

## What we are learning about: leadership of Every Child Matters

This paper focuses on current knowledge and thinking about Every Child Matters and school leadership. Its findings are summarised in six key messages.

# Contents

Introduction	03
The key messages	03
Key message 1	04
Key message 2	07
Key message 3	10
Key message 4	14
Key message 5	17
Key message 6	19
Appendix 1: Details of databases and websites searched	24
Appendix 2: Key search terms used	26
References and bibliography	27

# Introduction

The Every Child Matters (ECM) agenda encourages schools to offer extended services to help pupils achieve the five ECM outcomes, and to engage their families and the wider community in the process. As part of providing extended provision, schools are expected to work closely with a range of other specialist services to ensure that all pupils can achieve the ECM outcomes. The challenge for school leaders is to develop and implement models of leadership that are effective in addressing the ECM agenda, that facilitate and sustain effective partnerships with other agencies, and that engender buy-in to the ECM agenda from staff, as well as external services. With this in mind, the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) commissioned the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) to conduct a research study focused on current knowledge and thinking about ECM and school leadership.

The findings from this study are summarised here in the form of six key messages, evidence for which was collected from three main sources: a literature review of relevant material; telephone interviews with key stakeholders, including policy makers, researchers and local authorities; and focus groups with school leaders (see appendices 1, 2 and 3 for more details regarding sources and participants).

## The key messages

1. Effective school leaders are able to fully convince the staff in their school that a focus on ECM can raise standards and that ECM complements, rather than conflicts with, the standards agenda.
2. ECM cannot be achieved by a single school leader: effective school leaders share leadership responsibilities widely amongst the professionals working within the school
3. ECM outcomes cannot be achieved by the school alone: effective school leaders adopt a collaborative approach with other schools, agencies and services
4. ECM has widened school leaders' role and led to an emerging model involving leadership beyond their own institution, within the wider community
5. Effective school leaders believe in genuine student, parent, and community consultation in order to develop locally responsive solutions to ECM
6. To implement ECM effectively, school leaders will require new skills: effective school leaders engage in ongoing professional development and promote a whole-school learning culture.

## Key message 1

**Effective school leaders are able to fully convince staff in their school that a focus on ECM can raise standards and that ECM complements, rather than conflicts with, the standards agenda.**

### What the literature says

The current educational landscape requires school leaders to simultaneously raise student attainment and improve the quality of their lives (*Higham, Hopkins and Ahtaridou, 2007; Carter and Sharpe, 2006*). In addressing both the standards agenda and the ECM agenda, school leaders need to take a 'wider view' (*Craig, 2005*) and recognise that there are limitations to the improvements a sole focus on teaching and learning in the classroom can produce (*NCSL, 2006*). Recent literature stresses that schools are only one contributory factor in a child's education. Parents, for example, are more influential than schools up to the age of 11 years (*Desforges and Abouchaar, 2003*). Learning increasingly takes place outside of educational institutions and it is suggested that, if academic standards are to be raised in a sustainable way, school leaders need to see their role in terms of a broader social function as opposed to a narrow emphasis on improving classroom practice (*Otero and West Burnham, 2004*). This broader social function is addressed in the ECM agenda and therefore recognising the links between ECM and standards is increasingly pertinent. School leaders need to recognise the role that communities as 'the silent teacher' can have in achievement and, when seeking to raise standards, shift from focusing on institutional improvement to community transformation (*Craig and O'Leary, 2006; Otero and West-Burnham, 2004*). This concept has been referred to as building 'social capital'.

School leaders who are successful in meeting the ECM agenda recognise the links that ECM has with the standards agenda (*Kendall et al., 2007*). Staff in ECM engaged schools take the view that ECM goals will ultimately impact on standards of attainment. Kendall et al (2007) state that school leaders may find it useful to demonstrate these links to their staff and, where possible, gather evidence to reinforce this link. The literature goes on to suggest that leaders of extended schools and children's centres who have a vision for the five ECM outcomes and also for improved standards, deliver the most effective extended services (*Ofsted, 2006*). However, Bond and Farrar (n.d) believe that education professionals may not feel comfortable with ECM where they see this as less directly relevant to raising standards. Making these links explicit for them may therefore help some staff to embrace a wider definition and provide a more child-centred focus for their work.

### What the stakeholders say

Making the link between ECM and standards was one of the most frequently identified ways for leaders to promote buy-in to ECM amongst their staff. There was agreement amongst stakeholders that effective school leaders recognise the alignment of the ECM agenda and the standards agenda: 'They are so fundamentally tied together'; 'People have got to see that it is one and the same thing.' Not all stakeholders were convinced that the majority of headteachers think in terms of ECM, rather, that ECM may be seen as secondary to attainment, or that they cannot focus on both and therefore believe ECM to be a distraction. There was also a view that some headteachers see ECM as an initiative or policy development and therefore as an 'add on'. If treated in this way, it was thought that ECM would be perceived as intrusive by staff. Stakeholders stated that ECM needed to be integrated and embedded into schools'

working practice and that school leaders need to see extended school activities as being as important as activities in the traditional school day. They added that effective leaders link ECM into the core purpose of the school and constantly reinforce this message so it becomes integrated into practice.

Stakeholders pointed to evidence of variability across different types of schools. Schools in more challenging communities were reported to buy in to ECM more readily because they recognise that wellbeing and learning sit hand in hand, whilst schools in affluent areas were said to see ECM as less of a priority. There was therefore a view that some headteachers need to be convinced that ECM is about 'doing things for all children and not just a few'.

The use of peer pressure to encourage commitment amongst disengaged headteachers was raised by more than one stakeholder. According to one local authority representative, where headteachers who are a key influence and well respected by their peers are used to influence their colleagues, 'movement in relation to ECM tends to occur'. This was considered more productive than the local authority exhorting schools to become involved. Stakeholders thought that school leaders could be encouraged to engage by focusing on the benefits of ECM, particularly in terms of delivering their core purpose (i.e. evidence that ECM impacts on pupil learning) and by building on what they are already doing towards ECM. Good evidence of effectiveness (or 'early wins') was reported to shift some of those who are less inclined. It was thought that the sharing of good practice can also provide 'enormous drive to move things forward'. In addition, strategic vision and leadership from the local authority was thought to be influential.

Stakeholders stated that strong messages championing ECM are required at all levels of the system, by central and local government.

They thought that clarity about what is meant by ECM is required and considered it easier to focus on specific areas (e.g. extended services). It was reported to be 'a big leap of faith' to move from the traditional school day to extended services, but there was evidence that engagement in extended school activities could change school staff's perceptions about teaching and learning and make it easier for them to embrace ECM.

Some stakeholders indicated that there were particular issues to do with teachers' awareness of ECM and its significance as a strategy. It was considered essential, therefore, that school leaders reinforce amongst their staff the message that ECM can lead to raised attainment by meeting the wider needs of children and overcoming barriers to learning. Effective leaders ensure staff recognise they may not see improvements in standards unless they engage with this agenda. It was considered important to dispel misconceptions about the tensions between ECM and standards. There was also a view that ECM should not be seen as purely instrumental in raising attainment, rather that the five outcomes are of intrinsic value themselves.

For many stakeholders the key is integrating ECM outcomes into school leaders' thinking about school development and improvement planning. According to one local authority representative, leaders who effectively design school improvement plans (SIPs) around the ECM outcomes make the connection for staff between ECM and standards. The Ofsted inspection process and the self-evaluation form (SEF) were reported to drive this process and reference was made to Teacher Development Agency (TDA) materials as a practical tool to support school leaders with this process.

Effective school leaders provide clarity of vision and keep staff informed and involved in what is happening. One stakeholder described this

as the single most important factor influencing buy-in to ECM. Alongside this, it was considered important that school leaders ensure that their staff have a good understanding of all the elements of the ECM agenda and why they are important. A distributed leadership model was thought to assist the process of staff engagement and promote a sense of ownership (see key message 3). Stakeholders indicated that effective school leaders recognise that staff may be at different levels of engagement and they therefore define a self interest in ECM engagement for staff (by homing in on what is in it for them) rather than exhorting people to engage. They are sensitive to staff concerns, particularly about overburdening them. It was also suggested that it was helpful to identify local champions, to showcase good practice and provide exemplars of what teachers are already doing towards ECM ('join the dots for people and make connections'). One local authority, for example, had drawn up a charter which schools could use as an audit tool to measure themselves against to enable them to see what ECM means in practice. In some schools, extended school coordinators were reported to be collecting evidence of impact on learners and in this way enabling school leaders to demonstrate that involvement in the wider aspects are beneficial for learning.

### What the school leaders say

There was general agreement amongst school leaders that all schools need to be engaged with ECM and that the Ofsted process should ensure this. Some school leaders considered it so integral to their work they found it difficult to conceive that a headteacher might not be on board with the ECM vision (although a school might struggle with the practicalities). They insisted schools were accountable and ECM could not be ignored: 'It is the bedrock and baseline of so many other things.' They agreed with stakeholders that it could not be

seen as merely an initiative and had to be integrated into practice: 'ECM should be seen as integrated into everything and not just bolt on.' However, one headteacher voiced the opinion that ECM was not originally designed to raise standards, since it was introduced in response to the need to bring agencies together to safeguard children.

This headteacher pointed out the conflict between the rationale behind ECM and that of the standards agenda: ECM is about the child whereas standards are about the school. Countering this argument, another headteacher stated that the greater the focus on the child, the more likely that schools would raise standards, because the barriers to learning are more openly shared and easier to manage.

Consistent with the stakeholder view, school leaders felt that schools in socially deprived areas are more likely than schools in affluent areas to perceive ECM as a vehicle to raise achievement, and the latter are therefore less likely to make this connection. The head of a federation gave examples of two schools in different areas with the same senior management team (SMT), where one school was reported to have engaged in ECM more readily because it was considered important for the local community. School leaders reiterated the view of stakeholders regarding the need to get the message across: 'ECM is for every child. It is universal practice, not just for kids who need support.'

Whilst school leaders did not feel there was much resistance to ECM amongst their staff, they stated that the staff most engaged in ECM are not teachers. They also said that teachers are not used to this being part of their role and that some school staff do not feel it is part of their remit. In particular, they pointed to the fact that teachers in secondary schools have traditionally dealt with subject areas and the expectation that they address the needs of the whole child is therefore a culture change.

School leaders felt that the knowledge and commitment of the school leadership team is particularly influential in enlisting staff engagement. Where this is in place, ECM was reported to be better understood by staff and the link between ECM and standards made more explicit. It was considered important that all staff have training in ECM and for them to know the priorities of the school in relation to the agenda and the understanding behind this.

The general view, supported by stakeholders, was that staff could be brought on board by framing the school development plan (SDP) around ECM. The agenda would then be driven by meeting the targets/developments within the SDP. The school improvement process, particularly the requirement within the SEF to address ECM outcomes, was considered to have been particularly useful to school leaders in helping them to get staff on board. According to the headteacher of a special school, standards and ECM can be married by having individual education plans (IEPs) which integrate the five outcomes and meet standards: 'The strands aren't alien to standards. They are all tangibly married. It is about being overt. You write your development plan and ensure that you hit all the triggers.' Where an explicit link between ECM and standards is not made, it was reported that there could be divisions amongst staff, i.e. between those for whom everything revolves around ECM and those who have little to do with the agenda, and that, as a result, work undertaken by pastoral staff with the children may not be followed through in the classroom. Therefore, whilst retaining a sharp focus on teaching and learning, it is important to promote serious engagement with ECM by all staff.

The performance management process was also considered helpful in terms of inducing people to change. Headteachers explained that longstanding teachers do not always buy in to new developments so this process can take

time: 'Change is difficult and moving them on is difficult.' Teaching and learning responsibility (TLR) payments were reported to have helped to get the right staff on board and to change management structures.

School leaders stated that, if there was commitment to ECM from the local authority and the children and young people's plan had been written from this perspective, this commitment is easier to pass on to schools. School leaders also noted that they looked to support from the government and from the wider community to support ECM implementation.

## Key message 2

**ECM cannot be achieved by a single school leader: effective school leaders share leadership responsibilities widely amongst the professionals working within the school**

### What the literature says

In light of the increased demand that ECM has placed on headteachers, many are now clear that they will not achieve the five outcomes through their skills alone. As such, school leaders are harnessing the skills of other school staff and, by drawing them into the decision-making process, are building capacity for others to take on wider leadership roles. This is resulting in a distribution of leadership which has frequently been identified as an effective approach for promoting the aims of ECM (*Higham et al., 2007*).

ECM has also provided the opportunity for non-teaching staff (e.g. extended schools coordinators) to play a bigger role in leadership teams, and created opportunities for the role of associate staff to be developed, particularly where their roles are linked to ECM outcomes (*Kendall et al., 2007*).

As a result, flatter management structures are emerging which allow for a maintained focus on teaching and learning (PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2007). School leaders have been looking at the expertise both within their school and locally beyond the school to determine the best person to deliver specific aspects of extended provision (LGA, 2004). This not only brings in specialist teaching skills, but also relieves the perceived pressure of ECM on teaching staff.

Distributed leadership requires delegation of strategic, management and operational responsibility (Munby, 2007) and the literature suggests that some leaders find it difficult to hand over elements of control. It requires a high level of trust in those who take on responsibility (Coleman, 2006). It also relies on school leaders making previously implicit elements of individual roles explicit and clear, being more open to interdependence, to change, and to different ways of working (Gronn, 2003). It was stressed that current school leaders need to recognise that their schools are the training grounds for future leaders. Indeed, some authors have suggested that distributed leadership is integral to securing system-wide development and change (Carter and Sharpe, 2006). It also means that knowledge and expertise is less vulnerable to organisational or external shifts and changes, and as such is more likely to ensure sustainability (Harris and Mijuis, 2004 cited in Harris, 2005).

### What the stakeholders say

There was agreement amongst stakeholders that it was unrealistic and unhelpful for headteachers to take on single-handedly the wider set of responsibilities that ECM embraces. The ECM agenda was reported to be too broad to continue with the traditional leadership model where the headteacher has authority over everything. It was therefore

seen as essential that these responsibilities were delegated or shared amongst a wider team and 'distributed' leadership was frequently identified by stakeholders as an approach currently being used to promote the aims of ECM. Echoing the literature, there was a view that progress with regard to ECM would be impossible and unsustainable without a shift to distributed leadership. Examples of this model, where specific parts of the ECM agenda are shared out amongst a team of leaders, were reported to be on the increase. As a result of workforce reform, some schools were reported to have restructured their leadership teams and realigned leadership responsibilities with ECM. Effective leaders were reported to focus on staff strengths and to nominate individuals to implement and develop specific ECM areas (e.g. by taking charge of a particular ECM outcome). The introduction of TLR was felt to have facilitated this process, although, variation amongst local authorities was evident, for example, in one local authority, it was considered uncommon for staff to have an ECM brief and TLRs were reported to remain focused on achievement.

Distributed leadership was reported to have changed the school leader role dramatically. The move to shared leadership responsibilities was felt by some stakeholders to be a major challenge for school leaders in terms of both their mindset and their skill set (see key message 6). They were sometimes reported to find it difficult to distinguish between accountability and responsibility, and felt the need to remain in control: 'They have to be able to let go and not hold all the reins.' Where headteachers retain control and there are no processes and systems in place to allow others to take on management responsibilities, it was agreed that the wider ECM agenda would be impossible to manage.

Stakeholders stated that, because of the wider focus and the need for greater collaboration, new leadership roles that are emerging have



begun to include non-teaching professionals. This was considered beneficial in that it facilitated a wider range of outcomes and helped overcome barriers to learning. The wider membership of leadership teams was considered to be working successfully in some instances, although it was also reported to be in its early stages. One local authority representative expressed the more controversial view that perhaps schools might look to those outside of the teaching profession for school leaders, in common with the children's centre initiative which employs leaders from a variety of professions. He/she argued that this would result in better provision for the community population as a whole. However, there was an acknowledgment that, at the current time, it would be inconceivable for schools to have a non-educationalist at their head because of the focus on teaching and learning. The title 'headteacher' was said to be 'a difficult bridge to cross'.

The introduction of professionals from different backgrounds was considered a cultural change for school leaders and stakeholders stated that it was necessary for them to have an understanding of what these professionals can contribute to teaching and learning. The greater role of non-teaching professionals was said to have implications for school leaders, in particular with regard to performance management.

### What the school leaders say

School leaders agreed with stakeholders that there are too many ECM elements for leaders to handle alone and that there is a danger of headteachers spreading themselves too thinly. In the majority of cases, leadership responsibilities are shared amongst the senior leadership team and this now includes a non-teaching element (e.g. extended schools coordinators and non-teaching pastoral

managers). Support staff were said to play key roles on senior leadership teams in some instances. A number of school leaders reported having changed the structure of their leadership teams to encompass the broader roles associated with ECM. There was clear evidence that they allocate ECM responsibilities and have specifically delegated roles to work within the community and on a multi-agency basis. They stated that this helps to raise the profile of ECM within the school and that, without such measures, things were unlikely to change. Some schools had used TLR payments as an opportunity to restructure pastoral and leadership systems in line with ECM: 'It's about getting the right people on board and the management of change. ... It's about knowing what you want, where the barriers are and changing the structures to help. You move some on and others step aside.'

The profile of school staff was reported to have changed dramatically over the last few years (i.e. less than 40 per cent are now teachers) and this was felt to be a visible outcome of ECM and workforce reform. The learning mentors in one school, for example, as the staff most involved with ECM, had gained a higher profile by virtue of this status. It was noted, however, that the promotion of the role of support staff can contribute to the view of some teachers that ECM is the role of others. Effective school leaders, therefore, reinforce the message that 'ECM is not the job of the SENCO ... ECM is everyone's job. It is a shared responsibility for everyone in the school. You need everyone on board within and beyond the school.' Other than within children's centres, school leaders were not aware of any instances of other agencies taking the overall lead within educational institutions or schools and some found this a difficult concept to accept.

In line with stakeholders' views, school leaders stated that the introduction of 'para' professionals in schools has significant implications for them.

Unlike teachers, these professionals are unlikely to have a foundation of training, education and experience. This was said to create issues for school leaders with regard to performance management, continuing professional development and 'professionalism', as well as having the potential to affect the culture and ethos within the staff room. Thus, they raised the question as to how school leaders can effectively induct these professionals into the school environment and ethos. School leaders decried the 'blinkered' role of national and local government with regard to the changing workforce in schools, which meant they had little opportunity to remunerate support staff. Whilst occupational standards were reported to be moving towards a more professional footing, a pay structure that financially rewards support staff was still felt to be a long way off. They also reported the disparity between the salary of teaching staff compared to that of associate staff to be a significant issue.

### Key message 3

#### **ECM outcomes cannot be achieved by the school alone: effective school leaders adopt a collaborative approach with other schools, agencies and services**

##### What the literature says

Collaborative working is at the very heart of the ECM agenda and, with the emphasis on integrated children's services and the provision of more community-led activities, school leaders are being asked to work as partners with a whole range of services to meet the needs of children, young people and the wider community (*Craig and O'Leary, 2006*). Increasing numbers of schools are adopting a multi-agency approach to school leadership as a well-developed and direct response to ECM

(*PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2007*). This approach is outward looking, interagency focused and often involves teaching staff and professionals from other agencies working together as a leadership team.

In working with partners to achieve ECM, effective leaders enter into the 'spirit of collaboration' (*Huxham and Vangen 2005; 2004; Vangen and Huxham, 2003*), have a genuine desire to work in partnership and do not perceive it as being externally imposed (*Kendall et al., 2007*). They seek to achieve a 'collaborative advantage', i.e. something that would not have been possible without the act of collaboration (*Huxham and Vangen, 2004 and 2005; Huxham 2003*) and find 'win-win' strategies that have a common interest at the centre (*Coleman, 2006*). Indeed, collaborative advantage is a key motivation for establishing partnerships beyond the school because the school, with its primary focus on educational attainment, cannot achieve the ECM outcomes alone. The imperative to work towards the five ECM outcomes provides the common goals and purpose necessary for successful collaboration (*Kendall et al., 2007; Frost and Lloyd, 2006*).

Inter-school collaboration can also help schools to meet ECM requirements, resulting in collaborative advantage and providing a lifelong learning approach to a school's focus. In order to achieve the five outcomes, headteachers are recognising that working with their local or neighbouring schools is crucial to continued success and raised standards (*Fullan, 2004*). Federations of schools that have evolved are characterised by varying degrees of collaboration between schools, or between schools and other providers (*PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2007*).

The literature highlights that, on a day-to-day basis, effective collaborations are led by outward-looking school leaders who are solution-focused and start from the problem itself as opposed to the procedures

(Anning *et al.*, 2006; Lownsborough and O’Leary, 2005; PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2007). An array of strategies for leading collaborations effectively is apparent. There is no prescribed model and approaches need to be tailored to the local context. However, six key leadership strategies for facilitating effective collaboration emerge from the literature:

- **Organisational aspects** (PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2007; Coleman, 2006; DfES, 2006; Frost and Lloyd, 2006; Ofsted, 2006; SWQ, 2006; White *et al.*, 2005; HM Treasury, 2004)
- **Clarity of purpose** (DfES, 2006; NCSL, 2006; Frost and Lloyd, 2006; HM Treasury, 2004; Bond and Farrar, n.d)
- **Role demarcation** (Coleman; 2006; DfES, 2006; Frost and Lloyd, 2006; Lownsborough and O’Leary, 2005)
- **Good levels of communication** (PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2007; Ofsted, 2006; SWQ, 2006; Bond and Farrar, n.d)
- **A partnership approach** (DfES, 2006; Ofsted, 2006; SWQ, 2006; HM Treasury, 2004)
- **Establishing trust and mutual respect** (Carter and Sharpe, 2006b; Coleman, 2006; e.g. Huxham and Vangen 2005).

Successful collaboration takes time (Atkinson *et al.*, 2002; Cummings *et al.*, 2003 and 2004). To avoid ‘collaborative inertia’, effective school leaders set realistic targets and timescales, start small and move gradually to more ambitious targets, as well as building upon existing long-standing partnerships where possible (Coleman, 2006; Cummings *et al.*, 2003 and 2004; HM treasury, 2004; Huxham 2003; Huxham and Vangen, 2004 and 2005; NCSL, 2006; Vangen and Huxham, 2003; White *et al.*, 2005). Local authorities can also play an important role in supporting school leaders and acting as a key facilitator for engaging partners (Coleman, 2006; Ofsted, 2006). For instance, they can help develop strategic

collaborations between agencies and schools or amongst groups or clusters of schools and can encourage more reluctant partners to engage.

## What the stakeholders say

There was a general consensus amongst stakeholders that effective school leaders recognise that they (and their schools) cannot deliver the wider ECM outcomes in isolation. Effective leadership therefore involves a strong belief in, and commitment to, partnership working and recognition that different agencies and services have different expertise to contribute. Leadership was considered to be highly contextual and to involve the development of a vision that is clearly about developing partnerships and good relations with other organisations and other services. Effective school leaders ensure that the partnership is worthwhile and purposeful, and they demonstrate to their staff that working together adds value. According to one stakeholder, providing examples that show that partnership working is worthwhile ‘creates momentum’. Whilst headteachers were reported to have become better at working with a range of partners, some thought there was still a long way to go before they become comfortable with other deliverers providing services within schools.

Most stakeholders maintained that the key to effective leadership of partnership working is about ‘understanding where the other side is coming from’. When asked about the advice they would give to leaders new to collaborative working, they stressed the need for leaders to respect what other agencies believe is precious, recognise the other agency’s authority and ‘shed the skin of their own self importance’. Effective leaders understand the pressures and drivers of other services. They understand how the partnership can fulfil the school’s objectives, whilst at the same time ‘hitting other people’s targets’ and

they agree joint objectives rather than ‘push their own’. According to one stakeholder, being able to fulfil other agencies’ statutory responsibilities is an important lever for partnership working. To achieve this, effective leaders engage in constant dialogue and enter alternative professional frames of reference, and this can necessitate reframing their own understanding of education. They are willing to talk openly and honestly about what both sides want out of the partnership and to develop mutual trust. Many stakeholders stressed the need for open mindedness and a focus on listening. A didactic approach was considered counterproductive in partnership working as it was thought that it could lead to the disempowerment of others. Alongside this, stakeholders stated that effective leaders ensure clarity of language and meaning, otherwise they can make assumptions about other agencies: ‘You can assume an intent they don’t have.’

Stakeholders said that school leaders can develop a feel for what is happening locally and, as noted in the literature, feed into partnership forums and networks that already exist to avoid duplication. Increasingly, they were reported to be using a range of multi-agency forums as a way of strategically planning to deliver the ECM outcomes and the core offer for extended services. It was suggested that they work alongside local authorities and link into local authority structures and processes to assist them with partnership working. Local authority brokerage was considered to be one of the levers they could use for effectively engaging partners. However, how far partnerships should be brokered through the local authority and how far schools should be part of wider local authority partnerships and systems is, according to one stakeholder, still up for debate.

There was a view that, where money was provided for people to work together, collaboration and joint leadership

automatically follow: ‘You need the lure of joint funding that people can play with.’ According to some stakeholders, effective leaders think creatively about governance arrangements so that there is shared participation, shared responsibility and accountability, and so that partnerships are sustainable. There were said to be wide views and practices concerning leadership within different agencies/services. According to one policy maker, these differences need to be unpacked for multi-agency working to be effective. In contrast, another stakeholder stated that, increasingly, the same values are embedded in effective leaders across the sectors.

Operationally, effective leadership of partnership working was thought to be about providing strong direction and clarity about what can be achieved, as well as the capacity of individual leaders to be able to build and sustain close and appropriate working relationships across boundaries. Where schools are already involved in other initiatives (e.g. Behaviour Improvement Programmes and Behaviour and Educational Support Teams) and the structures and commitment to partnership working are already in place, this was thought to provide a platform on which to build. Effective leaders provide opportunities for staff from different cultures to work together to enable them to become familiar with each other’s worlds and to address underlying assumptions about each others’ roles. There has to be clarity about roles and responsibilities and different ways of working necessitate jointly agreed protocols on how to work together. According to one stakeholder, schools often begin by thinking they have to control everything on the school site and that militates against building networks which may help them to achieve better outcomes for children.

Inter-school collaboration, where headteachers work alongside each other for the benefit of the children, parents and communities they

serve, was identified by stakeholders as effective for addressing children's wider needs and therefore the ECM agenda. What was described as the 'old style of leadership', where headteachers are competitive, inward looking and aggressive in pushing forward their own agenda, was considered ineffective. Stakeholders stated that school leaders can find inter-school collaboration a challenge because of the tension between a collaborative approach and the competitive environment. However, they described models of headship that move beyond the leader of a single institution towards a more collective approach (e.g. executive headship of federations and supportive headship models). Federated leadership, for example, was cited as an effective strategy for engaging partners since it was thought that, by schools working together, local services can respond more easily (rather than having to engage with a number of different schools) and this can prevent services being fragmented.

### What the school leaders say

School leaders, in line with stakeholders, agreed that, as a result of ECM, schools could no longer work in isolation and needed to work in collaboration with other partners. They stated that ECM had led to a dialogue with a broader range of stakeholders and that schools were now working more collaboratively with other agencies and with other schools. It was thought that ECM had facilitated a common approach amongst agencies and that this enabled them to share concerns and work more closely together. Pre-ECM, it was felt that other agencies were often critical of the way schools operated. Partnerships were said to be becoming more formal and some referred to strategic groups or meetings (e.g. community learning partnerships) they attended with representatives from other agencies. School leaders talked about how positive the move towards partnership working has been because the child's needs are considered paramount.

On a day-to-day basis, school leaders thought that the key factors in terms of leadership of collaborations are the commitment of the leadership team, the establishment of a clear rationale for partnership working and articulating a clear vision, as well as effective communication. There was a view that, with schools the only constant in some children's lives, they are often the only organisation able to effectively coordinate agencies/services around the child.

School leaders indicated that they still found working with other agencies problematic in a number of ways. They shared concerns about the funding for partnership working and the sustainability of any additional support that is offered to children and families as a result. They stated that there can be difficulties in involving all the relevant agencies, particularly health, and in achieving a shared responsibility. It was also reported to be difficult to see the immediate results of partnership working and thereby for school leaders to justify the time spent to staff.

The view of one stakeholder with regard to the need for schools to control the services provided on the school site was borne out by the practical problems that school leaders raised. They stated that it can be difficult for school leaders when they have no authority over partners operating on the school site. Whilst, in common with stakeholders, they agreed that it was important to respect the professional expertise of other agencies, they stressed the importance of establishing agreed protocols with other agencies in such instances. Lack of physical space to house other agencies was reported to be problematic for some smaller primary schools.

Whilst discussions centred mainly on interagency collaboration, as with stakeholders, the importance of collaboration rather than competition amongst schools was stressed and this was thought by one of the school leaders to be an important key message

for schools. The role of the local authority in partnership working was reported to vary. Some were said to work directly with schools to facilitate collaboration with other schools and with other agencies, whilst others allow schools to work more autonomously. Some local authorities are more likely to have the relevant systems and structures in place than others. The type of local authority was also considered influential. In a rural locality, for example, the isolation of institutions and perceived lack of coherence of services was felt to make partnership working more difficult.

## Key message 4

### **ECM has widened school leaders' role and led to an emerging model involving leadership beyond their own institution, within the wider community**

#### What the literature says

The ECM agenda has expanded headteachers' responsibilities and given them influence beyond the boundaries of their school and within the wider social system in which their school operates. As a result, a new leadership approach is emerging, referred to in the literature as 'system leadership' (Hopkins, 2005). This embraces all the different models of leadership a headteacher can assume beyond the traditional boundaries of the school (e.g. leaders of extended schools, executive headteachers and federation leaders, community leadership) and recognises the interdependence between schools, other organisations and communities (O'Leary and Craig, 2007). It is suggested that school leaders need to shift from focusing on institutional improvement to community transformation, referred to as 'social capital', as noted earlier in key message 1 (Craig and O'Leary, 2006; Otero and West-Burnham, 2004).

This approach seeks to build sustainable leadership capacity and system-wide development and change (Carter and Sharpe, 2006; Harris et al., 2006). According to Barnes (2006), as well as contributing to the ECM agenda, system leadership can develop an ability to 'think big' and act in larger terms. It also allows schools to work for the interests of pupils across a wider system rather than for more parochial school self-interest.

Networking with other schools has provided the ground for system leadership (Carter and Sharpe, 2006b). The literature suggests that networks are creating environments in which school leaders are responding to the challenges of leading development work and learning beyond their own school, with the challenges of the wider locality driving their concern. Beyond collaborating with other schools (discussed in key message 3), some leaders have begun to take on responsibility for more than one school (Hopkins, 2005). Known as executive headship, this is targeted at integrating professionals with a wide range of experiences and expectations.

Leaders involved in working beyond their own institution and within the community will require a range of skills to create connected strategies to influence change within their own school, across other schools, within external agencies, and with the community. Future school leadership will involve building communities within schools, between schools and beyond schools (Collarbone, 2005) and, as such, will involve high-level skills in managing and brokering relationships. Six key leadership characteristics have been identified within the literature in relation to this approach (PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2007):

- A willingness to take on system-wide roles
- A moral and strategic purpose
- A focus on enhancing the quality of learning, teaching and assessment



- An ability to make schools personal and professional learning communities
- A commitment to building capacity through networking and collaboration
- A clear framework for developing leadership at all levels with individual schools.

Alongside this, 'system-wide' leaders are also typified by their focus on the local context and the development of partnership/collaborative working within the community as a whole.

### What the stakeholders say

There was a view amongst some stakeholders that, in the future, school leaders would need to take on leadership responsibilities that go beyond the boundaries of the school and into the wider community. As such, headteachers were reported to be key leaders in their local context. Stakeholders stated that the local community is now a very important part of school leaders' responsibility. This was said to be a very different, new and emerging type of leadership, being less hierarchical and involving less power and control. There were reported to be the seeds and 'pockets of practice' of this type of leadership in some areas and a number of headship models that move beyond the leader of a single institution (e.g. federations, shared leadership, and instances where one headteacher oversees two schools). According to one federation head, federations are established as a response to meeting the broader needs of children and young people.

This type of community leadership was thought to require an 'outward looking' approach and an understanding that improvement does not just happen within the boundaries of the school. Stakeholders stated that effective community leaders believe in meeting the needs of all children and families and focus on the creation of communities that

are self-improving. They were reported to be 'school exceeding' and to see the need to contribute to the system as a whole. However, stakeholders highlighted that school leaders may need to persuade their governing bodies that it is beneficial for them to focus on the needs of all the children in the local community rather than just those in their school.

There were a number of examples of system roles cited where, encouraged by the ECM agenda, school leaders had taken on a more community-wide role. They referred to examples of collaboration between schools and leadership beyond the institution in clusters of schools, federations and headteachers in executive headship roles. One stakeholder cited an example of a headteacher seconded to the post of director of community and wellbeing who was leading the ECM agenda across a community of schools and services. Headteachers were also reported to be involved in children and young people's strategic partnerships where they are involved in decisions about community provision.

However, there were some stakeholders who felt that there was a debate still to be had about how far school leaders should provide a wider community leadership role and there was some scepticism about whether this was beneficial. Some headteachers were reported to be challenging the need for this role. For some stakeholders, therefore, how far a headteacher is responsible more widely for pupils beyond their own school was an issue still to be resolved. According to one, whilst headteachers recognise that their role is broadening, it must not become so big as to be unmanageable. More than one stakeholder stated that their experiences suggested that such a move could be detrimental to the institution. There was a common view amongst some local authorities, for example, that, even though schools may have to focus beyond the classroom to improve, headteachers need to remain focused on

achievement and the school's core purpose. Some also thought that this might mean the weakening of the system a leader is trying to strengthen by pulling out key people. One local authority representative, for example, stated that he would prefer to use talented headteachers to coach other school leaders, rather than them taking on a community-wide leadership role. There was some agreement with this view, and another stakeholder stated that a school leader would not be providing the sort of leadership required by schools today if they were out of school 'improving the system'.

Community leadership was reported to be a fundamental challenge because school leaders are traditionally nurtured within institutions and this requires them to look beyond the school and exercise leadership across the community and a range of agencies and services. In addition, stakeholders thought that, not only could this be detrimental to the school, but there was an underlying assumption, considered erroneous by some, that a good school leader has the skills to be a good 'system' leader. The skills required by leaders for this role are discussed more fully in key message 6.

### What the school leaders say

School leaders thought that 'community leadership' was not yet established and still ill defined. They recognised that school leaders have more of a role within the community and that they need the skills and confidence to undertake this role, which is different from the more traditional and narrowly defined school leadership role. The headteacher of one of the secondary schools stated that they have a

community vice-principal and examples were given of school clusters where a leader oversees and genuinely leads across the community, where there is parity with heads of other agencies. There were examples of primary headteachers who are working in the community, taking on the role of community leaders and feeding back to the school. There was also reported to be a headteacher of a 'virtual' school who was 'looking at children in the widest sense' within the community. Other staff within the school were said to take on the role of headteacher while the school leader stepped out to take a wider brief (reflecting the distributed leadership model discussed earlier in key message 2).

Some school leaders found it difficult to say whether they were comfortable with this type of leadership model because it was still at the theoretical stage and not a reality as yet. However, others were resistant to the idea: 'There is a danger of making a heads job undoable, it would be enormous.' Those taking this view agreed with some of the stakeholders in feeling that it could take away from the core business of the school. They stated that, while they valued the impact of extended schools and working with other agencies/services, they felt that this wider role would be comparable to managing a huge organisation.



## Key message 5

### Effective school leaders believe in genuine student, parent, and community consultation in order to develop locally responsive solutions to ECM

#### What the literature says

The importance of the local context is central to ECM and an understanding of local needs is considered essential for ECM leadership (*DfES, 2006; Ofsted, 2006*). The literature emphasises that leaders need to recognise and appreciate that there is no single blueprint or ‘best way’ for engaging partners in collaborative working, developing extended services or responding to ECM (*Carter and Sharpe, 2006; Coleman, 2006*). Rather, effective school leaders appreciate the importance of developing a local, tailored strategy for seeking out new partners and responding to local need (*Cummings et al., 2003 and 2004; Kendall et al., 2007*).

School leaders are beginning to place the local context at their centre in response to ECM. Local solutions leadership requires an awareness of, and receptivity to, how different ways of leading a school may be successful and effective in different circumstances (*Munby, 2007*). As such, effective leaders seek local solutions and are innovative in their approach. Some leaders may look to collaborate and federate with other schools in the local area to ensure that the approach taken is context specific and tailored to local needs. Consultation is fundamental to any such approach.

ECM demonstrates the connection between the child, the school, the home and the community, and effective leaders see the school as working with the community to working for the community (*Bond and Farrar, n.d*). One emerging leadership approach has service-users at its core: ‘User-centred leadership’

(*Munby, 2007*). Leaders adopting this approach consider their core business as connecting with the users of their school to make sure that the school revolves around and serves them. They place a heavy emphasis on the role of students, parents and the wider community, and engage in genuine dialogue with them to assess needs. Three key factors have been suggested as instrumental in developing a community based needs-led approach to leadership (*Craig and O’Leary, 2006*):

- ‘Re-shaping participation for today’s communities’, i.e. organising interaction between the school and the community so it is more frequent.
- ‘Building the belief that communities can make a difference’ by schools celebrating the benefits and outcomes of community collaboration and leadership.
- ‘Creating new spaces for community life’, i.e. meeting in spaces and places where the school and community have equal control.

By creating opportunities to consult and work with the community, responses to ECM can focus on local needs. As such, they are more likely to result in meaningful outcomes and more focused and successful responses to ECM.

#### What the stakeholders say

There was a shared belief amongst stakeholders that, in order to address ECM, effective school leaders are outward looking and listen to, and respond to the needs of the local community. Leadership was said to be least effective where the headteacher is not prepared to consult with children, families and the wider community or assumes they know their needs: ‘Only by providing what is wanted are you going to guarantee access to provision and only then are you going to be able to work towards delivering outcomes.’ If the community genuinely feels its needs are being taken on board this was thought to be a good

starting point. Stakeholders stated that services have to be tailored to local needs to enable them to be more responsive and to assist schools with the ECM agenda. They thought that the local authority has a strategic role in bringing together partners and researching local priorities.

With the advent of extended services, schools were reported to be increasingly aware of the need to consult widely, particularly in genuinely seeking and utilising pupil, parent and community views to inform planning. There was a view that it is beneficial for service users to be involved in influencing the direction of change and schools therefore need to hear what children and young people are saying and need to understand what they think and want. Whilst some stakeholders thought that the process of consultation was totally embedded in schools, there were those who thought that some schools were detached from their community. They stated that genuine consultation means having a belief that children have something authentic to say and a climate where they are genuinely able to express their views.

Whilst genuinely engaging the community was considered hard to achieve, it was thought to be central to success. To achieve this, it was thought that effective leaders spread the message to the community that the school is a resource for them and a belief that it matters. Stakeholders described this as a two-way process: 'Seizing every opportunity to get the community into the school and the school into the community' and engendering in the school that they are part of the community. Successful headteachers are visible within the community and adapt strategies to local circumstances. Stakeholders gave examples of strategies for increasing community involvement, including holding consultation events in the local library or the foyer of the local supermarket, organising social events to engage parents, capitalising on PR opportunities (e.g. using

local papers and community groups) and having someone to take on the specific role of community liaison. They also talked about the use of local people and third sector organisations with credibility in the community to engage parents. Establishing a community room was described as a tangible way for the school to demonstrate that it wants to engage with the community.

A few local authorities were reported to be working on how children and young people exercise leadership. They talked about a range of student involvement at different levels, e.g. student councils, pupils as researchers and pupil representation on children and young people's strategic partnerships. It was the norm in one authority for students to be involved in staff recruitment and in the design and delivery of services. However, it was noted that, even where there was real commitment to pupil participation within the local authority, schools were felt to be at different stages within this process.

Whilst stakeholders reported that school leaders require recognition of the more 'customer orientated' approach, they were felt to be more aware that their 'customers' have a more sophisticated understanding of their role. There was a view that it was early days in terms of understanding the full significance of the consultation process and the much wider degree of consultation was reported to be a challenge for school leaders. Effective school leaders understand how to undertake genuine consultation 'conversations' and are able to manage the feedback. It was thought that this can require a cultural shift and take headteachers out of their comfort zone, from someone in authority to someone open to the views of others, who has to respond accordingly. According to one stakeholder, when the culture does not privilege teacher voice over student voice, this has massive implications for school leaders because there can be disharmony of views.

## What the school leaders say

School leaders agreed that they now worked much more in a 'user-centred' way, although some felt that this was more to do with school improvement, rather than ECM directly. They admitted being more conscious of having to consult key stakeholders, wanting to improve the use of parent and pupil voice and ensuring their input into decision making. The headteacher involved in a federation of schools stated that a major focus of the federation was about consultation with the community.

School leaders indicated that engaging parents was a big issue, although their role in ECM was thought to be paramount. Making the school welcoming was considered the first step to engaging parents and the local community: 'Buildings are important and people need to feel comfortable'. Schools need to be seen as more than academic institutions. In one local authority, the development of wellbeing centres was seen as a way to engage parents and make them take responsibility for their children's education. The focus on wellbeing and the change of context meant that the centres are not seen as schools. The process of consultation also raised issues for school leaders and, as the ECM agenda develops, it was thought that school leaders would need to be able to manage parental expectations.

There was some agreement that schools' attention to pupil voice has always been strong, but is becoming stronger, and this was reported to be a priority within the school development plan. Pupil voice was reported to be having an impact on self-evaluation and influencing how the school moves forward. School leaders expressed the opinion that it has been difficult for staff to accept the enhanced role of student voice because it requires a cultural change, but it is now becoming more acceptable. Again a variety of exemplars of schools incorporating student voice, similar to those proffered by

stakeholders, were cited. One school leader talked about the input of pupils into departmental reviews, which was described as a tangible example of how pupil voice can be used to raise teaching standards. It was noted that, whilst this sort of feedback can be uncomfortable for teachers, it can be very powerful and teachers are becoming increasingly used to this notion.

## Key message 6

**To implement ECM effectively, school leaders will require new skills: effective school leaders engage in ongoing professional development and promote a whole-school learning culture**

### What the literature says

The literature highlights the range of new skills that will be required by school leaders in order to implement ECM. Whilst these have been touched on throughout the report, this key message serves by way of a summary of these.

Most significantly, the literature refers to the need for leaders to have a commitment to, and recognition of, the value of partnership working to better meet the needs of every child and young person within their school and community (*Craig and O'Leary, 2006; Kendall et al., 2007; PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2007*). Thus, recognising the collaborative advantage of partnership working is a crucial ECM competency. The ability of school leaders to manage and broker new relationships with service providers, and to recognise and respect the experience and expertise of professionals working beyond schools is stressed, as is the need for leaders to develop stronger skills of communication (*Huxham and Vangen, 2005; LGA, 2004; Ofsted, 2006; PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2007; SWQ, 2006*).

The literature refers to the need for leaders, as a result of the shift in responsibilities required by ECM, to recognise the broader social function of their role and their influence beyond the immediate boundaries of the school (Hopkins, 2005; Otero and West-Burnham, 2004). Thus, it emphasises that effective leaders take a 'wider view' or more outward looking approach (Craig, 2005; PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2007). They seek to engage the local community and recognise the importance of this for school improvement (Craig and O'Leary, 2006; Otero and West-Burnham, 2004). This wider leadership role requires the development of additional skill sets to those required for leading a single institution. Leaders need to be able to communicate a vision and moral purpose that resonates with every stakeholder and provides coherence (Carter and Sharpe, 2006a; 2006b). As well as having to manage teaching and learning, being able to develop people, and to develop the organisation as a whole, Hopkins and Higham (2007) state that system leaders also require the ability to change other contexts beyond the school by engaging with the whole system (e.g. empowering communities and leading partnerships committed to enabling all schools to move forward). In addition, system leaders need to pace change appropriately, to interpret and respond to different explanations for negativity and reluctance to change, and to manage risk so that the boundaries of what can be achieved can be pushed (Lownsborough and O'Leary, 2005).

As highlighted in the literature, further competences are linked to the distributed leadership model in which school leaders harness the skills of others, both within and beyond school (Higham et al., 2007). Effective school leaders are open to change, open to new and different ways of working, and, above all, to be able to 'let go' of certain responsibilities (Gronn, 2003). Effective school

leaders establish trust amongst their leadership teams, are receptive to different styles of leadership and recognise experience and expertise within the school and other professionals (e.g. Coleman, 2006). Furthermore, the increasing role of non-teaching professionals and managing a changing workforce require additional and newly developed skills, in particular with regard to performance management (Kendall et al., 2007).

In order to address the ECM agenda, effective school leaders seek to promote a learning culture within and across their school as a whole (for students; teachers; non-teaching staff; associate staff etc). By investing in the professional development of staff in this way, school leaders can promote greater staff buy-in, which is crucial to implementing any system of change, especially the ECM agenda (SWQ, 2006). By encouraging such a culture and providing continuing professional development opportunities for school staff, leaders can build confidence and reduce reluctance and defensiveness amongst staff, thereby creating an openness to change (Mujis and Harris, 2003; O'Leary and Craig, 2007).

The literature also suggests that ECM has required school leaders to develop an understanding of local needs (e.g. DfES, 2006; Ofsted, 2006). Effective school leaders therefore consult with community members and recognise the role of pupils and their families in school development (Munby, 2007). Listening skills and the ability to respond to need are therefore reported to be becoming increasingly important.

### What the stakeholders say

With the advent of ECM and the leadership changes required, stakeholders frequently alluded to the new skills leaders may require in order to implement the agenda. Thus, the need for greater collaboration and community

leadership, and the focus on distributed leadership, each suggest the potential for leaders to require a new or different set of skills or qualities, some of which may not be part of currently recognised leadership qualities. Stakeholders stated that professional training needs to be broader and different. A few stated that, rather than requiring school leaders to acquire new skills, leadership styles may need to be developed from different arenas (e.g. business models) and applied to a new setting. They felt there would need to be an assessment of the attitudes and skills that were required.

Stakeholders felt that a more subtle set of skills was required for successful collaborative working than those currently recognised for effective school leadership. They referred to the need for leaders, for example, to develop negotiation skills and excellent interpersonal and social skills for engaging multi-agency partners effectively. Effective leaders require the skills for brokering relationships, as well as an understanding the joint benefits of collaboration. Headteachers were reported to be getting better at working with a range of partners. Stakeholders stated that the skills required by leaders for the wider community leadership role also involve relationship building, brokerage and entrepreneurialship. The key to this type of system-wide leadership was felt to be about managing relationships effectively and learning about other agencies and services.

Stakeholders talked about school leaders ensuring that staff take on new roles and have access to relevant training opportunities. Flexibility was said to be key, as effective leaders move rapidly and become involved in 'futures' thinking, i.e. thinking ahead with regard to the training needs of staff. They added that effective school leaders show a commitment to developing others into effective leaders as this is important for sustainability and succession planning, as well

as ECM. They ensure, through training and exposure to the practices of other schools, that staff have a broader perspective and learn new skills. There was a view that ECM had resulted in new opportunities for leadership, including a range of new leadership roles and new routes for leadership. Some stakeholders thought that this might improve recruitment and retention issues and thereby ensure sustainability.

As highlighted within the literature, a number of stakeholders believed that successful school leaders place importance on developing their schools as learning organisations. To maintain this, they have a commitment to learning at all levels of the system and take the view that everyone, staff, as well as students, are continually learning. According to one stakeholder, this is about moving from a 'professional training' to a 'professional learning' environment. Some stakeholders talked about the development of a school culture of reflection and consultation that builds in sustainability. They stated that this can be achieved by school leaders brokering experiences in other schools and providing opportunities for sharing good practice. Effective school leaders highlight exemplars of what staff are already doing towards ECM and provide evidence of what works.

### What the school leaders say

School leaders acknowledged that, with the advent of ECM, they might require new skills and competencies. Rather than focusing in detail on identifying the new leadership skills required, they stated, as did stakeholders, that a set of qualities, abilities and skills for this more complex role would need to be developed.

They talked extensively about the management of change: 'It's about getting the right people on board and the management of change.' There was a view that headteachers are managing change all the time and they have always had to be flexible and adaptable.

According to one headteacher, as a result, they are 'top in terms of skills'. Some therefore felt that, because a change culture is already embedded in schools, there is little resistance to ECM from staff. There was also considered to be more scope to induce change than in the past, for example, through the performance management process and the use of TLRs.

Alongside this, some additional skills required by school leaders were highlighted. School leaders stated, for example, that for collaborative working, they require strong interpersonal skills and the ability to develop positive relationships with a range of professionals. According to one headteacher, school leaders 'have to get to grips with emotional intelligence', the essential premise of which is to do with recognising and managing one's own emotions as well as those of others', and improving relationships and understanding between people. They stressed that effective school leaders have effective communication skills, are able to articulate a vision and to communicate with all those involved. Once they have developed a vision, they set in place the structures to enable change. However, there was also a view, proposed by one secondary headteacher, that, although the leadership role has become more diverse as a result of ECM, the leadership skills are the same since the job revolves around the driving of development plans.

A distinction between management and leadership was also made by a small number of school leaders. As highlighted previously, the involvement within schools of professionals from outside of the teaching profession was reported to raise significant management issues for school leaders. They therefore require the necessary skills to effectively and cohesively integrate 'para' professionals into the school workforce. The current qualifications for headteachers were reported to focus more on leadership skills and less on these types of management requirement.

## Conclusions

Throughout the literature a plethora of terms is assigned to different styles or models of leadership and this makes the distillation of key messages for ECM leadership important. Only in this way can school leaders understand the key principles of what is required and integrate these into their practice.

In the main, there is little within the key messages emerging from the data that school leaders themselves are likely to dispute, particularly given the consistency of findings across the three evidence sources. Whilst there is inevitably some variation across schools, there was a sense that school leaders are making the link between ECM and standards, that they are already adopting a more collaborative approach and developing a local response to ECM through engagement with their local community. School leaders recognise that ECM is not merely an initiative or policy development; rather it is something that needs to be integrated into their staff's working practice. When working effectively, as well as improving outcomes for children and young people, this may also help to improve the life of their staff.

The main area of contention is likely to lie in the suggestion that the school leaders' role is extended to a wider leadership role beyond the single institution. As a new and emerging leadership role, this is something which school leaders and other stakeholders will wish to discuss and debate further. In addition, there is evidence that the enhanced skills required for school leaders to undertake this new and complex role require more detailed definition. Effective school leaders recognise that they cannot achieve everything all in one go. It is important that the school leader's role remains manageable, that they recognise the need for continuing professional development and that they are provided with the necessary support in the form of future CPD provision to take on this challenge.



# Appendix 1: Details of databases and websites searched

## Databases searched:

- **Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts:** Index of articles from over 600 international English language social science journals, from 1987 to the present.
- **British Education Index:** An indexing service covering over 300 education and training journals produced in the UK, report and conference literature, and material included in the complementary Education-line collection of full text documents.
- **British Education Internet Resource Catalogue:** Internet based database of information about professionally evaluated and described internet sites which support educational research, policy and practice.
- **ChildData:** This database is produced by the National Children's Bureau and includes approximately 69,000 bibliographic records on issues concerned with children and young people.
- **Current Educational Research in the UK (CERUK):** CERUK is a database of current or recently completed research in education and related disciplines. It covers a wide range of studies including commissioned research and PhD theses, across all phases of education from early years to adults.
- **International Bibliography of the Social Sciences:** This database contains bibliographic information from an international selection of publications (including over 2600 journals) in the fields of economics, political science, sociology, and anthropology.
- **Intute: Social Sciences:** This gateway aims to provide a trusted source of selected, high quality online information in the social sciences. It includes a browsable and searchable Internet catalogue giving access to online resources selected by experts in a range of subject areas.
- **Research in Practice:** This is the largest childcare research implementation project in the country and aims to promote the use of evidence in both policy and practice. Features include an EvidenceBank of research reviews relating to children in need and a Research Resources section including guidance on identifying, acquiring and evaluating research evidence.
- **Social Care Online:** This database provides information about all aspects of social care, from fostering, to mental health and human resources.
- **Social Policy and Practice:** The database covers public and social policy, public health, social care, community development, mental & community health, homelessness, housing, crime, law & order, families, children and older people. Content is from the UK with some material from the USA and Europe. A significant number of the references are to grey literature and UK government publications.



## Websites searched:

- NCSL
- DCSF
- Teachernet
- Ofsted
- DENI
- Scottish Executive
- Department of Health
- Institute/Centre for Excellence in leadership (health and social care)
- Continyou
- Centre for Excellence in Leadership
- IDEA/LGA
- Solace (LA network)
- DEMOS
- TDA
- CfBT
- Children's Workforce development council
- Innovation Unit (wider workforce, MA working, system leadership)
- Committee for Sustainable Development (e.g. EC's Future Matters)

# Appendix 2: Key search terms used

## Every Child Matters:

ECM

Every Child Matters

Every Child Matters Agenda

Children's services

Integrated children's services

Extended Schools

Lead Professionals

Children's Trusts

National Service Framework

Common Assessment Framework

Children's Centres/Sure Start

## Leadership:

Leadership

School leadership

School leaders

Heads

Headteachers

Principals

Deputy headteachers

Assistant headteachers

School management

Management teams (further breakdown e.g. Middle management, Department heads, Bursars, Subject leaders)

## Author searches

Michael Fullan (systems leadership)

David Hopkins (systemic leadership)

John Burnham-West (general literature on school leadership)

Ron Glatter (primary school leadership)

Alma Harris (University of Nottingham)

John MacBeth (Cambridge University)

Centre for Excellence in Leadership (website)

# References and bibliography

## References

- ANNING, A., COTTRELL, D., FROST, N., GREEN, J. AND ROBINSON, M. (2006). Developing multi professional teamwork for integrated children's services. Open University Press.
- ATKINSON, M., WILKIN, A., STOTT, A., DOHERTY, P. AND KINDER, K. (2002). Multi-Agency Working: a Detailed Study (LGA Research Report 26). Slough: NFER .
- BARNES, I. (2006) Primary Executive Headship: A Study of Six Headteachers who are Leading More than one School. Nottingham: NCSL.
- BOND, K. AND FARRAR. M. (n.d). What are we learning about...? Community leadership in networks. Nottingham: NCSL.
- CARTER, K. AND SHARPE, T. (2006). School leaders leading the system: system leadership in perspective. Nottingham: NCSL.
- COLEMAN, A. (2006) Collaborative Leadership in Extended Schools. Leading in a multi-disciplinary environment. Nottingham: NCSL.
- COLLARBONE, P. (2005) Remodelling Leadership. Paper presented at the North of England Education Conference. Available at: [http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/doc/n/neec\\_conf\\_collarbone2.doc](http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/doc/n/neec_conf_collarbone2.doc) [8 October 2007].
- CRAIG, J. (2005). Taking the Wide View. The new leadership of extended schools. London: DEMOS.
- CRAIG, J. and O'LEARY, D. (2006) The invisible teacher: How schools can unlock the power of community. London: DEMOS.
- CUMMINGS, C. and TODD, L. with DYSON, A. (2003). Extended schools pathfinder evaluation: Issues for schools and local education authorities (Research Brief RBX18-03). London:DfES.
- CUMMINGS, C. and DYSON, A. with TODD, L. (2004). Evaluation of the Extended Schools Pathfinders Projects (Research Report RR530). Nottingham: DfES.
- DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS. (2006). Championing Children: A shared set of skills, knowledge and behaviours for those leading and managing integrated Children's services. Nottingham: DfES.
- DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS. (2005). Extended Schools: Access to opportunities and services for all. A prospectus. Nottingham: DfES.
- DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS. (2007). The Governance and Management of Extended Schools and Sure Start Children's Centres. Nottingham: DfES.
- DESFORGES, C. AND ABOUCHAAR, A. (2003). The Impact of Parental Involvement, Parental Support and Family Education on Pupil Achievement and Adjustment: A Literature Review. London: DfES.
- FROST, N. AND LLOYD, A. (2006). 'Implementing multi-disciplinary teamwork in the new child welfare policy environment', Journal of Integrated Care, 14, 2, 11–17.
- FULLAN, M. (2004). The future of educational change: system thinkers in action. Paper presented at the American Educational Research association annual meeting, April 2004. Available at: <http://networkedlearning.ncsl.org.uk/knowledge-base/conference-papers/system-thinker-in-action-aera-fullan-2004.rtf> [25 October 2007].
- GRONN, P. (2003) In Rethinking educational leadership (Eds, Bennet, N. and Anderson, L.). London: Sage Publications.

- HARRIS, A., BROWN, D. AND ABBOTT, I. (2006). Executive leadership: another lever in the system? *School leadership and management*, 26, 4, 397-409.
- HARRIS, A. (2005). Leading or misleading? Distributed leadership and school improvement. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37, 255-265.
- HARRIS, A. (2003). Teacher Leadership as Distributed Leadership: heresy, fantasy or possibility? *School Leadership and Management*, 23, 3, 313-324.
- HIGHAM, HOPKINS AND AHTARIDOU (2007) *Improving School Leadership: Country Background Report for England*. London: London Centre for Leadership in Learning.
- HILL, R. (2006). Leadership that lasts: Sustainable school leadership in the 21st century. Leicester: Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL).
- HOPKINS, D. AND HIGHAM, R. (2007). System leadership: mapping the landscape. *School leadership and management*, 27, 2, 147-166.
- HM TREASURY (2004) *The sum of its parts? The Development of Integrated Community Schools in Scotland*. Available online: [www.hmie.gov.uk/documents/publication/dicss-01.html](http://www.hmie.gov.uk/documents/publication/dicss-01.html) [25 October 2007].
- HUXHAM, C. AND VANGEN, S. (2004). Doing things collaboratively: realizing the advantage or succumbing to inertia? *Organizational dynamics*, 33, 2, 190-201.
- HUXHAM, C. AND VANGEN, S. (2005). *Managing to collaborate: the theory and practice of collaborative advantage*. Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- HUXHAM, C. (2003). Theorizing collaborative practice. *Public Management Review*, 5, 3, 401-423.
- KENDALL, S., LAMONT, E. WILKIN, A. AND KINDER, K. (2007) *Every Child Matters. How School Leaders in Extended Schools Respond to Local Needs*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION. (2004). *From vision to reality: transforming outcomes for children and families*. London: LGA.
- LOWNSBROUGH, H. AND O'LEARY, D. (2005) *The Leadership Imperative. Reforming children's services from the ground up*. London: Demos.
- MUJIS, D. AND HARRIS, A. (2003). Teacher Leadership – Improvement through Empowerment? *Educational Management and Administration*, 31, 437.
- MUNBY, S (2007) Steve Munby's Speech to the NCSL annual Seizing Success Conference. Available at: <http://www.ncsl.org.uk/media/057/5F/steve-munby-speech-conference2007.pdf> [25 October 2007].
- NATIONAL COLLEGE FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP. (2006). *Working Together. Helping Community Leadership Work in Practice*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- O'LEARY, D., AND CRAIG, J. (2007) *System Leadership: Lessons from the Literature*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- OFSTED (2006) *Extended services in schools and children's centres*. Available: [http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/assets/Internet\\_Content/Publications\\_Team/File\\_attachments/extended2609.doc](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/assets/Internet_Content/Publications_Team/File_attachments/extended2609.doc) [3 October 2007].
- OTERO, G. AND WEST-BURNHAM, J. (2004) *Leading Together to Build Social Capital*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS LLP (2007). *Independent Study into School Leadership*. London: DfES.
- SQW (2006) *Research to Inform the Management and Governance of Children's Centres. Final Report to DfES*. London: SQW Limited.
- VANGEN, S. AND HUXHAM, C. (2003). Nurturing collaborative relations: Building trust in interorganisational collaboration. *The journal of applied behavioural science*, 39, 1, 5-31.
- WHITE, G., SWIFT, J. AND BENNETT, A. (2005). *Sure Start maintaining pilots: what can we learn?* London: DfES.

## Bibliography

- BARNES, I. (2006) New models of headship: Primary executive heads. Nottingham: NCSL.
- BARNES, I. (2006) Primary executive headship: a study of six headteachers who are leading more than one school. NCSL.
- BARNES, I., COLEMAN, A., CREASY, J. AND PEARSON, F. (2005) New models of headship: Secondary or special school executive heads. Nottingham: NCSL.
- BENNETT, N., WISE, C., WOODS, P. AND HARVEY, J. (2003) Distributed leadership. Nottingham: NCSL.
- BOND, K. AND FARRAR, M. (2004) Leading together to build social capital. Nottingham: NCSL.
- BOND, K. AND FARRAR, M. (n.d) Working towards community leadership: Rotherham. Nottingham: NCSL.
- BUSH, T. AND GLOVER, D. (2003) School Leadership: Concepts and evidence. Nottingham: NCSL.
- CARTER, K. AND SHARPE, T. (2006) School leaders leading the system: system leadership in practice. Nottingham: NCSL.
- CARTER, K. AND SHARPE, T. (Eds) (2006) School leaders leading the system: NCSL's leadership network in conference. Nottingham: NCSL.
- COLLINS, A., IRESON, J., STUBBS, S., NASH, K. AND BURNSIDE, P. (2005) Does every primary school need a headteacher? Key implications from a study of federations in The Netherlands. NCSL.
- COLLINS, A., IRESON, J., STUBBS, S., NASH, K. AND BURNSIDE, P. (2006) New Models of headship series: Federations. Nottingham: NCSL.
- COULTON, S. (2006) Getting our heads together: shared leadership of a collaborative school improvement project. NCSL.
- COURT, M. (2003) Different approaches to sharing school leadership. NCSL.
- DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND SKILLS. (2006) Sure start children's centres practice guidance. Nottingham: DfES.
- FULLAN, M. (2002) The role of leadership in the promotion of knowledge management in schools. OECD Conference.
- FULLAN, M. (2003) The moral imperatives of school leadership. London: Sage Publications.
- GLATTER, R. AND HARVEY, J. (2006) Varieties of shared headship: a preliminary exploration. NCSL.
- HUXHAM, C. AND VANGEN, S. (2000) Leadership in shaping and implementation of collaboration agendas: how things happen in a (not quite) joined-up world. Academy of Management journal, 43, 6, 1159-1175.
- MUNBY, S. (2007) NCSL chief shares six steps to successful school leadership. Nottingham: NCSL. Available online: <http://www.ncsl.org.uk/aboutus/pressreleases/pr4-06062007.cfm> [30.01.2008].
- NCSL. (2006) ECM. Why it matters to leaders. Nottingham: NCSL.
- NCSL. (2006) Lessons from extended schools. Nottingham: NCSL.
- NOBLE, M. (2006) Leading an extended school. Leicester: ASCL.
- OFSTED. (2005). Extended schools: a report on early developments. London: Ofsted.
- PATERSON, F. (2006) New models of headship: Co-headship. Nottingham: NCSL.
- PENN, H. AND ANG, L. (2005). Leading questions. Nursery World, 105, 3957, 10-11.
- WEST-BURNHAM, J. AND OTERO, G (n.d.) Leading together to build social capital. Nottingham: NCSL.

**Publications and resources also available from NCSL:**

- **ECM Leadership Direct** is an online Resource exploring the implications for Every Child Matters for schools and school leaders.  
[www.ncsl.org.uk/ecmleadershipdirect](http://www.ncsl.org.uk/ecmleadershipdirect)
- **NCSL programmes** for school leaders at all levels.  
[www.ncsl.org.uk/programmes](http://www.ncsl.org.uk/programmes)
- **Publications and resources** available to download and order.  
[www.ncsl.org.uk/publications](http://www.ncsl.org.uk/publications)
- **The Leadership Library** is a free unique resource bringing together some of the best leadership and management thinking from around the world.  
[www.ncsl.org.uk/leadershiplibrary](http://www.ncsl.org.uk/leadershiplibrary)
- **The Tomorrow's leaders today** campaign is about finding, developing and keeping great headteachers.  
[www.ncsl.org.uk/tomorrowsleaderstoday](http://www.ncsl.org.uk/tomorrowsleaderstoday)

To download this publication or to order a copy free of charge, please visit [www.ncsl.org.uk/publications](http://www.ncsl.org.uk/publications)

**National College for School Leadership**

Triumph Road  
Nottingham NG8 1DH

T: 0845 609 0009  
F: 0115 872 2001  
E: [enquiries@ncsl.org.uk](mailto:enquiries@ncsl.org.uk)  
W: [www.ncsl.org.uk](http://www.ncsl.org.uk)

