National College for
School Leadership

Innovation in Headteacher Induction

Full Report

Spring 2004

Case study research carried out for the

National College for School Leadership

by

Dick Weindling

Create Consultants, London

Contents

Executive summary

The purpose of this study was to identify induction programmes for new headteachers operating in different countries, to describe their structure and content and to highlight good practice. In doing so, the report aims to be of practical relevance to programme developers, in this country and elsewhere.

Implications for induction programmes
What can we learn about the best ways of supporting new headteachers from this review of induction programmes?

1. New headteachers and principals require particular types of support in order to establish themselves and function as effective leaders in their schools.
2. Needs analysis may be helpful but it is important to recognise that new headteachers may not be fully aware of their major needs. Needs should, therefore, be re-reassessed periodically.
3. The case studies show that mentoring plays a vital role, particularly during the first year when headteachers want help and advice from the mentor about the initial problems they encounter.
4. Ideally, mentors should be experienced and practicing headteachers.
5. The recruitment, training and support of mentors is an important consideration.
6. New headteachers benefit from meeting with other new colleagues to share ideas and to overcome feelings of isolation. Residential sessions offer additional benefits.
7. Programme durations between 10 and 12 days a year appears to allow sufficient time for a cohort of new leaders to form and begin to become a learning community.
8. Programmes would benefit from drawing on the findings from organisational socialisation to help headteachers understand the two-way interaction of the new leader and the school.

Recommendations for programme developers

The author offers the following set of recommendations to help the development of innovative induction programmes.

- It is important to support new headteachers through the process of organisational socialisation when they attempt to take charge of the school and learn about being a head in their particular organisation. Induction programmes can help heads to read the culture of the school and overcome the isolation commonly reported by new leaders.
- Programmes should focus on the role of the head as a change agent and transformational leader.
- The headteacher is increasingly seen as the lead learner and the leader of learning. So it is important that programmes model the concepts of continuous learning, reflection and the development of a learning community.
- The use of action learning, group problem solving and study groups is likely to be beneficial, and maximise the potential of cohorts to form a supportive learning community.
- The structure of the programme should incorporate e-learning, mentoring, and regular meetings of groups of new headteachers.
- Mentoring is an essential support for new leaders. Paying mentors for their professional work enhances the status and quality of their work.
- A balance is required between the number of meetings and the reluctance of new leaders to be out of their schools during the first year.
- Thought should be given to the best use of IT and the establishment of a dedicated website for e-learning. The website should contain training materials, articles, think-pieces, case records and the opportunity for new headteachers to discuss themes of interest, post messages and request advice and guidance.
- The content of programmes should include findings from research on effective leaders and what we know about the needs and problems of new headteachers and principals.
- More attention needs to be paid to evaluation. Both formative and summative evaluations that address the impact on participants' schools are helpful, ideally led by an agency that is independent of the programme.

Increasing numbers of programmes are now being run to help new headteachers and principals become more effective leaders during the difficult and stressful first years in post. This review is intended to assist planners and help them improve their programmes so that new heads do more than just survive this induction period, and instead become skilled leaders through improved confidence and competence.

About this study

This study used key informants and internet searches to identify 43 induction programmes operating in 14 countries. The amount of available information varied considerably and sufficient data for analysis was obtained for 18 of the programmes. Brief summaries were prepared for the programmes for which there was sufficient information. Five programmes were selected as case studies that were considered to have interesting and innovative features of potential application to the induction of headteachers in England. These case studies are also available on the NCSL website.

Contact details
For further information, contact:
Dick Weindling
Director, CREATE Consultants
Tel: 0207 328 8619
Email: dweindling@blueyonder.co.uk

1. Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify induction programmes for new headteachers operating in different countries, to describe their structure and content and to highlight good practice. In doing so, the report aims to be of practical relevance to programme developers, in this country and elsewhere.

This report distinguishes between three broad chronological phases of a headteacher's career; pre-service (before appointment as a head or principal); induction (in the first years after appointment); and in-service (during the individual's subsequent career). Until recently relatively few leadership development schemes had a planned progression through all three phases (although Chicago provides a good example of sequential programmes that link these three phases).

In most countries, considerable attention has been given to the pre-service phase of school leadership. In-service training courses (usually offered for the introduction of new legislation, or contemporary issues) also have a long history. Induction programmes, however, appear to be the least developed of the three phases, with a recent review of US programmes stating that "formal induction programs are too new to have generated a significant body of empirical research" (Lashway, 2003).

The structure of this report

This report begins with a general review of the development of induction programmes in England, the USA (which had the largest number of induction programmes) and elsewhere. The next section provides an overview of the five case studies selected. This is followed by a set of recommendations for programme developers. Detailed case study examples which incorporate commentaries provided by two independent experts in the field are also available from the NCSL website.

2. Developments in England

In 1987, Weindling and Earley (1987) published an influential report of a national study of new secondary headteachers in England and Wales. The research provided compelling evidence of the stressful nature of early headship. As a result, the report recommended that induction support, should be offered to all new heads. In 1992, funding was provided for a national headteacher mentoring scheme which proved both popular and successful (Bolam et al,1993). Unfortunately, changes in the funding structure meant that the scheme only lasted for 18 months. The next major change came about with the introduction of the Headlamp scheme in 1995. This provided all new headteachers with £2,500 to be spent on their own management development in the first two years following appointment. The majority of the funding had to be spent with any of the 150 registered providers (frequently this was their own LEA or professional association). Guidance from the DfEE said that LEAs had a responsibility to induct new heads into their services, procedures and practices. The following elements were identified as present in these induction schemes:

- a needs assessment
- an induction training programme
- mentoring
- networking through groups of heads
- link advisor support

In 2000/01, HMI inspected the support systems for new headteachers in 43 LEAs and concluded that it was good in 10 authorities, satisfactory in 14, unsatisfactory in another 14 and poor in 5 (Ofsted, 2002). The report said:

No LEA inspected offers good support in all the areas of induction (those listed above) 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 were primary headteachers.

The inspectors were also critical of much of the mentoring they found in the 43 LEAs, which they found extremely variable.

The NCSL, which took over responsibility for leadership development from the TTA, conducted a review of induction provision (Newton, 2001), which showed that about 9,000 new headteachers had used Headlamp (representing an 85% take-up). A set of recommendations were made for a new scheme, the Headteacher Induction Programme (HIP), which began in September 2003.

In 2003, Ofsted published another report on Headlamp which focused on the work of six providers (two LEAs, two universities, a professional association, and a diocesan provider). They judged the overall quality of training to be good or very good, and found that the headteacher participants felt it helped increase their confidence, addressed specific issues in their schools, and developed their knowledge and understanding of leadership styles and management strategies. But weaknesses in the programmes were found in two areas: needs identification and quality assurance. Mentoring was not a strong feature of Headlamp provision. Where it formed a significant part of a formal training programme, it was most successful when mentors had received good quality training and clear guidance on how to conduct mentoring sessions. However, the role of the mentors was frequently underdeveloped and many mentoring sessions lacked rigour or challenge. Learning networks, where a group of newly-appointed headteachers kept in touch regularly to support one another's learning, were not widely used as part of the Headlamp programme. However, when they were managed by skilled and experienced trainers, they were considered to provide good opportunities for the participants to learn with, and from, each other.

Currently the NCSL is offering HIP as an entitlement for all new headteachers with a grant of £2,500 (plus £500 from the school governors) for training and development to be spent with the 20 registered providers.

HIP has the following key elements:

- needs assessment
- coaching
- mentoring
- the New Visions programme for Early Headship
- modules

The HIP modules include: raising pupil achievement; securing a positive ethos and maintaining high standards of behaviour; leading schools facing challenging circumstances; inclusion; working with the governing body; and leading the transformation of the school workforce. The New Visions programme was piloted in 2002 and the evaluation showed very positive results (Bush et al 2003).

3. Developments in the USA

Traditionally in the USA, new principals were largely left to 'sink or swim'. Having completed their university preparation course they were assumed to be ready to take up their principalship. In 1998, a survey found that less than half the US school districts (equivalent to LEAs) had formal induction or mentoring programs for new principals (Educational Research Service, 2000). Recently there has been a growing concern prompted by the high proportion of serving principals nearing retirement and the apparent shortage of new candidates. This has led to an increase in the number of programmes to support new principals. It is hoped that these will reduce principal turnover, and that by helping the principals to become more effective, the teaching and learning in their schools will improve.

This review identified a total of 30 induction programmes in the USA. At the time of writing, 14 states have induction programs for new principals, and another six states are currently considering introducing legislation to provide these programmes (see Appendix). All the present US state-wide schemes are using a set of standards as the basis for the content and assessment of their programmes. The most commonly adopted standards are provided by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) which has six main elements:

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students:

- *Standard 1*. By facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
- *Standard 2*. By advocating, nurturing , and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
- *Standard 3*. By ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

- *Standard 4*. By collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

- *Standard 5*. By acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

- *Standard 6*. By understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

The state schemes are mandatory for new principals. Several states have introduced a two-tier system of administrative licensure. Having obtained an initial Level 1 pre-service certificate, a new principal must obtain a Level 2 licence by successfully completing the state programme.

As an example of a state induction programme, South Carolina offers a one week residential and three or more one-day follow up sessions to provide training in leadership and management skills. The programme, which must be a minimum of 12 days, emphasises instructional leadership, effective schools research and analysis of test scores for curricular improvement. Mentors, who are principals from nearby districts, give support throughout the year. The Leadership Academy trains the mentors and reimburses their travel expenses. Mentors meet twice with participants and Academy staff make one visit to the new principal's school during the year. The state pays all training costs related to the New Principals Academy.

The funding of induction programmes is clearly an issue. Although the induction programmes have been introduced by state legislation, many have not provided the districts, who are required to run the programmes, with any extra funding. Oregon is an exception, whereby 'districts in need' are provided with up to $3,000 per person per year.

4. Developments in other countries

A recent book edited by Hallinger (2003) provides details of school leadership development from 11 countries directly and another 11 indirectly. Hallinger reviewed the period from 1980 to 2002 and pointed out that global forces such as school-based management, integrated and centralized curriculum, high-stakes testing and accountability, have created major changes in the education systems of the world which in turn have affected school leadership preparation and development. Although the book offers an excellent global perspective covering the pre-service and in-service phases, induction programmes have developed only in the last few years and relatively little research and evaluation have been undertaken so far. In fact, Hallinger sees this as a key area:

> Induction into the principalship or other school leadership positions has emerged as a key issue in school leader preparation and development...Concern for the professional induction of school leaders should be high on any agenda for reform.

Huber (2003) explores leadership development in 15 countries and considers a number of induction programmes. These are divided into those which are mandatory and those which are optional.

Mandatory: Austria, Hong Kong, some German States, and some Swiss Kantones.
Optional: Denmark, Sweden, some German States, and some Swiss Kantones.

Wales has recently developed an induction scheme for new headteachers. The Professional Headship Induction Programme (PHIP) is part of the Welsh Assembly Government's National Headship Development Programme (NHDP). PHIP is a two-year programme that supports the professional development of all newly appointed headteachers in Wales. It was introduced in September 2001 and over 100 newly appointed headteachers take part in the programme each year. They receive government funding of between £2,000-£2,500 during the two-year programme.

12

Programme materials are developed and managed by the Welsh Assembly Government, but the scheme is administered by the LEA of the newly appointed headteacher. An external evaluation of PHIP is currently being conducted.

PHIP has three main components: a professional headship profile, peer networking and mentoring.

(i) Professional headship profile

The profile is a planning and guidance instrument for new headteachers and enables them to access and create their own induction programme. It builds on the preservice programme in Wales. The profile also includes a National Training and Development Directory which outlines training and development opportunities.

The profile aims to provide new headteachers with:

- an insight, through their relationship with their mentor into their own work and the work of headteachers in general

- a tool to reflect and evaluate progress, providing a non-judgemental sounding board to interpret the early days of their headship

- encouragement and support to become effective lead professionals

(ii) Peer networking

An integral part of the PHIP programme is the participation of the new headteachers in peer network groups. These normally meet on a termly basis, ie there are six meetings over the two years, these can involve the LEA contact officer.

The aims of the peer networks are:

- to provide focused and structured opportunities to share current issues

- to disseminate good practice and develop peer and professional recognition

- to reduce professional isolation

- to increase informal face to face and on-line networks of communication

"Pen-i-Ben" (Head to Head) is a further element of support for peer networking. It is a bi-lingual (Welsh and English) on-line community for PHIP participants.

(iii) Mentor support

Mentoring forms a significant element of the PHIP programme and the relationship lasts for the duration of the programme. The mentoring component is designed to provide new headteachers with support from experienced colleagues to assist them with the transition to headship. There is a two-day national training programme, attended by all mentors prior to their taking up the role within the PHIP programme. The training of experienced headteachers as mentors also facilitates their own professional development and assists in their mentoring and staff support role within their schools. Mentors are not paid, though funding is provided to cover the cost of supply cover for headteachers who act as mentors.

PHIP has some similarity with the SAGE programme in Victoria, Australia, which is one of the case studies. The New Zealand programme is another of the case studies and this can be compared with NCSL's New Visions programme. Although there are believed to be headteacher induction programmes in France, Hong Kong, Netherlands, Sweden, and some Canadian areas, no further information was found on these schemes.

5. Key programme components

The amount of information available for the 43 induction programmes found across the world varied considerably – while some had lots of detail, others provided very little. Sufficient detail was available for 18 programmes and an analysis of the information obtained shows that the programmes varied in relation to a number of over-arching components: the programme structure; content; process; mentoring; and evaluation. Each of these is outlined below:

Programme structure

The structure of induction programmes followed a common pattern. New headteachers are invited to attend the programme soon after appointment (either on a voluntary basis, or as part of a mandatory scheme). The programmes varied in length, some such as those in Louisiana, Georgia and Ohio lasted for two years, but most lasted a year, and typically consisted of a series of meetings (some residential) offering workshops and presentations. Between the meetings the new heads were supported by a mentor, and in some programmes, by small local group meetings.

Content

For many of the US schemes the content of the induction programmes is shaped by the ISLLC standards outlined above. Most schemes focus on the headteacher as instructional leader (ie someone who works to improve teaching and learning). They contained elements focusing on school improvement, effective leadership and the management of change. They also tended to offer units on basic management skills such as finance and the law. The programme content also included issues which were current at the time, (for example, they often had a component on the new US government initiative 'No Child Left Behind').

Process

There were a number of processes that were common to the majority of the 43 programmes.
- coaching
- mentoring

- reflection
- self-assessment instruments
- leadership portfolios
- e-learning
- computer simulations
- study visits
- school enquiry visits
- study groups
- problem-based learning
- case studies
- action enquiry methods
- group problem solving
- networked learning communities

The use of reflection was highlighted as a fundamental component in most programmes, whereby the new headteacher or principal would be encouraged to be a reflective practitioner. A number of schemes tried to bridge the gap between theory and practice by using approaches such as problem-based learning, case studies and action enquiry methods. The benefits of working as a cohort group, allowing the members to support and learn from each other, have also been recognised. This played a major part in many of the programmes, which paid specific attention to the development of learning communities. The effective use of e-learning is still developing in many of the schemes and computer simulations were rare. However, Louisiana used a commercial web-based system called 'Blackboard' as a key method of programme delivery.

Some programmes used self-assessment instruments as a needs analysis. Portfolios of evidence collected by the new headteachers appear to be mainly used for assessment purposes. For example, a number of states were piloting portfolios for ISLLC recognition and in Arkansas, Ohio, Louisiana and Maine, principals were required to produce a portfolio as part of their assessment.

Mentoring
All the identified schemes used mentoring, which it seems has almost become synonymous with induction. For example, in Oregon and Mississippi, mentoring is

specified as 90 hours a year face-to-face contact between the mentor and the new principal. The mentors can be retired administrators or practicing principals. NAESP (The National Association of Elementary School Principals) has worked with Nova Southeastern University (NSU, Miami) on a national mentor training and certification scheme. The first 'Leadership Immersion Institute' began with a four-day program in June 2003. Further training will take place, and at the end of a successfully completed year the 'master mentors' will provide training for local mentors.

The variables across the programmes are as follows.

- **Whether the mentors were practicing or retired heads**. Most programmes used experienced practicing headteachers, others used a mixture of retired and current heads. The Santa Cruz scheme only used retired administrators. While retired people are able to give more time, they may be seen by the new head as too distant from current issues in schools.

- **The ratio of mentors to new heads.** This, ranged from 1 to 1, to around 1 to 6, with an exceptional 1 to 20. While 1 to 1 mentoring offers the most concentrated experience, it can be expensive. Practicing headteachers are usually not able to support more than one or two people because of the demands of running their own schools. In some schemes, retired administrators work with large numbers of beginning heads. Kentucky is unusual in that it uses a team of three people: a mentor, a university professor, and the district superintendent, who support and assess new principals over their first year in post.

- **Whether and how much the mentor was paid.** In some schemes the mentors were not paid, or were only paid a modest stipend. In England LEAs usually gave a small payment (say £500) from Headlamp as token recognition for the work of the mentor who was most commonly a practicing headteacher. In Kentucky and Ohio the mentor receives $1,000 per person being mentored. In the Prince George County programme the mentors were paid $3,000 for providing 18 months of support.

- **What training is provided for mentors.** Mentor training has been identified as a crucial factor for the success of a programme (Bolam et al, 1993). Mentor training varied from none at all to three days training. The best programmes provided preparatory training and also further training and discussion sessions during the mentoring year.

Evaluation

This is the area which most clearly needs development. Although the programmes usually conducted end of course evaluations, very few had commissioned external, independent evaluations. Notable exceptions were NCSL's New Visions and HIP, and the Welsh PHIP programmes which are currently being externally evaluated.

6. Overview of the case studies

Four of the 43 induction programmes were selected as case studies to offer examples of good practice at the national, state and district levels. A commercial programme, LeaderLab, was included as a fifth case study as it contained a number of interesting features which could be adapted to support new headteachers. The programmes were chosen as they offered a range of structures, processes and content.
The five case study programmes were:

- New Zealand, First Time Principal Programme
- Australian Principal Centre (APC), Victoria, SAGE Principal Mentor Programme
- Georgia State University, Academy for New Principals
- Prince George County, Beginning Principals Mentoring Program
- The Center for Creative Leadership (CCL), North Carolina, LeaderLab

A key person involved with the programmes was commissioned to write a descriptive report using a set of common headings. LeaderLab is no longer run by CCL, so this case study was written by Dick Weindling using published reports. Two leading US researchers, Bruce Barnett and Kent Peterson, were asked to write commentaries on each of the case studies, pointing out features of particular interest and also highlighting the areas they thought could be improved.

The following section gives an overview and description of the characteristics of the five case study programmes in relation to the five dimensions identified above (namely: structure, content, process, mentoring and evaluation).

Programme structure

The five programmes ranged in length from six months for LeaderLab, to two years for the Georgia State scheme. In terms of the size of the cohorts, Prince George County, as a local programme, had between 15 to 27 new principals (depending how many were appointed each year). At the other extreme, the New Zealand national programme had 200 first time principals per year. The other three programmes usually worked with cohorts of around 40–50 participants.

The structure varied across the schemes. The New Zealand scheme had three four-day residential sessions. LeaderLab was structured around one six-day and one four-day classroom session. Georgia used monthly cluster group meetings for groups of 3–5 principals supported by a 'fellow' (an experience principal) who acted as a mentor, coach and consultant. In addition, the whole group had 3 one-day meetings and a two-day Summer retreat. In the Prince George County scheme, there were monthly meetings for mentors and new principals and the whole group met at a two-day retreat. The SAGE programme consisted of a centrally run two-day programme to train experienced principals as mentors plus a follow-up day which was delivered regionally. The actual mentoring between the mentor and their new principal partner was left to each of the regions to organise. Some, but not all, of the regions in Victoria arranged meetings for the group of new principals in their area.

Content
Each of the programmes had developed their content in different ways, although there was some degree of commonality.

The New Zealand Ministry of Education commissioned a study from the Hay Group of management consultants to identify the core components of effective principals. These were then used to form the basis of the curriculum. The programme modules were organised around the four clusters of key competencies: Vision and Leading, Striving for Excellence, Building Community Relationships, and Self Efficacy. Leading university educators gave keynote talks and shared their research findings, drawing out the implications for teaching and learning. Practice sessions enabled the principals to work on how to implement specific improvements. In compliance sessions, external agencies provided information about mandatory requirements.

The SAGE programme focused on mentoring. It examined the phases of mentoring and looked at the roles and functions of mentors. The two-day programme helped the experienced principals to identify their learning styles and develop mentoring skills. The content is based on research about beginning principals, effective mentoring, adult learning and Kolb's learning styles.

The content of the Georgia State programme focused on the principal as instructional leader and change agent. It was based on research on leadership development and socialisation theory which stresses the two-way interaction between the new principal and the school (with each trying to influence and change the other). Findings from an international study of beginning principals were also used in the cluster meetings.

The Prince George County scheme was based on a review of the research on effective principals and the ISLLC standards. This produced five major themes: instructional leadership, supervision and the evaluation of teachers, data analysis, shared decision-making, and school reform and managing change. These formed the basis for the monthly meetings. The focus was on enhancing leadership skills that promote increased student learning.

LeaderLab concentrated on vision-building and action learning for the participants, who were middle and senior leaders in business and the public sector. The three basic content areas were: the challenges faced by leaders in the future, leadership competencies to deal with these challenges, and skills for self-development. The aim was to develop the participants' 'sense of purpose' and help them to implement an action plan at their place of work.

Process
The New Zealand scheme is designed to help principals become critically reflective about their role in improving teaching and learning in their school. During the residential sessions, case studies are presented by experienced principals. Action learning groups of about 20 principals work together to apply their new learning from the keynote talks and the case studies to their own school context and to design preliminary action plans. Groups of schools with similar characteristics build supportive peer networks. 'Learning from each other' sessions are held at the end of each residential to share knowledge and experience in small groups. The principals develop a portfolio over the year which is based on a self-assessment questionnaire. They review their portfolio with their mentor during school visits.

All the new principals were given a laptop computer to enable them to engage in the online component, which has a dedicated website. It was reported that principals used it

between once a fortnight and once a month. The e-learning component was particularly useful for the principals in rural areas.

SAGE was designed to develop reflective mentoring. The three key roles were seen as: guidance, facilitation and input. Self-assessment questionnaires are used to identify the experienced principals' mentoring skills. The programme includes techniques such as shadowing, reflective interviewing and the use of journals. It utilises case records, role-play, videos for problem-based learning, and key readings. In terms of theory, Kouzes and Posner's (1997) 'Leadership Challenge' and the developmental change processes of Hall and Hord (2001) were applied to mentoring.

The Georgia state programme also centres on the importance of reflection. It takes up the theme of building a professional learning community. The summer retreat uses leadership profiles, case studies, journal writing, and feedback from critical friends. Before the retreat, the principals complete a leadership self-assessment instrument and the results on their leadership styles are discussed with an external consultant. In the cluster meetings, fellows (or mentors) help the principals to develop their school improvement plan. Participants are also paired with another new principal who acts as their 'conscience' over the year and reminds them of their action plan. There is a password protected website for new principals to post questions, obtain information, and keep in touch with fellow principals.

In the programme offered by Prince George County, the monthly sessions open with a 'successes and challenges' session when each new principal shares their experiences for a few minutes. The rest of the sessions are spent on instruction and discussion of the five major leadership components (see above). The scheme uses lectures, demonstrations, case studies, and problem based learning. The principles of adult learning and learning from each other are used in the cohort groups. The participants are given books, videos, key articles, and a 'Guide for New Principals' containing advice on practical issues from experienced principals.

In LeaderLab the aim is to connect classroom learning with the leadership situation in the workplace. The key process is action learning, based on the work of Revans(1998) and Argyris (1999). Here participants address their real world problems with help from an

assigned 'process adviser' (PA). Over time, this is designed to lead to change, both of themselves and their organisations. The programme begins with a self-assessment instrument and 360 degree feedback from work colleagues, the results of which are discussed with the PA. The participant develops an initial action plan which is implemented in the work place during the three-month period between the classroom-based sessions. At the second classroom session participants modify their action plan and then continue with the implementation in the second three month period. Throughout the programme, participants write a daily learning journal which is discussed with their PA. The classroom sessions use lectures and discussions. Groups of three participants work as 'change partners' who support one another. An unusual feature was the involvement of a professional artist who worked with the leaders to construct a personal metaphor of change. Ideas from Vaill (1989), 'Managing as a Performing Art' were used in the course.

Mentoring

All five of the programmes used various forms of mentoring, although this was much more developed in some cases than others.

The New Zealand scheme used mentors who were current principals and retired principals. Mentors who were current principals supported up to six new principals, whereas retired principals mentored up to 20. They made three visits to the new principal's school during the year and kept in touch by email and telephone. The mentors also attended two days during the participants' first residential course. Before the first school visit, the principals completed a self-evaluation questionnaire to identify their current strengths and weaknesses. This was discussed with the mentor in order to develop a plan focusing on teaching and learning.

Mentor training was provided in three separate one-day sessions. The focus was on the role of the mentor, the skills required, the programme curriculum, the principals' portfolio, and preparation for the school visits. The theory of mentoring is based on the work of Argyris (1999). Mentors were paid for their work and their attendance at the training and the residential sessions.

SAGE is essentially a mentor training programme designed to give experienced principals in Victoria the skills and knowledge required to support new principals. Senior Education Officers in each of the regions select experienced principals from criteria supplied by the Australian Principal Centre who run the course. The Senior Education Officers attend part of the central training to develop a regional strategy and they oversee the actual mentoring within their region. The mentors are not paid, but see it as a mark of respect that they have been chosen to work with the new principals.

Georgia uses mentors, identified as 'fellows', who are distinguished principals. They work with three to five new principals in monthly cluster meetings. They receive a one-day training session by outside consultants (which is similar to the technique of cognitive coaching, developed by Costa and Garmston, 2002). During the year they are sent materials, books and articles. At the summer retreat, the fellows talk to each other about strategies that have worked well. They are paid a modest stipend.

The Prince George County scheme employs mentors, who are veteran principals. Mentors attend a two-day retreat with the new principal. They help them to analyse student test scores and develop a school improvement plan. They have monthly meetings with the new principals and spend a minimum of 15 days at their mentee's school over the 18 month period. The mentors are asked to work-shadow the new principal at least once per semester. In addition, they use email and telephone contact to stay in touch. Mentors only receive a short initial training. Support is provided throughout by the programme coordinator, a former principal and central office administrator.

A central component of LeaderLab is the use of 'Process Advisors', who usually have a background in psychology and consultancy. After training and accreditation, the PAs work with two or three participants. Throughout the programme they provide a combination of three critical elements: assessment, challenge and support. They are required to give each participant 25–30 hours of support during the six month programme. There is a three-day training programme for the PAs, which includes an observed practice session for selection and further coaching. They receive a structured set of notes and the Center for Creative Leadership (which runs the programme) maintains frequent communication with the PAs throughout the programme. There are quarterly meetings and an annual retreat for the PAs. Mentors participate in topic

sessions and the sharing of stories and experiences. As this is a commercial programme, it may be assumed that the PAs are paid for their work, but no details of payment are given in the published reports.

Evaluation

The five programmes all had evaluation mechanisms, which varied in complexity and extent. The New Zealand scheme employed a part-time research assistant who collected and analysed questionnaire data from the participants at the three residential courses. The evaluations were reported to be generally positive and the feedback was used to modify the course. The Ministry of Education is considering commissioning an external evaluation to look at the impact of the programme.

The SAGE programme conducted end of training evaluations which indicated a high degree of satisfaction by the mentors. Some informal feedback, which was very positive, had been obtained from regional education officers and a few new principals. But no systematic external evaluation has yet been undertaken to determine the views of the majority of beginning principals or the impact on their schools.

The Georgia state programme commissioned an external evaluation in June 2002. This consisted of a questionnaire survey of all participants and focus group interviews conducted at the summer retreat. There were positive responses from the new principals who were able to link theories of leadership with their everyday practice. They welcomed the opportunity to hear leading speakers on the cutting edge of school reform. The programme helped to reduce the isolation of new principals. The use of journals supported their reflection. The fellows said the new principals had increased in self confidence and the mentoring was considered to be positively rewarding by the experienced principals. However, the evaluation does not seem to have looked at the impact of the programme at school level.

Prince George County has collected informal data at the annual retreat which showed that participants welcomed the support of the mentors, but they wanted more time at the monthly meetings. There has not been an external evaluation of the programme.

The Center for Creative Leadership (Young and Dixon, 1996) conducted a major evaluation of LeaderLab participants and compared them with a control group of leaders who had not yet attended the programme. Questionnaires and telephone interviews were conducted with the participants, their work colleagues and the PAs, three months after the programme had ended. The results were very positive with statistically significant higher scores for implementing change recorded for LeaderLab participants compared with the control group. The key role of the PAs was demonstrated, particularly in relation to the process (rather than the content) of the planned changes. The participants liked the programme structure with the two classroom sessions separated by the implementation phases. The journals were seen as helpful, but leaders experienced difficulties in finding the time to make journal entries.

7. Implications for induction programmes

What can we learn about the best ways of supporting new headteachers from this review of induction programmes?

New headteachers and principals require particular types of support in order to establish themselves and function as effective leaders in their schools. During their first year, mentoring and induction into their LEA or district culture – helps new heads to learn 'the way we do things round here'. Once they have settled in, induction programmes can also provide opportunities for them examine deeper aspects of what it means to be a headteacher.

These case studies show that mentoring plays a vital role, particularly during the first year when headteachers want help and advice from the mentor about the initial problems they encounter. With support from their mentor, and perhaps using self-assessment instruments, new heads can do an initial needs analysis. But it is important to recognise that they may not yet be aware of their major needs. So they will have to reassess their changing needs over time.

Ideally, mentors should be experienced and practicing headteachers. However, not all school leaders make suitable mentors. The recruitment, training and support of mentors is therefore an important consideration for LEAs. After initial training a follow-up session during the year can be particularly effective once the mentors have worked with their mentee for a period of time. The most developed mentoring schemes in the case studies were SAGE and LeaderLab.

New headteachers also benefit from meetings with other new colleagues to share ideas and to overcome the feelings of isolation often reported by new leaders. Group meetings help new leaders realise that there are many common issues, and reduce the sense of isolation experienced by many. All the programmes considered here used regular meetings of new heads, and the additional benefits of residential sessions were demonstrated in the New Zealand programme and in LeaderLab. The total duration of programmes ranged between 10 and 12 days a year. This appears to allow sufficient time for a cohort to form and begin to become a learning community.

In terms of content, most of the programmes considered here focused on leadership for learning, effective principalship and the management of change. (Prince George County had used a review of the literature to design the content of the programme). Many of the US schemes based their content on a set of standards which was used to assess and provide principal certification.

Programmes would benefit by drawing on the findings from organisational socialisation to help headteachers understand the two-way interaction of the new leader and the school. (This was used in the Georgia programme). Research on new heads can be used to prepare the participants who need to be able to read and understanding the school culture. The research also indicates the stages new leaders are likely to go through. (Both SAGE and the Georgia programmes used findings from this research).

The programmes used a combination of techniques to help headteachers become reflective practitioners, and the belief in the value of reflection was noticeable in all the schemes. Opportunities were also provided to see how other schools worked, through visits and case studies. The programmes used the principles of adult learning to support heads' learning through problem-based learning, case studies, and group problem solving. An issue for all professional development is to strengthen the link between theory and practice. Many of the programmes had given careful thought to the process so that participants could apply findings from research to their particular school context.

IT and e-learning were used in some of the schemes to facilitate access to knowledge and information from a dedicated website, and to headteachers for the exchange of advice and ideas. (The New Zealand programme is a good example).

LeaderLab used a powerful model of leadership development with particular reference to the implementation of an action plan in the workplace, supported by a Process Advisor. This has considerable potential for school leaders and programme planners should consider how to use aspects for their induction schemes.

LeaderLab did the most comprehensive evaluation of all the case studies. Both formative and summative evaluations are helpful, ideally led by an agency that is

independent of the programme. Clearly, a key test of the evaluation process is whether developers use the outputs to modify and improve the programme. Evaluation should examine the participants', mentors', and trainers' views of programme structure, content and process. Ideally the impact on participants and their schools should be considered some time following the programme. The NCSL (2003) have recently produced a model of six levels of impact:

- Reach: The reach of the various components of the programme, including the number of headteachers involved and the range, type and size of schools involved.

- Engagement: The quality of the participants' experiences of the programme. The degree to which participants' needs and wants are identified and successfully met.

- Outcomes: The personal outcomes for participants in terms of attitudes, knowledge, awareness, skills, and thinking. Also addressed are the types or forms of learning and whether these have contributed towards participants becoming better school leaders, more enthusiastic about their tasks and roles, more confident and better prepared, and a greater awareness of current thinking about leadership and school improvement.

- Application: The application of the above learning within the school context.

- Improvements in the school: The perceived impact within participants' schools – on pupils, school attainment and achievement, staff (teachers and support), school policies and procedures.

- Changes in the system:The perceived impact on the district schools more widely. The degree of inter-school activity and levels of collaboration.

It is worth acknowledging that these levels of impact become progressively more difficult to assess.

8. Recommendations for programme developers

Using the review findings together with research on new headteachers and principals, the author offers the following set of recommendations to help the development of innovative induction programmes.

- It is important to support new headteachers through the process of organisational socialisation when they attempt to take charge of the school and learn about being a head in their particular organisation. New heads often experience surprises as they encounter aspects of the underlying school culture and they will use the process of sense-making to understand what is happening (Hart and Weindling, 1996). Induction programmes can help them to read the culture and overcome the isolation commonly reported by new leaders.

- The early changes made by new headteachers usually concern organisational structure. Those changes which affect teaching and learning in the classroom are more difficult to make, so they come later and are sustained over a few years. (Weindling and Earley, 1987). Programmes need, therefore, to focus on the role of the head as a change agent and transformational leader.

- The headteacher is increasingly seen as the lead learner and the leader of learning. So it is important that programmes model the idea of continuous learning, reflection and the development of a learning community.

- The structure of the programme should incorporate e-learning, mentoring, and regular meetings of groups of new headteachers, together with one or two residential sessions. But a balance is required between the time for meetings and the reluctance of new leaders to be out of their schools during the first year.

- Thought should be given to the best use of IT and the establishment of a dedicated website for e-learning. The website should contain training materials, articles, think-pieces, case records and the opportunity for new headteachers to discuss themes of interest, post messages and request advice and guidance.

- Mentoring is an essential process to support the new leader over their first year. The mentors, ideally experienced headteachers, need high quality training. This could take the form of an initial two-day preparation course with another day follow-up about a third the way through the year. Mentors play an important role in helping new leaders devise and implement action plans. Paying mentors for their professional work enhances the status and quality of their work.

- Incorporating a range of the processes shown earlier (such as the use of problem-based learning, group problem solving and study groups) is likely to be beneficial. It is also important to maximise the potential of the cohort to form a supportive learning community (See Norris et al 2002). Action learning sets allow the participants to work on their problems and develop their action plans.

- The content of the programme should include findings from the research on effective leaders and what we know about the needs and problems of new headteachers and principals. (See Weindling and Earley 1987, Daresh and Playko 1992, Parkay and Hall 1992, and Hobson et al 2003).

- It is clear that more attention needs to be paid to evaluation. All the case study programmes conducted end of course evaluations. But only LeaderLab followed up the participants to assess the impact after the programme. Ideally, planners need to commission external evaluation which looks at the effects on participants and their organisations.

Increasing numbers of programmes are now being run to help new headteachers and principals become more effective leaders during the difficult and stressful first years in post. This review is intended to assist planners and help them improve their programmes so that new heads do more than just survive this induction period, and instead become skilled leaders through improved confidence and competence.

9. About this study

This study has identified 43 induction programmes operating in 14 countries. Nine of the programmes operated at a national level, 18 at the state level and another 16 at a local level (Appendix 1 provides a list of the schemes). The amount of available information varied considerably and sufficient data for analysis was obtained for 18 of the programmes. Brief summaries were prepared for the programmes for which there was sufficient information. Five programmes were selected as case studies that were considered to have interesting and innovative features of potential application to the induction of headteachers in England. Four of the selected programmes were designed exclusively for new heads and principals. The fifth was a commercial programme aimed at leaders in different professions.

Identifying headteacher induction programmes proved challenging and time consuming. In order to locate the programmes a search was made using a combination of strategies. First, recommendations were obtained from 46 key informants around the world. The key informants were all leading academics in the field of school leadership development. The informants were usually only aware of programmes operating in their own university or state. There was a diversity of providers and it was difficult to locate a comprehensive source of information. Nevertheless, useful information was obtained from the Education Commission of the States (ECS), which had recently compiled data on training programmes for principals across the USA.

Internet searches were also conducted using combinations of relevant key words and phrases, such as 'new/beginning principals/headteachers', 'induction programs' and 'academies'. Having identified potential providers, further details were sought from websites or organisations such as universities, charitable foundations, States and school districts. Emails were sent to programme co-ordinators, requesting further information. In addition, the author searched for relevant material in books, articles and online databases.

References

Argyris, C, 1999, *On Organizational Learning,* 2nd edn, Oxford, Blackwell

Bolam, R, McMahon, A, Pocklington, K, Weindling, D, 1993, National Evaluation of the Headteacher Mentoring Pilot Schemes. Mimeo, London,Department for Education

Bush, T, Briggs, A, Glover, D and Middlewood, D with Blackburn, S Heystek, J and Stephen, J, 2003, External Evaluation of the New Visions Induction To Headship Pilot Programme: Cohort One. Nottingham, NCSL, Final Report to the NCSL, September 2003

Costa, A and Garmston, R, 2002, *Cognitive Coaching: a Foundation for Renaissance Schools*. Norwood, MA, Christopher-Gordon

Daresh, J and Playko, M, 1992, *The Professional Development of School Administrators: preservice, induction, and inservice applications.* Boston, Allyn and Bacon

Educational Research Service (2000). The Principal, Keystone of a High-Achieving School: attracting and keeping the leaders we need. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service

Hall, G E and Hord, S M, 2001, *Implementing Change: Patterns, Principles and Potholes.* Boston, Allyn and Bacon

Hallinger, P (ed), 2003, *Reshaping the Landscape of School Leadership Development: a global perspective*, Lisse, The Netherlands, Swets and Zeitlinger

Hart, A W and Weindling, D, 1996, Developing successful school leaders. In: Leithwood et al (eds). *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, Dordrecht, Netherlands, Kluwer

Hobson, A, 2003, *Mentoring and Coaching for New Leaders: a review of the literature.* Nottingham, NCSL, available from www.ncsl.org.uk/researchpublications

Hobson, A, Brown, E, Ashby, P, Keys, W, Sharp, C and Benefield, P, 2003, *Issues of Early Headship- problems and support strategies*, Nottingham, NCSL, available from www.ncsl.org.uk/researchpublications

Huber, S, 2003, School leader development: current trends from a global prespective, in Hallinger, P (ed), 2003, *Reshaping the Landscape of School Leadership Development: a global perspective,* Lisse, The Netherlands, Swets and Zeitlinger

Kouzes, J M and Posner, B Z, 1997. *The Leadership Challenge: how to keep getting extraordinary things done in organization,* San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass

Lashway, L, 2003, Inducting School Leaders, ERIC Digest 170, Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management

NCSL, 2003, *School Leadership 2003*, Nottingham, NCSL, available from www.ncsl.org.uk/college-publications

Newton, P, 2001, The Headteachers' Leadership and Management Programme (Headlamp) Review, Nottingham, NCSL

Norris, C J, Barnett, B G, Bason, M R and Yerkes, D M, 2002, *Developing Educational Leaders: A working model, the learning community in action*, New York, Teachers College Press

Ofsted, 2002, Leadership and Management Training for Headteachers: A report by HMI, London, Office for Standards in Education

Ofsted, 2003, Training for Newly Appointed Headteachers, A report by HMI, London, Office for Standards in Education

Parkay, F W and Hall, G E, 1992, *Becoming A Principal: the challenges of beginning leadership,* Boston, Allyn and Bacon

Revans, R, 1998, *ABC of Action Learning*, 3rd edn, London, Lemos and Crane

Vaill, P B, 1989, *Managing As A Performing Art,* San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass

Weindling, D and Earley, P, 1987, *Secondary Headship: the first years.* Windsor: NFER-Nelson

Young, D and Dixon, N, 1996 *Helping Leaders Take Effective Action: a program evaluation.* Greensboro, NC, Center for Creative Leadership

Appendix 1:

Induction programmes for new principals and heads

Note: Italics indicates there was sufficient information available for analysis

National level (N=9):

Austria

England (HIP)

France

Denmark

Hong Kong

Netherlands

New Zealand

Sweden

Wales (PHIP)

State or regional level (N=4):

Australia, Victoria, NSW

Canada, Prince Edward Island

Germany, e.g. Bavaria

Switzerland, various cantons

US state-wide programs (N=14):

Arkansas

Colorado

Kentucky

Louisiana

Maine

Maryland

Mississippi

New Jersey

Ohio

Oregon

South Carolina
Tennessee
Texas
West Virginia

In addition, principal induction programs are being discussed or planned in the following six states:
Connecticut
California
Delaware
Illinois
Iowa
Massachusetts

US academies, regional and district programs (N=16):

Albuquerque (Extra Support for Principals, ESP)
Colorado Southeastern BOCES
Chicago Leadership Academies for Supporting Success (CLASS, Leadership Initiative For Transformation, LIFT)
Georgia State University (Academy for New Principals)
Massachusetts Elementary School Principal Association (MESPA Seminar Series for New Principals)
Minneapolis Public Schools District (MESPA Mentoring Program)
NAESP, National Academy for School Leadership Development (NASLD)
National Center on Education and the Economy (National Institute for School Leaders)
New York (New Visions
Ohio Principal Leadership Academy (OPLA, Entry Year Program)
Oklahoma State University (New Principals Assistance Program)
Prince George County, Maryland, (Beginning Principals Mentoring Program)
Santa Cruz, California, (New Administrators Institute)
San Diego (Educational Leadership Development Academy, Induction and Support Program)
Texas Elementary Principals and Superintendent Association (TEPSA)
University of Washington (New Principals Coaching and Mentoring Program)