



OFFICE FOR STANDARDS
IN EDUCATION

Leadership and Management Training for Headteachers

Report by HMI

April 2002

HMI 457

© Crown copyright 2002

Office for Standards in Education
Alexandra House
33 Kingsway
London
WC2B 6SE

Telephone 020 7421 6800 or 6774

Web site: www.ofsted.gov.uk

This report may be reproduced in whole or in part for non-commercial or educational purposes, provided that the information quoted is reproduced without adaptation and the source and date of publication are stated.

Contents

Introduction	4
Main Findings	5
Quality of School Leadership and Management	6
National Professional Qualification for Headship	8
LEA Arrangements for the Induction of New Headteachers	12
Leadership Programme for Serving Headteachers	16
Conclusions and Key Issues	18
Annex: LEAs visited	21

Leadership and Management Training for Headteachers

Introduction

1. The government White Paper, 'Schools Achieving Success', emphasised the importance of effective school leadership for raising standards and school improvement. The three national training programmes for headteachers are a central component of the government's drive to improve school leadership and management. These programmes are the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH), the Leadership and Management Programme for New Headteachers (HEADLAMP) and the Leadership Programme for Serving Headteachers (LPSH). They are designed to meet, respectively, the needs of aspiring headteachers, newly appointed headteachers and headteachers with several years' experience. In addition, local education authorities (LEAs) have a responsibility for providing induction for newly appointed headteachers. This report contains inspection findings for NPQH, LPSH and LEA induction arrangements, including some elements which were paid for with HEADLAMP funding.

2. Between summer 1998 and spring 2001, Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI) carried out inspections of the first seven cohorts of NPQH, prior to the introduction of a revised programme from January 2001. Inspection of the old model included visits to training and assessment events, as well as follow-up visits to candidates in their schools. No public reports were published but HMI provided regular feedback to the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) on the quality of the programme and on points for development. This report contains a resumé of these inspection findings. HMI have recently begun an inspection of the revised model for NPQH.

3. During the academic year 2000/01, HMI also inspected arrangements for the induction of new headteachers in 43 LEAs. The LEAs included a balance of London boroughs, county, metropolitan and unitary authorities. During the visit to the LEA, inspectors interviewed staff responsible for headteacher induction and scrutinised relevant documentation. Follow-up visits were made to a sample of headteachers from each LEA, where possible including a mix of headteachers with and without experience of NPQH. A total of 165 headteachers were visited. The purpose of these visits was to gain information from newly appointed headteachers about the quality of their induction programmes and to assess the potential impact of these programmes on them and on improvement in their schools. Details of LEAs visited are included in the annex.

4. For LPSH, during autumn 2000 and spring 2001, HMI visited 15 training events spread across the seven LPSH providers. During these visits, inspectors observed training sessions, held discussions with trainers and participants and scrutinised relevant documentation. Follow-up visits were made to a randomly selected sample of 33 course members in 23 LEAs. The purpose of these visits was to find out more about headteachers' individual contexts and their reasons for undertaking LPSH, and to make judgements about the quality of the training and, where possible, its impact on them and on improvement in their schools. The follow-up visits included an

interview with the headteacher and a scrutiny of evidence of school improvement, for example Section 10 inspection reports, school development plans and information on pupil performance.

5. Although OFSTED has not previously published reports on induction or LPSH, it has fed back inspection findings to Department for Education and Skills (DfES) officials and, more recently, to the National College for School Leadership (NCSL). Some of these findings are reflected in the College's Leadership Development Framework and, in particular, in its review of HEADLAMP and LPSH.¹

6. This report also draws upon OFSTED's substantial evidence on the quality of leadership and management in schools from section 10 inspections and focused surveys by HMI, such as that reported in *Improving City Schools*.² The evidence from 2000/01 school inspections has been analysed to establish whether the quality of leadership and management is improving and to identify significant strengths and areas about which there are still some concerns. This analysis is included to establish the context for school leadership and management training and to help inform judgements of the relevance of this training.

Main Findings

- Leadership and management in schools continue to improve. They are good or better in approximately three quarters of primary, special and secondary schools. However, there are still one in twelve primary schools, one in seventeen secondary schools and one in twenty special schools with unsatisfactory or poor leadership and management. In addition, even in schools where leadership and management are judged to be good overall, there are common areas of weakness across all phases to which training needs to respond.
- The quality of the NPQH programme improved significantly throughout the first seven cohorts. Much of the training was of good quality. However, there remained concerns about the selection of appropriate candidates and the capacity of the training to respond to a wide range of needs.
- There is inconsistency in the quality of support provided by LEAs for newly appointed headteachers. Around a quarter of LEAs visited provide good support but support is unsatisfactory or poor in just under a half. In a large majority of cases, LEA link advisers provide good induction support to individual headteachers, irrespective of the overall quality of the induction programme.
- There are no effective systems in place for monitoring the appropriateness of HEADLAMP expenditure.
- The quality of much of the LPSH training is good and is generally well received by headteachers. However, it does not always meet the needs of headteachers from a variety of contexts and there is no effective monitoring of the outcomes.

¹ *Leadership Development Framework – NCSL 2001*
The Headteachers' Leadership and Management Programme (Headlamp) Review – NCSL 2001
Leadership Programme for Serving Headteachers: a Review – NCSL 2001

² *Improving City Schools – OFSTED 2000*

- The three national training programmes for headteachers are intended for individual leaders rather than leadership groups. However, inspection, headteachers' comments and good practice in some LEAs, all indicate the need for leadership and management training to focus on leadership teams as well as on individual headteachers.
- There is no clear progression in the content of the three national training programmes for headteachers. In particular, HEADLAMP rarely builds explicitly on the content or outcomes of NPQH. In part, this is a consequence of NPQH being the only programme which is explicitly based on the National Standards for Headteachers.³
- The various training programmes do not yet meet sufficiently the particular needs of participating headteachers, for example headteachers of schools facing particular challenges and headteachers of small rural primary schools.
- Monitoring of the impact of national headteacher training programmes is not well established.

Quality of School Leadership and Management

7. The annual report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools (HMCI) for 2000/01 provides the following summary of the current situation with regard to school leadership and management:

'The leadership and management of our schools continue to improve, being good or better in some three quarters of primary, special and secondary schools . . . At secondary level, the quality of leadership given by headteachers is often closely related to the quality of that of heads of department . . . There has been a welcome increase in the proportion of schools where monitoring and evaluation of teaching and performance are now good or better, though much remains to be done.'

8. In 2000/01, leadership and management of the headteacher and key staff were judged good or better in 74% of primary schools, 77% of secondary schools and 78% of special schools. Changes to the inspection arrangements make direct comparisons difficult but it is clear that there have been steady improvements in the quality of school leadership over the past five years. There is insufficient evidence at present, however, to assess the contribution made by the three national programmes to these improvements. Other factors, such as changes of headteacher following critical section 10 inspection reports, clearly need to be taken into account. Although the overall picture in 2000/01 is encouraging, leadership and management were judged unsatisfactory or poor in one in twelve primary schools, one in seventeen secondary schools and one in twenty special schools.

9. The most effective aspects of the work of headteachers are the strategic leadership qualities of :

- ensuring clear educational direction

³ National Standards for Headteachers – Teacher Training Agency (TTA) 1998. These set out the knowledge, understanding, skills and attributes which relate to the five key areas of headship: strategic direction and development of the school; teaching and learning; leading and managing staff; efficient and effective deployment of staff and resources; and accountability.

- reflecting the school's aims and values in its work
- securing a shared commitment to improvement and the capacity to succeed
- identifying appropriate priorities for development
- financial planning which supports the school's educational priorities.

10. Even in schools where leadership and management are judged to be good overall, there are some fairly common areas of weakness. Less effective aspects relate particularly to operational management responsibilities, the implementation of which involves the contribution of leadership teams rather than just the headteacher:

- the delegation of appropriate tasks to staff with management responsibilities
- monitoring and evaluation of the school's performance and taking effective action
- the monitoring, evaluation and development of teaching.

This would suggest that national training programmes need to provide opportunities for school leadership teams to undertake joint development activities, as well as focusing on the needs of individuals.

11. While the main areas of weakness in leadership and management are common across phases, there are some notable differences between the primary and secondary sectors:

- There are considerably more concerns about the adequacy of staffing, accommodation and learning resources in secondary schools (23% unsatisfactory or poor) than in primary schools (5% unsatisfactory or poor).
- There are considerably more concerns about the effectiveness of governing bodies in fulfilling their statutory duties in secondary schools (29% unsatisfactory or poor) than in primary schools (11% unsatisfactory or poor).

12. *Improving City Schools* identified the following key features of effective leadership and management in schools in challenging circumstances:

- A determination to concentrate on changes most likely to lead to improvement, despite the wide range of issues clamouring for attention, and good judgement in weighing up which initiatives will contribute positively to the work of the school.
- A high visibility and accessibility of the senior team in the school and its local community.
- Simple and pertinent management systems, including well-focused development planning and monitoring.
- Good use of data on pupil participation and performance as the basis for setting targets.

- Skills in harnessing and managing resources from a range of sources, combined with excellent financial planning and control to ensure that the resources available are used well.
- The ability to establish effective partnerships with external agencies, particularly in secondary schools, with education-business partnerships and with further and higher education.

13. Differences between the phases in aspects of leadership and management, common areas of concern, especially in management, and the particular requirements of schools in challenging circumstances, all have implications for the national training programmes. In particular, there is a clear need for training which is flexible and capable of responding to areas of weakness in schools identified through inspection, as well as to the differing circumstances of headteachers in different phases and contexts.

National Professional Qualification for Headship

Findings from 1998 to 2000 inspections

14. The NPQH was introduced in 1996 and was aimed at aspiring headteachers. The first cohort of candidates began in 1997 and by February 2000 over 6000 candidates had registered for the qualification.⁴

15. The first model of NPQH comprised of a single standard route and could take candidates up to three years to complete. This standard route incorporated an initial needs assessment, a compulsory module on Strategic Leadership and Accountability and three option modules: Teaching and Learning, Leading and Managing Staff, and Efficient and Effective Deployment of Staff and Resources. The modules were based upon the five key areas of headship as identified in the National Standards for Headteachers. Each module was assessed and candidates also had to take part in a final assessment day. The Teacher Training Agency (TTA), which was at that time managing the scheme on behalf of the DfEE, modified this model after the first year by developing the accelerated route, aimed at those candidates deemed 'close to headship'. The main elements of the accelerated route were selection, initial assessment, focused training and support, and final assessment, all to be completed in one term.

16. Until 2001, LEAs had specific responsibilities with regard to the NPQH in recruitment, selection for the two routes, encouraging headteacher involvement, ensuring governor awareness and dealing with appeals. During this period, recruitment took place twice each year. Each LEA had a named NPQH contact. Training was organised on a regional basis and run by 10 regional centres which were a mixture of higher education, local authority and private providers.

17. This model of NPQH, for candidate cohorts 1–7, ran until the summer of 2000 and has since been replaced by a new, shorter model to be overseen by the NCSL.

⁴ DfEE Press release 44/00

18. HMI inspected the original model of NPQH between summer 1998 and spring 2000. Inspectors observed training in the standard route at centres across the country and attended centre-based and school-based assessment days for both standard and accelerated routes. They visited 165 candidates from all school phases, of whom about 10% were following the accelerated route. Inspectors carried out structured interviews with candidates and scrutinised a range of documentation.

Standard Route

19. The quality of training was judged good or better in three quarters of the sessions observed and it improved steadily during the period of the inspection. The features of very good training included:

- clear objectives shared with the candidates
- sessions that had good pace, with timings planned to maximise the involvement and contribution of candidates
- careful grouping of the participants in specialist or cross-phase groups, depending on the activity
- sessions based on identified needs
- effective use of the TTA materials and guidance
- the inclusion of relevant, topical materials such as the National Numeracy Strategy.

Trainers in these sessions were enthusiastic about school leadership and were able to motivate candidates effectively; they displayed a high level of questioning skills and made frequent, informed reference to the National Standards for Headship.

20. In some instances, trainers gave differentiation sufficient consideration to meet the needs of the range of candidates. However, participant groups often included too wide a range of experience to enable training to meet their diverse needs. Groups could include subject co-ordinators, newly appointed deputy headteachers, experienced deputies, acting headteachers and newly appointed headteachers, all from three different phases. Some activities led to candidates with a special needs background, for example, working in isolation, when participants were asked to work in phase groups and where there was only one special needs candidate.

21. The quality of the participants' responses to the training reflected the mixed experience and calibre of the candidates. Involvement of candidates in the practical training activities was very good, but too often the focus was on task completion rather than engaging with the intellectual and professional challenges offered. A good number of the candidates were highly perceptive and well informed. However, a significant minority struggled with the concepts articulated in the activities and displayed weaknesses in communication skills. These raised questions about their suitability for headship and the rigour of the initial assessment process.

22. At some centres, completion of the pre-course tasks was optional, while at others, tasks completed by the candidates were not referred to in the centre-based training. Most candidates, however, conscientiously completed the tasks and associated reading, and viewed them as a valuable component of the training, although they demanded considerable time and energy.

23. The use made of the different elements of needs assessment varied across and within centres. Most participants felt that their self-assessment was too often taken at face value and that its subsequent use was, at best, superficial. Candidates were positive about the use of psychometric tests but, in practice, these were rarely followed up. The development plans were often a summary of strengths and points for training and frequently were not seen as relevant by the candidates. They too were rarely followed up, particularly in work with secondary-phase candidates.

24. The quality and value of the assignments improved during the period of the inspection. Overall, the compulsory module assignments were practical, realistic and focused on school improvement. However, the validity of the assessment tasks for the three optional modules was sometimes compromised when candidates were allowed simply to write up previous experiences. In these instances, the assessment tasks did not challenge current practice and had little or no impact on the candidate's school. Most candidates tackled the assignments in a professional manner and, where they had been completed well, the candidate gained in knowledge and understanding, as well as in confidence and improved skills in managing people. A substantial minority of the assignments were unsatisfactory, often with poor analytical commentaries that lacked depth. There were differences in the level of support that candidates were able to draw upon across the regions. In the best practice, candidates discussed assignments at length with tutors, and additional support was offered when required, through facilities such as helplines. In poor practice, little or no support was provided and there was minimal discussion with tutors.

25. Participants often felt that the role of their own headteachers in supporting them through the qualification was unclear, and only in a quarter of schools visited did the headteacher provide very good guidance and support. In supportive schools, the headteacher was committed to staff development, with careful co-ordination of opportunities for the NPQH candidate to undertake management roles. They gave active support through, for example, working with the candidate on self-assessment and negotiating assignments. Effective internal mechanisms to evaluate the NPQH programme were in place in these schools.

Accelerated Route

26. Some LEAs lacked the necessary information to provide candidates with effective support in their initial application for the accelerated route. Headteachers similarly were often unclear as to the difference in structure and assessment of the accelerated route. These weaknesses in the selection process resulted, on a number of occasions, in there being little discernible difference between candidates on the accelerated route and good candidates on the standard route.

27. As on the standard route, the quality of the initial self-assessment process was too variable. There was inconsistency in guidance on the use and analysis of the

psychometric test, as well as in the quality of candidates' self-assessments. Little use was subsequently made of these to inform the training process.

28. The quality of school-based assessment overall was good. The assessors were secure in their understanding of the process and consistent and systematic in approach. Interviews and cross-referencing of evidence were well focused, although there was some variation in the provision of feedback to candidates. Assessors generally provided a cogent analysis of levels of knowledge and understanding in the five areas of headship.

29. Candidates' presentation of evidence was well organised and clearly related to the National Standards for Headship. Witness statements usually provided good examples of corroboration. Evidence generally reflected a wide range of experience but within specific areas, frequently curriculum responsibility. Where documentation did not clearly identify the candidate's involvement, the assessor effectively followed this up.

30. Inspectors did not observe training on the accelerated route. However, the overall view of the candidates was that the training failed, as on the standard route, to meet the needs of individuals: too much of it was of a generic nature, with insufficient differentiation in terms of their phase backgrounds.

Final Assessment

31. The quality of the final assessment of both routes was good. There was a suitable range of tasks and activities providing sufficient evidence for accurate judgements to be made. Assessors applied criteria rigorously and became more aware of what was meant by 'readiness for headship' during the inspection period. They made good use of the assessment meeting to reach corporate judgements on each candidate. However, a failure rate of 10% of candidates on the accelerated route suggests some problems with initial selection procedures.

32. The assessors were an appropriate mix of headteachers, former headteachers, LEA advisers, former advisers, and consultants. The best assessors had specialist knowledge, analytical and observational skills, made very good use of the guidance and followed procedures consistently. They were well focused in discussions and showed rigour in their judgements.

33. The group interview varied in quality across the centres. The best were effectively organised to ensure that all candidates could participate. However, where specific phase candidates were in a minority, they tended to be marginalised and saw themselves as disadvantaged.

34. Although candidates on both routes were generally well briefed regarding the broad outline of the day, a substantial minority of participants were not sufficiently clear about the assessment process. In addition, feedback to candidates who failed was often minimal and those who passed received no subsequent information about their performance.

LEA Arrangements for the Induction of New Headteachers

Findings from 2000 to 2001 inspections

35. All new headteachers appointed to their first permanent headship are entitled to a HEADLAMP grant of £2,500 to fund their own training and development. To be eligible for this grant, expenditure must be incurred with one or more of the registered providers listed in the HEADLAMP directory which accompanies the DfEE's Guidance published in 2000.⁵ Providers include local authorities as well as higher and further education institutions, professional associations, management consultants and other private sector organisations. The guidance indicates that each LEA has a responsibility to induct new headteachers, for example into its services, procedures and practices, and that this induction should be free to the participant and the school. In practice, some LEAs offer elements of a more comprehensive induction programme, while others provide a very limited programme. In addition, many LEAs are recognised HEADLAMP providers and offer support and training which is eligible for expenditure under the HEADLAMP grant. This inspection took into account all aspects of the induction programmes offered by the LEAs, including those which were paid for with HEADLAMP funding. However, no HEADLAMP-funded training sessions were observed.

36. The types of support offered by LEAs for new headteachers include:

- needs assessment
- an induction training programme
- mentoring
- networking
- link adviser support.

37. The quality of induction support was judged to be good in 10 LEAs, satisfactory in 14, unsatisfactory in 14 and poor in 5. No LEA inspected offers good support in all of the areas of induction and a significant number of LEAs have unsatisfactory provision in a majority of areas. Induction support for primary headteachers is frequently better than that for secondary, special or nursery headteachers. This is because induction programmes are commonly undifferentiated and focus on the needs of the vast majority who are primary headteachers.

38. The size and type of LEA does not have a direct effect on the quality of induction. However, smaller LEAs are confronted with issues of economy of scale resulting from the need to offer induction programmes to a small number of headteachers. For this reason, some LEAs are beginning to work in association with neighbouring authorities to provide joint conferences and training.

39. In just over half of the LEAs, there is an adviser with responsibility for headteacher induction. Although there is no direct correlation between having an

⁵ *Leadership and Management Programme for New Headteachers (HEADLAMP) Guidance 2000*

adviser with such a responsibility and the quality of the induction programme, in LEAs where no single adviser has overall responsibility induction is more often poor or even non-existent.

Needs Assessment

40. The identification of the needs of newly appointed headteachers is a weak feature of LEA induction programmes. Approximately a third of the LEAs have some form of needs assessment built into the programme. More often there is an assumption that needs assessments will have been completed as part of NPQH or HEADLAMP training. Even where this is the case, the results are not necessarily used to inform the LEA programme.

41. Where needs assessments are carried out, they are often informal and are conducted with the link adviser, so the quality depends greatly upon the link adviser's understanding of headship generally and the school's context in particular. In good practice:

- headteachers are assessed rigorously against the National Standards
- the process is informed by NPQH outcomes, where appropriate
- development needs are identified which take the school's context into account
- a written report is produced, leading to a personal development plan.

Headteachers frequently express the opinion that needs assessment is most useful when carried out one or two terms after taking up the appointment. They also welcome opportunities to involve members of their senior management team in needs assessment and in elements of the induction programme.

Induction programme

42. Approximately one quarter of the LEAs provide a good induction programme for new headteachers while almost one in nine provide very little. The features of good LEA programmes include:

- early contact, including meetings before the headteacher takes up post
- useful information packs and documentation, which make clear headteachers' entitlement
- effective introductory meetings
- the use of needs assessments to inform subsequent training
- regular meetings and training opportunities
- additional support from the link adviser
- involvement of experienced headteachers in the process, not just as mentors

- opportunities for headteachers to include other members of their senior management team in elements of the induction programme
- monitoring and evaluation of the induction programme leading to improved provision.

43. Aspects of the weaker programmes include:

- the lack of any induction programme specifically aimed at newly appointed headteachers
- insufficient recognition of the needs of particular phases and types of school
- a programme tied to the academic year which discriminates against January and Easter appointments
- insufficient guidance and information on the opportunities available. For example, headteachers are frequently unclear about the LEA's induction programme and are not sufficiently aware of the potential uses of HEADLAMP funding.

Mentoring

44. Mentoring of new headteachers is rarely well developed. Although some LEAs run a formal mentoring programme, the effectiveness of these is extremely variable. In most cases, the mentor is seen as a 'critical friend' but there are few examples where mentoring is linked to a planned programme for school improvement. In some LEAs it is left to the new headteacher to make contact with a mentor; this often results in very informal arrangements.

45. The more effective mentoring usually has several of the following features:

- a selection process with formal training for mentors
- written guidance for new headteachers and their mentors
- structured and purposeful meetings, with clear agendas
- careful costing, including funding for supply cover
- monitoring and evaluation of the process, leading to improvement.

Networking

46. Although headteachers generally report good support through already constituted networks, for example phase, cluster or diocesan, these rarely focus on induction and tend not to be developmental. Agenda items tend to focus on topical issues of a general nature rather than addressing specific needs of headteachers or schools. Very few **new headteacher** groups are in existence but, where they develop, it is usually through HEADLAMP or as a result of NPQH. Headteachers find these a useful forum for discussing common issues and, in the best examples,

they result in the identification of training needs and a planned programme to meet them.

Link adviser support

47. Overall, support provided by link advisers is good and more consistent across LEAs than other aspects of induction. Headteachers value the support and see it as focused on their own needs and those of their school. Good features include:

- link advisers being involved in the appointment of headteachers
- the careful matching of link adviser to headteacher and school
- an additional entitlement of link adviser time for new headteachers
- differentiated support which depends on the needs of the school and the headteacher
- effective needs assessment by the link adviser, leading to the development of a planned induction programme.

48. In approximately one third of LEAs, headteachers have a basic entitlement to support from link advisers, but additional induction support can be purchased using Standards Fund or HEADLAMP funding. Many headteachers take up this option. However, when link adviser induction support has to be purchased, some headteachers do not choose to spend Standards Fund or HEADLAMP funding in this way. As a result, the LEA cannot be sure that all of its new headteachers have received appropriate adviser support.

HEADLAMP

49. The great majority of LEAs provide basic information about HEADLAMP. In a minority of LEAs, however, headteachers remain unclear about different HEADLAMP providers and what training qualifies for funding. This is not helped by the fact that some headteachers receive DfES guidance late or not at all and they are consequently unaware of their options.

50. Few LEAs are in a position to monitor or evaluate headteachers' spending on HEADLAMP and little support or guidance is given about how to obtain value for money from HEADLAMP funding. However, some LEAs have begun to work closely with neighbouring LEAs, higher education institutions or other HEADLAMP providers with a view to securing consistency of provision for their headteachers and also cost-effectiveness. Although there are some positive benefits to this, a balance has to be struck between, on the one hand, giving headteachers clear guidance on the use of HEADLAMP funds and, on the other, over-selling their own local arrangements and consequently not necessarily meeting headteachers' individual needs.

51. While the DfEE guidance indicates that HEADLAMP is meant to provide the link between NPQH and LPSH, in practice there is no clear progression through the programmes. HEADLAMP and LPSH are not explicitly based on the National

Standards, and there is no system for taking account of the content or outcomes of one programme to inform the next stage of leadership training.

Leadership Programme for Serving Headteachers

Findings from 2000 to 2001 inspections

52. The LPSH was introduced in 1998 for headteachers with at least three years' experience of the role. The stated objectives of the programme are to raise the performance of pupils and staff in schools by enabling headteachers to develop further their leadership qualities and give them an understanding of:

- models of organisational and leadership effectiveness
- the impact of the headteacher's leadership on the school
- what highly effective headteachers do to raise standards
- the participant's own development needs
- the key issues in the participants' schools which need to be tackled in order to achieve improvement targets
- the use of information and communication technology (ICT) for personal development and school improvement planning.

53. LPSH is a stand-alone programme which focuses on the leadership of an individual headteacher. Its content does not take account of outcomes of previous training and it is not explicitly based on the National Standards for Headteachers. It consists of an initial four-day workshop, during which participants identify a personal development plan and action plan, as well as school improvement targets and a school action plan. Participants have the option of being paired with a business partner (the Partners in Leadership scheme), so that leadership and management experiences can be shared. Targets identified during the initial four days are reviewed at a fifth day, 'Day 5', which takes place up to a year after the initial four-day workshop. The inspection of LPSH included Day 5 training events, and follow-up interviews with headteachers at their schools.

Day 5

54. Attendance at Day 5 training events is quite variable, ranging from just over half of those who attended the initial workshop to the whole group. On average, four headteachers, out of groups of 12 to 14, do not attend and these non-attenders are frequently from the secondary sector. Reasons given for non-attendance include retirement, change of post, illness and OFSTED section 10 inspections. The LPSH groups are commonly dominated by primary headteachers, and some secondary headteachers feel that there is a lack of consideration of issues specifically related to their own phase. Headteachers of special schools and of very small primary schools also at times feel that the programme does not sufficiently meet their particular needs. This makes them more reluctant to give up time for Day 5.

55. From January 2001, in response to inspection findings and comments by participants on the previous model, a revised Day 5 was introduced. This allowed for more input by trainers, clear tasks which secured a higher level of involvement from participants, and a change of focus to the future and planning for development. In the majority of revised sessions visited, time was used effectively and productively. However, many headteachers had still not fully understood the models of school leadership presented during the first four days of the programme, and few had referred to the LPSH manual in the period leading up to Day 5.

56. The quality of Day 5 training is generally good. All trainers follow the required training pattern. Individual sessions are most effective when they include:

- clear objectives
- effective, challenging questioning
- promotion of in-depth critical discussion
- a balance between individual and group work
- exemplification of models of leadership based on data, and of strategies to address issues raised.

57. Weaknesses in a minority of providers relate to a lack of focus and pace, and an inappropriate model of training, with too much formal input which leaves insufficient time for discussion.

Information from interviews with headteachers

58. Headteachers' reasons for undertaking LPSH include:

- a general desire to continue their professional development and to keep abreast of new thinking
- positive recommendations about the course from the LEA or colleagues
- the lack of any previous significant leadership training
- OFSTED inspections which identified leadership as a key issue for improvement.

59. Headteachers identify the following main strengths of LPSH:

- good quality presentations and effective trainers
- opportunities to reflect on and discuss issues
- clear focus on the school's needs and school improvement
- opportunities to meet headteachers from outside the LEA
- useful summaries of leadership and management models and styles

- valuable one-to-one consultations
- raised awareness of their own leadership style, resulting from analysis of school data
- group support and networking opportunities.

60. They also identify a wide range of perceived weaknesses. A quarter of headteachers interviewed considered the model of training to be 'too didactic'. Other significant weaknesses mentioned by some headteachers include: the use of a dated video; the lack of confidentiality; no reference to the most recent research on leadership and management; little recognition of the practical complexities of headship; and insufficient time for the programme.

61. The majority of headteachers set targets at the end of the four-day programme. However, a quarter of headteachers had difficulty in setting appropriate and relevant targets and half did not set revised targets following Day 5. Of those who did set targets, one third felt that they were inappropriate, vague and not linked to raising standards or school improvement. There are no procedures for monitoring the progress made with targets and the headteachers are not accountable for their achievement, unless they are explicitly linked to their own performance management or school improvement plan.

62. Uptake of the Partners in Leadership scheme is patchy. In effective practice, there is a good match between partners, who agree agendas, make visits to each other's establishments and are committed to learning from each other. An example of a two-way beneficial improvement for a headteacher and their business partner was where the business partner was working with the school to help develop performance management and the school's drama department was helping the business partner's personnel to improve their presentational skills.

63. The ICT element of the programme remains problematic. The purpose of the LPSH web site is unclear and there is no real focus for its use. Participants encounter a wide range of problems in accessing the Internet during the four-day course and therefore often do not get sufficient training to enable them to make effective use of the web site. Consequently, over 90% of headteachers had not made use of the ICT component after unsuccessful first attempts.

64. There is no planned follow-up to LPSH. This is a significant weakness in the programme. Some LEAs recognise the need to provide further support through, for example, follow-up meetings or discussion of LPSH outcomes with link advisers. However, the quality of this support is inconsistent because not all of the LEA personnel concerned are familiar with the LPSH programme.

Conclusions and Key Issues

65. The NCSL has been charged with overseeing the development of leadership training for managers in schools. In 2001, the NCSL produced its Leadership Development Framework and consulted on its proposals. At the same time, it produced a review of LPSH and HEADLAMP. Both of these reviews have taken

account of HMI inspection findings. In addition, the NCSL has been instrumental in the introduction of the revised model of NPQH. The following conclusions and key issues are intended to contribute to debate about how best to support leaders in our schools.

66. The evidence from school inspection indicates that strategic school leadership is often stronger than operational management. Training programmes need to address more clearly the differences between leadership and management and to provide training that targets areas of weakness emerging from section 10 inspections, such as monitoring and evaluation of the school's performance and taking effective action. The joint OFSTED/NCSL 'Headfirst' project, which is training headteachers in school self-evaluation, using inspection criteria, is one important initiative to tackle these weaknesses.

67. Inspection also shows that there are a number of key features that are particularly associated with effective leadership and management of schools facing particular challenges. National training programmes need to take these into account and provide more differentiated opportunities for participants.

68. There is a need to consider more fully how the various training programmes can be developed to form a coherent and progressive entitlement to leadership training. Training programmes need to take account of the National Standards for Headteachers and to follow on from each other in a developmental and structured way which provides opportunities for developing leadership teams as well as individual leaders.

69. The NCSL and headteacher training providers should consider how best to monitor and evaluate the impact of leadership training on raising standards and school improvement, with a view to ensuring both quality and value for money. This will entail closer auditing of the expenditure of training funds, quality assurance of providers of leadership training, and decisions about whose responsibility it is to monitor and evaluate the outcomes of training.

70. The revised NPQH seeks to address a number of the matters identified in this report. Success will depend upon all those involved tackling the following issues:

- improving selection procedures
- providing training which focuses more closely on candidates' individual needs, as well as emerging national issues such as inclusion and entitlement
- clarifying the role of headteachers in supporting the NPQH candidate within the school
- providing clearer information for candidates about assessment procedures
- improving the quality of feedback to candidates after the final assessment.

71. Key issues for LEAs and the NCSL to address in supporting newly appointed headteachers are:

- the inconsistencies in the quantity and quality of LEA induction support
- the quality and effectiveness of needs assessment
- the quality and effectiveness of mentoring
- ensuring that headteachers are fully aware of the details of HEADLAMP funding and provision
- the monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of HEADLAMP expenditure.

72. Key issues for the NCSL to consider in the further development of the LPSH are:

- the structure of the training programme, which needs to ensure that impetus is not lost
- the composition of groups and the provision of differentiated training to meet the needs of headteachers from varying contexts
- more explicit linkage to the National Standards for Headteachers
- the quality of target-setting and monitoring of progress
- the function and operation of the Partners in Leadership programme
- the quality of the ICT input and web site
- ways of providing effective follow-up to the programme.

Annex: LEAs visited

The following list shows LEAs visited for the inspection of headteacher induction.

Autumn term 2000

Bracknell Forest
Brighton and Hove
Bristol
Buckinghamshire
Havering
Kent
Medway
Northamptonshire
Oxfordshire
Salford
Sandwell
Southend
Surrey
Warrington
West Sussex

Spring term 2001

Bath and North East Somerset
Blackpool
Bromley
Calderdale
Cambridgeshire
Coventry
Hertfordshire
Liverpool
Luton
Milton Keynes
Portsmouth
Solihull
Southampton
Wokingham

Summer term 2001

Cumbria
Devon
Gateshead
Herefordshire
Islington
Lambeth
Leicestershire
North Somerset
Reading
Stoke-on-Trent
Sunderland
Thurrock
Warwickshire
Wiltshire

Types of schools visited

Nursery – 1
Primary – 108
Secondary – 46
Special – 10.