is given full consideration by O'Brien and MacLeod (2009). Much of this has come together with the emergence of a new curriculum – *Curriculum for Excellence* (SEED 2004) – the progress of this innovation and full details of current developments can be found online at http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/understandingthecurriculum/whatiscurriculumforexcellence//. Schools and teachers are encouraged under this new curriculum to seek creative and engaging ways of educating young people to become "successful learners, confident individuals, active contributors and responsible citizens". Teachers are expected to engage collaboratively in curriculum development with much less central prescription. Such an approach is challenging for the teaching profession in Scotland and in itself puts different forms of pressure on school leaders, perhaps more so in secondary schools, as participative, active and authentic learning moves centre stage in Scottish schools.

Nevertheless, some research suggests Scotland, like other nations, remains firmly in the grip of managerialist discourse and policymaking. Reeves et al. (2006: 3) as part of the Applied Educational Research Scheme (Cowie and McKinney 2007), designed to build useful research capacity particularly in Scottish University Education Faculties, reported that having analysed recently published Scottish policy publications,

> … the documentary evidence confirmed that policy formation in school management and governance in Scotland reflects the use of "globalised" solutions to modernising public services through the adoption of managerial strategies to bring about change. This was exemplified in the recent re-structuring of the schools' work force under the terms of the McCrone Agreement (SE 2001 [see SEED 2001b]) which has been introduced alongside other centralised strategies to re-define teacher professionalism such as a framework of occupational standards for teachers…However there is also a "new" strand post-devolution, identifiable as a europeanised and globalised theme, about nation-building and the "revival" of democracy.

The researchers go on to conclude that the policy discourse stresses involvement and participation with frequent references to partnership but in their view with little demonstrable commitment to the values and aims of the rhetoric used in the policy documents.

Of course schooling in the UK was not alone in facing such accountability measures. How new managerialism emerged and developed in education internationally is considered in an analysis of changing work patterns among those involved in educational leadership (Gronn 2003).

School Leadership Policy Priorities

When New Labour was elected in 1997 the foregoing modernisation and school improvement agenda became even more pronounced in England where the new Government's White Paper, Excellence in Schools (DfEE 1997: 46) demonstrates the belief in leadership, particularly that of head teachers.

> The vision for learning set out in this White Paper will demand the highest qualities of leadership and management from headteachers. The quality of the head often makes the difference between the success or failure of a school. Good heads can transform a school; poor heads can block progress and achievement. It is essential that we have measures in place to strengthen the skills of all new and serving heads.

The White Paper was quickly followed a year later with renewed emphasis on the type of leadership required of head teachers (DfEE 1998: 22).

> All the evidence shows that heads are the key to a school's success. All schools need a leader who creates a sense of purpose and direction, sets high expectations of staff and pupils, focuses on improving teaching and learning, monitors performance and motivates the staff to give of their best. The best heads are as good at leadership as the best leaders in any other sector, including business. The challenge is to create the rewards, training and support to attract, retain and develop many more heads of this calibre.

This was reflected throughout the emerging situation within the UK where devolved governments subsequently agreed that high quality leadership drives excellent schools and that inspirational school leaders can turn around schools in difficult circumstances and make a lasting difference to the lives of generations of young people and to whole communities. Of course the concept of leadership is contested and viewed as problematic in the academic literature – this is not necessarily the case in policy documentation where often a mix of almost conflicting conceptualisations (Reeves et al. 2006) can be evident across a range of statements from government(s). So in the last decade we have witnessed an emphasis on the role of head teacher plus the emergence of "teacher leadership" and "distributed leadership" but within the UK as in other parts of the world the dominant variant is described as "transformational" and largely derived from the seminal work of Leithwood et al. (1999).

Two important research reports on school leadership in England and Wales have been commissioned by government in the past decade (Earley et al. 2002; DfES/PricewaterhouseCoopers 2007). The comprehensive research reported by Earley and his colleagues (2002: 7) indicates differing perceptions of school leadership and the head teacher role in particular:

- Head teachers, and others in leadership positions in schools, tend to think of their roles in terms of "leading with a clear vision" and "setting high expectations".

They make a distinction between "leadership" and "management" conceptually, if not always in practice.
- Teachers want to become leaders in order to "have a say" and "make a difference".
- The majority of head teachers still spend some of their working week in the classroom, either teaching, observing or coaching.
- Leaders in schools are demotivated by the bureaucracy and excessive paperwork which they associate with the role and also by "constant change" in the education system.
- Respondents were of the view that recruitment and retention of school leaders is likely to become increasingly problematic.
- Head teachers, deputy head teachers and middle managers in schools are perceived by LEA respondents and training providers to be of varying quality. There is much concern among both that middle managers are not sufficiently aware of and trained for their role as leaders.

The research also identified a number of key issues not least questions around the appeal and attractiveness of leadership roles, the building of capability as leaders, building capacity through preparation and support for school leaders, using data and ICT for leadership purposes and the emerging and now increasingly vexed issue of recruitment and retention of school leaders. The Pricewaterhouse Coopers Report (2007: v), when addressing the role and responsibilities of school leaders confirms the continuing demands being made of those with such responsibilities:

> 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.

While being mindful of the importance of specific contextual differences, the report (section "School leadership policy priorities") also considered the benefits and pitfalls and the inherent diversity of a range of existing and emerging models of school leadership, described as traditional, managed, multi-agency, federated and system. Roles and responsibilities and the commensurate necessary skills needed by leaders were discussed and lead into consideration of the continuing issues of building capacity and succession in leadership.

Beyond government funded research, the Economic and Social Science Research Council (ESRC) recently funded a major project – *Knowledge production in educational leadership* (RES-000-23-1192) – this was a wide ranging project and important articles are now emerging from the study (Gunter and Forrester 2008, 2009). The abstract of the article by Gunter and Forrester (2009: 495) indicates that this project "focused on the first 10 years of New Labour education policy-making, with a particular emphasis on investment in school leadership as a means of delivering radical reforms". They argue that a key focus of the time was on schools and teachers perceived as failing. The role of head teachers was to turn such situations around.

The investment in head teachers was substantial not only in related salary increases for heads but in terms of the development and support opportunities provided including the establishment and significant funding afforded to the then National College for School Leadership (NCSL), later renamed The National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Services. Gunter and Forrester (2009: 497) confirm the view that in England what New Labour brought about was the establishment of,

> … the *leadership of schools* as distinct from school or educational leadership. Educational leadership is based on the headteacher as qualified teacher where s/he is able to teach and has risen through the ranks to take on professional leadership. Hence the headteacher knows about teaching and learning, and can lead professional colleagues in debates and decisions about curriculum development and improvements to teaching and learning. School leadership developed rapidly from 1988 when site-based management was introduced, where the school could hire and fire staff, and where funding was based on open enrolment by students. Curriculum was taken from professionals and handed over to national agencies who determined what was to be taught. The school as a small business challenged the "teacherness" of the head and emphasised an entrepreneurial, chief executive role. New Labour accelerated the removal of curriculum and pedagogic decisions from professionals begun under the previous Thatcherite governments, and provided schools with curriculum strategies, scripts and learning resources that meant teachers had to deliver what had been determined externally and centrally, and the school as a business was controlled though outcomes measurements by national benchmarks…

This once more confirms the dominance of the concept of the "transformational leader", embodied in the head teacher, in leadership policymaking in the period being considered. In alignment with this, the PricewaterhouseCoopers Report suggests that in future the technical leadership skills required of school leaders will not necessarily include those relating to curriculum development or pedagogy, traditionally and fundamentally the realms of professionally qualified teachers. This fits neatly with the recent emphasis on children's services (O'Brien and MacLeod 2009) where a range of co-professionals can cooperate in the educational and welfare interests of children. In England, again as Gunter and Forrester observe (2009: 498),

> The person who heads up educational provision on a campus alongside other services, such as a health centre or welfare services, may have QTS, but the overall executive can come from the public, private or voluntary sector. While the New Labour rhetoric about this development is about the "new" and "modern", the reality is that the leader remains a single appointed person who is officially trained and licensed according to prescribed standards, and leadership is about localised delivery in the school or wider area (what policy-makers are calling systemic leadership).

So what is the licence to headship and how has that developed?

Policy and Provision for Leadership Preparation and Support

New forms of preparation, support and development for school leaders and managers associated with such significant changes have become necessary perhaps because of the complex, often ambiguous and multi-faceted role and expectations

now demanded of school head teachers in particular. Across the UK, the emphasis for some time has been on preparing and supporting school head teachers in tandem with the pressures on and expectations of heads. Such emphasis has been fuelled by expressions of concern not only in the UK but also in Canada, New Zealand, Australia and the USA about the downturn in applications for headship and of the potential of a crisis in the supply and retention of school principals and heads (O'Brien 2009; Rhodes and Brundrett 2005). Successive OFSTED and HMIE reports suggest that 20% of heads are not up to the job plus anecdotal evidence of the declining quality of those who do apply abound. How this has been addressed can be illustrated with what has occurred in Scotland over the period.

Standards-Based Development

Sutherland (1997), in his report on teacher education and training, had indicated the need for more coherence in the arrangements for the CPD of teachers. Similar to developments in England and Wales, in Scotland a national CPD framework (Purdon 2003; Christie and O'Brien 2005; O'Brien 2007) to include teacher probation and induction, and the range, types and levels of CPD undertaken by teachers was envisaged, and since 1998 such a framework has emerged albeit in a piecemeal fashion.

This framework (Table 19.1) is standards based. A major difference within the UK is that when closely examined and compared with English standards the Scottish standards appear to be less "technicist" and based on an agreed acceptance of the importance of professional values and a broader view of education and the professional role of teachers and school leaders.

While the professional and remuneration effects for teachers of the post-McCrone teacher settlement (SEED 2001a, b) are significant, there were other important implications – management within Scottish schools was to be "flattened" because the agreement included changes in the structure and management of schools, with moves to a reduced hierarchy, more participative management, an emphasis on collegiality (MacDonald 2004) and enhancement of the professional autonomy of attested experienced teachers. There were important implications for teacher career structures and for the future "pool" of aspirant principals

Table 19.1 The Scottish professional development framework for teachers

Career stage	Programme/qualification	Associated standard
Pre-service	Initial teacher education	The Standard for ITE in Scotland
Initial induction year	Teacher induction scheme	The Standard for Full Registration
Established teacher (after 5 years)	Chartered Teacher Programme leading to Chartered Teacher Status	Standard for Chartered Teacher
Senior management	Scottish Qualification for Headship (SQH) flexible routes to headship	The Standard for Headship

or head teachers, especially with the suggestion that there should be a national programme for Chartered Teacher (CT) status with commensurate financial rewards (O'Brien and Hunt 2005).

The Standard for Headship and the SQH

School management had been stressed until recent times in Scotland (O'Brien et al. 2008) and the training provided during the early 1990s illustrates that. Given the developing importance afforded to school leadership, emphasised regularly in HMIe reports for example, the government funded the development of a Standard for Headship (S*f*H) with subsequent revisions (SEED 2002a, b, 2005a, b). An associated programme of professional development was introduced to allow candidates with management experience to satisfy the S*f*H prior to their application for appointment as head teachers. This post-graduate award and professional qualification – the Scottish Qualification for Headship [SQH] – was designed to develop and improve candidates' practice as school leaders and managers and involves not only attending courses and workshops but also a large element of work-based learning (Reeves et al. 2002).

While there is a parallel qualification available in Northern Ireland, Wales and England, managed by the NCSL, viz. the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) (Watkin 2000; Estyn 2010), the difference in Scotland is that SQH programmes were originally offered by three *consortia* of local authorities (Murphy et al. 2002), the employers, in partnership with approved universities; with the academic content being validated by a university while GTCS accredited the professional content and endorsed the work-based learning model adopted. The programmes are rigorous (Cowie 2005) and are considered highly developmental from a theoretical and practical perspective. Despite existing SQH programmes being positively evaluated by an independent national evaluation (Menter et al. 2003), the number of people coming forward nationally with employer support to benefit from SQH provision suggested that the programme would not produce enough qualified people, i.e. those who have met the S*f*H to meet the possible shortage of applicants for headship. Recent research (MacBeath et al. 2009; O'Brien 2009) suggests this is a genuine concern partly because of the reluctance of deputy heads to consider a move upwards. The Scottish Qualification for Headship is a huge valuable development experience for many aspirant head teachers (O'Brien and Torrance 2005), nevertheless the Scottish government recognised the need to have in place alternative forms of preparation for headship, which met different personal and professional needs and encouraged all those with the potential to undertake the post of head teacher, to pursue the S*f*H.

For that reason, government developed proposals for additional ways of meeting the *SfH*. This informed the national Leadership Group that was established to consider the possibility of a Leadership Academy, perhaps similar to NCSL although the economics of such a proposal perhaps led to this swiftly becoming a *Leadership Agenda*.

The overall intention of this Leadership Group was to create opportunities which maximised flexibility, increased mentoring and coaching capacity, establishing additional support and development mechanisms for head teachers who are new in post and enabled potential head teachers to identify their own needs and pursue their own, personalised development pathways.

Perhaps the most controversial work of the Leadership Group was associated with the consultation (SEED 2006) setting out proposals for more flexible approaches to achieving the S*f*H. The consultation responses queried the evidence base for the need for such alternative routes, questioned the reliance on coaching given the current capacities at local authority and school level and lack of any protected time for this activity and endorsed the involvement of higher education and existing partnerships and stressed the need for continuing national rigorous assessment procedures. Despite such reservations, a programme was established to pilot and to test some flexible approaches to meeting the S*f*H. The pilot programme which emerged relied heavily on a coaching and mentoring model (Gronn et al. 2008) and this approach is now gathering momentum while the SQH looks likely to decline.

Supporting School Leadership

Akin to programmes developed in the NCSL in England such as "Leading from the Middle", Scotland has had an emphasis on preparing school leaders to achieve the *SfH* but has also developed provision for various perceived stages of school management and leadership (SEED 2003; O'Brien and Torrance 2005) such as project management. A framework for leadership development has also been produced mirroring similar approaches in England and in Wales (Table 19.2).

Several initiatives have emerged to attempt to build capacity and to promote the possibilities of coaching and mentoring including inviting international "thought leaders" in such areas to International Summer Schools in Scotland. NCSL in its way too introduced international thinking to English school leaders through conferences and seminars but also its comprehensive research and publication output. From April 2006, Scottish Local Authorities were encouraged to put forward proposals to participate in a coaching and mentoring project. The principle behind the initiative was to build coaching and mentoring capacity. Not all projects were related to leadership and management, several were concerned with mentoring beginner teachers and some with coaching school students, but many authorities

Table 19.2 The Scottish professional development framework for school leaders

Project leadership	Time limited, small-scale projects for teachers early in their careers
Team leadership	Regular leadership of working groups or of established teams of staff
School leadership	including Scottish Qualification for Headship (SQH)
Strategic leadership	Leadership (for those with overall responsibility for a school or engaged in leading major initiatives at a local or national level)

took the opportunity to access funding for leadership-related development, mainly in relation to the induction of new head teachers; existing head teachers are viewed as potential coaches, and it will be interesting to see what emerges over time from such developments. Prior to this there was little evidence in Scotland of successful coaching and mentoring other than in relation to beginner teachers in their induction year and even that is regarded as problematic, uneven and patchy (O'Brien and Christie 2005).

Conclusion

Much of the recent activity related to policy in school leadership and management is summarised in publications from the OECD activity, *Improving School Leadership*. For the first time two background reports for the UK were produced, another indication of the devolved changes, one English (Higham et al. 2007) the other from Scotland (SEED 2007). Genuine challenges exist across the jurisdictions within the UK. Given the demands and expectations placed on them, those in leadership positions need to have access to a wide range of resources, skills and abilities. School leaders need to apply these both strategically, in terms of the long-term direction of the school, and operationally in the complex situations, and the interactions with individuals, which occur within school communities. School leaders must use cognitive resources, which allow them to understand and interpret pedagogical practice and democratic social process. They will need affective interpersonal resources, which support their emotional work with and for others. They will need access to the spiritual and moral resources that allow them to explore with others in their school communities the values and purposes of education, issues of social justice and the ethics of the school community. Such cognitive, affective and moral resources, informed by experience and situational knowledge, offer the best guarantees of good judgement in dealing with the tensions and dilemmas of schooling. It is not just head teachers, and others in positions of authority within and external to schools, who are called to develop these resources, but all who share in leadership activity. This is the challenge for the future to move beyond reliance on the head teacher and to promote, seek and utilise leadership capacity where it is needed.

References

Bryce, T., & Humes, W. (Eds.). (2008). *Scottish education: Beyond devolution (3rd Rev ed.)*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Christie, F. & O'Brien, J. (2005). A CPD framework for Scottish teachers: Steps or stages, continuity or connections? In A. Alexandrou, K. Field, & H. Mitchell (Eds.), *The continuing professional development of educators: Emerging European issues, symposium*, London.

Cowie, M. (2005). A silver lining with a grey cloud? The perspective of unsuccessful participants in the Scottish qualification for headship programme across the North of Scotland. *Journal of In-service Education, 31*(2), 393–410.

Cowie, M., & McKinney, S. (2007). The applied educational research scheme: What might be the implications be for leadership in Scottish education? *Scottish Educational Review, 39*(1), 72–83.
Daugherty, R. (Ed.) (2006). Themed issue on education policy in Wales in the era of political devolution. *Welsh Journal of Education 14*(1 & 2).
Day, C. (2002). School reform and transitions in teacher professionalism and identity. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37*, 677–692.
Day, C. (2005). The UK policy for school leadership: Uneasy transitions. In N. Bascia, A. Cumming, A. Datnow, K. Leithwood, & D. Livingstone (Eds.), *International handbook of educational policy* (pp. 393–420). Dordrecht: Springer.
DfEE. (1997). *Excellence in schools*. London: The Stationery Office.
DfEE. (1998). *Teachers: Meeting the challenge of change*. London: DfEE.
DfES/PricewaterhouseCoopers. (2007). *Independent study into school leadership*. London: DfES.
Earley, P., Evans, J., Collarbone, P., Gold, A., & Halpin, D. (2002). *Current state of school leadership in England*. London: Institute of Education.
Egan, D., & James, R. (2003). Education. In J. Osmond & B. Jones (Eds.), *Birth of Welsh democracy: The first term of the National Assembly for Wales*. Cardiff: Institute of Welsh Affairs and Welsh Governance Centre.
Estyn – Her Majesty's Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales. (2010). *The impact of the National Professional Qualification for Headteachers (NPQH) programme on headship*. Cardiff: Estyn.
Gronn, P. (2003). *The new work of educational leaders*. London: Paul Chapman.
Gronn, P., MacBeath, J., Davidson, J., Forde, C., Martin, M., & McMahon, M. (2008). *Towards a "Mixed Economy" of head teacher development: Evaluation report to the Scottish Government*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Available at: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2008/09/30142043/0. Accessed August 2010.
Gunter, H. M., & Forrester, G. (2008). New labour and school leadership 1997–2007. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 55*(2), 144–162.
Gunter, H. M., & Forrester, G. (2009). School leadership and education policy-making in England. *Policy Studies, 30*(5), 495–511.
Higham, R., Hopkins, D., & Ahtaridou, E. (2007). *Improving school leadership*. London: OECD Country Background Report: England.
Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
MacBeath, J., Gronn, P., Opfer, D., Lowden, K., Forde, C., Cowie, M., & O'Brien, J. (2009). The recruitment and retention of headteachers in Scotland. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
MacDonald, A. (2004). Collegiate or compliant? Primary teachers in post-McCrone Scotland. *British Educational Research Journal, 30*(3), 413–433.
McPherson, A., & Raab, C. D. (1988). *Governing education: A sociology of policy since 1945*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Menter, I., Holligan, C., Mthenjwa, V., & Hair, M. (2003). *Scottish qualification for headship: Key issues from the evaluation – Insight 8*. Edinburgh: SEED.
Murphy, D., Draper, J., O'Brien, J., & Cowie, M. (2002). Local management of the Scottish Qualification for Headship (SQH). *Journal of In-service Education, 28*(2), 277–296.
National Assembly for Wales. (2001). *The learning country: A comprehensive education and lifelong learning programme to 2010 in Wales*. Cardiff: National Assembly for Wales.
O'Brien, J. (2007). Control or empowerment? The professional learning of Scottish teachers in the post McCrone era. In J. Pickering, N. Pachler, & C. Daly (Eds.), *New designs for teachers' professional learning*. London: Bedford Way Papers No. 27: Institute of Education.
O'Brien, J. (2009). Is there a recruitment crisis? School leadership, professional development and succession planning. In M. S. Khine & I. M. Saleh (Eds.), *Transformative leadership and educational excellence: Learning organizations in the information age* (pp. 351–362). Rotterdam: Sense.
O'Brien, J., & Christie, F. (2005). Characteristics of support for beginning teachers: Evidence from the new induction scheme in Scotland. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 13*(2), 189–203.

O'Brien, J., & Hunt, G. (2005). A new professionalism? Becoming a chartered teacher – Part I. *Teacher Development, 9*(3), 383–401.
O'Brien, J., & MacLeod, G. (2009). *The social agenda of the school*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.
O'Brien, J., & Torrance, D. (2005). Professional learning for school principals: Developments in Scotland. *Education Research and Perspectives, 32*(2), 165–181.
O'Brien, J., Murphy, D., & Draper, J. (2008). School leadership. In *Policy and practice in education series* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.
Paterson, L. (2000). *Education and the Scottish Parliament*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.
Phillips, R. (2003). Education policy, comprehensive schooling and devolution in the disUnited Kingdom: An historical "home international" analysis. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(1), 1–17.
Purdon, A. (2003). A national framework of CPD: Continuing professional development or continuing policy dominance? *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(4), 423–437.
Raffe, D. (2004). How distinctive is Scottish education? Five perspectives on distinctiveness. *Scottish Affairs, 49*, 50–72.
Raffe, D., Brannen, K., Croxford, L., & Martin, C. (1999). Comparing England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland: The case for "home internationals" in comparative research. *Comparative Education, 35*(1), 9–25.
Rees, G. (2007). The impacts of parliamentary devolution on education policy in Wales. *Welsh Journal of Education, 14*(1), 8–20.
Reeves, J., Forde, C., O'Brien, J., Smith, P., & Tomlinson, H. (2002). *Performance management in education: Improving practice*. London: Paul Chapman.
Reeves, J., Cowie, M., & Lewis, M. (2006). *Investigating school management and governance in Scotland post-devolution*. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Geneva, 13–15 September.
Rhodes, C. P., & Brundrett, M. (2005). Leadership succession in schools: A cause for concern. *Management in Education, 19*(5), 15–18.
Sammons, P., Power, S., Elliot, K., Robertson, P., Campbell, C., & Whitty, G. (2003). *Key findings from the National evaluation of the new community schools pilot programme in Scotland – Insight 7*. Edinburgh: SEED.
Scottish Executive Education Department (2001a). *A teaching profession for the 21st century: Agreement reached following recommendations in the McCrone Report*. Edinburgh: HMSO.
Scottish Executive Education Department (2001b). *A teaching profession for the 21st century. The agreement*. Edinburgh: SEED.
Scottish Executive Education Department (2002a). How good is our school? Self-evaluation. Edinburgh: SEED.
Scottish Executive Education Department. (2002b). *The standard for headship*. Edinburgh: SEED.
Scottish Executive Education Department. (2003). *Continuing professional development for educational leaders*. Edinburgh: SEED.
Scottish Executive Education Department (2004). Ambitious, excellent schools: Our agenda for action. Edinburgh: SEED. Available at http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2004/11/20176/45852. Accessed August 2010.
Scottish Executive Education Department. (2005a). *Ambitious, excellent schools: Standard for headship*. Edinburgh: SEED.
Scottish Executive Education Department (2005b). *Scottish qualification for headship: Information about the Scottish qualification for headship*. Edinburgh: SEED. Available at http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library5/education/sqhis-00.asp. Accessed August 2010.
Scottish Executive Education Department (2006). *Achieving the standard for headship – Providing choice and alternatives: A consultation document*. Edinburgh: SEED.
Scottish Executive Education Department (2007). *Improving school leadership*. Edinburgh: OECD Country Background Report: Scotland.
Sutherland, S. (1997). Teacher Education and Training. Report 10 of the Dearing Report – National Committee of Inquiry into *Higher Education, Higher Education in the Learning Society*. London: The Committee.

Watkin, C. (2000). The leadership programme for serving headteachers: Probably the world's largest leadership development programme. *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 21*(1), 13–19.

Welsh Assembly Government. (2006). *The learning country 2: Delivering the promise*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.

Whitty, G., Power, S., & Halpin, D. (1998). *Devolution and choice in education: The school, the state and the market*. Open University Press: Buckingham.