

CEPaLS 08:

New Models of Leadership: A Literature Review

Helen M Gunter, University of Manchester, UK

Overview

I prepared this material for this report:

Chapman, C., Ainscow, M., Bragg, J., Gunter, H.M., Hull, J., Mongon, D., Muijs, D. and West, M. (2008) *Emerging Patterns of School Leadership*. Nottingham: NCSL.

The material was determined by the remit provided by the NCSL. The material was not used, and so I am presenting it here.

Introduction

The remit for the New Models of Leadership Project from the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) in England is to provide an overview of current developments in school leadership according to prescribed categories:

- Managed structures
- Secondary federations
- All-through schools
- Academy leadership
- Trust schools

This report is based on a search of published and web based sources, which are listed in Appendices 1-5.

Methodology

The remit for this literature review is to:

- ❑ Provide an accessible state of the art review of the current knowledge base;
- ❑ Highlight key messages and implications for school leaders and governors; and,
- ❑ Contain a spreadsheet of sources of information and a database of references in endnote form.

We have completed this remit through the submission of this written report, a spreadsheet of sources in Appendices 1-5, and an endnote data base.

The protocol for reading the publications is as follows:

- ❑ The features of emerging structures, leadership, management and governance.
- ❑ The impact of emerging structures on leadership, management and governance in terms of: capacity building, distributed leadership, work-life balance and leadership effectiveness, and value for money.
- ❑ The policy and regulatory guidance available to support those implementing structural change.

We have used this to structure the spreadsheets of sources of information in Appendices 1-5, and the reports we provide on each of the five categories.

A search on all publications about the five categories identified by the NCSL took place in November 2007. The requirement is to draw on:

- ❑ Academic and practitioner literature.

- ❑ Government and government agency documentation including websites and internally generated case studies etc.
- ❑ Work in progress.
- ❑ Credible unpublished work.

The search was conducted as follows: first, a review of the major journals in the field (e.g. *Educational Management and Administration*; *School Leadership and Management*); second, a review of online publication databases through the John Rylands Library, University of Manchester; third, a review of webpages from the DfES and non-departmental public bodies such as the NCSL; fourth, an email to networks such as the *British Educational Leadership Management and Administration Society*; fifth, emails to particular researchers both nationally and internationally about publications and projects. This yielded the following sources:

Out of 70 sources used, 52 are report research that is funded by the Department or its agencies. There are only 18 sources that are independently funded.

Part 1: Five Categories of Structures

1.1 Managed Structures

Summary of Key Findings

- ❑ Restructuring of schools is taking place internally and externally with some relocation of decision-making.
- ❑ There is evidence of role redesign.
- ❑ There are no new forms of governance emerging.
- ❑ There are no new forms of leadership and management emerging.

The NCSL want to know about the approach to leadership within what the DfES/Pricewaterhouse Coopers (2007) report identified as “Managed Structures”. This is defined as a structural arrangement that has developed because the limitations of what they call the “Traditional Model”. While most schools are organised along traditional lines with the headteacher as the main school leader distributing leadership to others in the school, it is under pressure because: “the current policy environment is placing significant stress on the sustainability of this model and that schools may need to begin to move away from it in order to ensure that pupil standards and pupil welfare are protected” (xi). The Managed Model also operates with the headteacher as the prime leader in school using distributed leadership with an emphasis on: first, co-headship where schools may work together to share leadership and management resources; and, second, the expanded role of non-QTS staff such as school business managers, and community leadership as a result of the *Every Child Matters* agenda.

There is no published evidence on which this policy initiative and development is based. Overall, twelve sources were used to examine managed structures, and all are funded by the government. This includes the DfES/PwC (2007) report into school leadership that is responsible for the creation of this category, and a *post hoc* application of Managed Structures can be made to the evaluation of pilot of the *Remodelling the School*

Workforce where Butt and Gunter (2007) have a series of chapters that report on the role of the wider workforce both during and after the project. The development of the remodelled workforce is evidenced in Woods (2007) scoping study for the NCSL on the role of School Business Managers (SBMs). In addition, there is a case study of Kingswood School funded by the Innovation Unit which examined the redesign of school change through an inclusive approach to decision-making. An issue that the NCSL has been interested in funding is sharing the headship role and so we will include studies by Court (2003) and Paterson (2003). There is a strong normative approach around Managed Structures and so we include Coleman's (2006) advice and guidance on how to collaborate. There are no literatures available from independently funded and designed studies on this particular structure and approaches to leadership, management and governance.

Following the protocol given to us by the NCSL we present an analysis of the evidence from this literature:

Features: the main outcome of the literature review is that there are sub-sets of Managed Structures. The category Managed Structures is the product of the DfES/PwC (2007) report into school leadership, and there are two main subsets:

- The internal restructuring of schools to distribute roles and responsibilities. A key feature is the development of a diverse workforce that enables those with QTS to focus on teaching and learning. The example of the inclusion of non-teaching staff on the senior leadership team is used. Research drawn from the piloting of Remodelling the School Workforce shows that the wider workforce has grown in number and role (Gunter and Butt 2007a; 2007b; Lance et al. 2007, Woods 2007), and case study research of innovations confirms this (Hollins et al. 2006). Additionally, the example of co-headship is used to illustrate how a job share can enable leadership responsibilities to

be divided up. Court (2003) examines sharing leadership with how two people can lead a school or others in the school develop, what Gronn calls, conjoint agency.

- The internal restructuring of schools to include other agencies. Presented as a variant to the Managed Model and known as the Multi-Agency managed leadership model. This model embraces a range of agencies in the same premises together with membership of the school leadership team, and so there are examples that are currently included in other parts of the report that would come under this definition. However, we draw attention to the Darlaston Collaborative which works with a range of agencies, though it is not clear how the governance, leadership and management arrangements operate.

Features: leadership, management and governance: the main outcome of the study is that governance has not been affected by the developed of Managed Structures. None of the studies mention it and it seems that governance arrangements in each school, like the traditional model, do not have a requirement or expectation to establish supra decision-making boards or committees.

There is no evidence of new forms of leadership or management in England. The main approach is the traditional headteacher who creates a senior leadership team that includes non-teaching staff who have taken on whole school responsibilities such as premises, cover, finance, student services (see Gunter and Butt 2007b; Hollins 2006; Rayner and Gunter 2007, Woods 2007). The guidance and advice given on how to operate in this way and extend it through multi-agency work with extended schools is highly normative and is premised on the single leader in control (Coleman 2006). Like other evidence in this report (see in particular Secondary Federations) there is a focus on reform and the evaluation of reform around the role of the headteacher. For example, the NCSL (2006) study into the Primary Strategy Consultant gives pre-eminence to the

single headteacher who has the skills of leading a successful school. In particular, it is stressed that the single head can bring to another school the ability to work with that school rather than attempt to impose an approach. An important outcome of this study has been the encouragement of networking.

Studies of co-headship in England (Paterson, 2006) examine job shares (two part time heads) or joint heads (both heads work full time), and this is recognised as a south of England innovation. However, there is no evidence provided of how this actually operates, and how other members of the workforce have their roles and responsibilities affected by this arrangement. Court (2003) provides examples of shared leadership from Canada, England, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway and USA, and identifies approaches that are more radical. While the usual hierarchy with two people in the post is evident, she also identifies teacher leadership arrangements where a team of teachers took on the former principal leader work and responsibilities. Examples from Oregon, Norway, and New Zealand are used to show how teachers are appointed from within the staff, and develop democratic practices and cultures. This form of capacity building does not seem to be a feature of English schools, and what seems to be the case is that leadership is developed through hierarchical roles combined with the delegation of responsibilities. Unlike the examples presented by Court (2003) Distributed leadership is top down. The main thrust for shared headship arrangements in England is to handle the stress of the job or inability to fill posts rather than to increase participation and democratic practices. While work-life balance is recognised as a reason within policy texts for remodelling the school workforce, the evidence shows that reform has not taken notice of how teacher job satisfaction or how local conditions can impact on hours of work (Butt and Gunter 2007). There is no research evidence presented on value for money.

Impact: there is no empirical study of Managed Structures. There are studies which examine what schools are doing on the ground, and have made public particular gains. For example, Gunter and Butt (2007a) provide evidence since the remodelling pilot which shows that schools have sustained and continued to develop changes that had been made in the organisation of the school, with reports of improvements in student outcomes. Hollins et al. (2006) show the long-term nature of working in a successful school and bringing about a range of innovations through staff participation. This is the only study we have found in our literature search where students have been actively involved in policy development and leadership alongside and with adults.

Co-headship is reported as having benefits, and Paterson (2006) presents this in terms of dealing with the recruitment and retention crisis. It seems that the success of co-headship depends on: “the leadership pairing and their match with the needs of the school... nevertheless, co-headship appears to offer a creative response to the challenges of contemporary school leadership and looming headteacher shortages” (p8). Court (2003) agrees on the personal aspects to making this successful, but focuses on mutual learning by identifying the need for time for reflection, a commitment to experimentation, and the need to negotiate on pedagogic practices.

Policy and Regulatory Guidance: it is not possible to report on this in detail as it does not seem to be part of the remit of the various government funded projects to comment or provide evidence about it. The only commentary we have identified is from the pilot of Remodelling where headteacher respondents have talked about how the reform has lost impetus and there is a need for more funding if gains are to be sustained (Gunter and Butt 2007a, b).

1.2 Secondary Federations

Summary of Key Findings

- ❑ Restructuring of schools is taking place internally and externally with some relocation of decision-making.
- ❑ There is evidence of role redesign.
- ❑ There are no new forms of governance emerging.
- ❑ There are no new forms of leadership and management emerging.

The NCSL wanted to know about Secondary Federations, covering both governance and leadership arrangements.

There is no published evidence on which this policy initiative and development is based. Overall, 14 sources have been identified and are listed in Appendix 2. All of the sources, except two, are from government directed and financed projects and publications. We should note that in addition there is the DfES funded evaluation of the Federations Programme (Lyndsay et al. 2007) but as this is about all Federations and not just secondary schools we have placed it in the analysis of All Through Schools, which include primary, secondary and special Federations, see section 1.3, and Appendix 3. There are no major empirical studies of Secondary Federations, and so the evidence base is from small-scale studies of single Federations that are on the DCSF or Innovation Unit website or schools in collaboration in a neighbourhood (e.g. Harris 2005), a town (e.g. Wokingham 2007), a city (e.g. Ainscow et al. 2006, Ainscow and Howes 2007) or a region (e.g. Coulton 2006). The two independent sources are from Lumby and Morrison (2007, forthcoming) based on surveys, including students, in two English and one Welsh LAs.

Following the protocol given to us by the NCSL we present an analysis of the evidence from this literature:

Features: the main outcome of the literature search is that there is a range of local circumstances and histories that underpin the establishment and development of the secondary federations. The single cases on the DFES/Standards Site (2007) shows, for example, a confederation in Plymouth of three schools that has been established for 15 years. They collaborate on post 16 education with joint planning, governor decision-making, professional development and workforce innovations. The Secondary School Federation in Cambridge has developed a whole city approach to curriculum planning and there is a middle leadership development programme. These are illustrative examples to show the trend to undertake joint planning and to examine provision, and in some cases to focus on a particular problem that they all share. For example, the Hard to Place Peak 11 is a Federation of 11 secondary schools where heads work with the LA on developing strategies for disaffected pupils. Some federations are about partnering schools together with the example of the VIP Valley Invicta Park soft Federation between a grammar and a community high school (Innovation Unit 2005) and three schools partnering with an urban high school in challenging circumstances (Ainscow et al. 2006). Whereas Harris (2005) reports on the merger between two schools with a new leadership team and staffing.

The organisational arrangements show the retention of single governing bodies for each school with their own headteacher. What seems to be the trend is to create collaborative meeting structures with a range of purposes, for example:

Sector 3 in the East Midlands: schools are collaborating on a school improvement project on raising attainment at KS4. The five secondary schools are part of a much larger collaboration including: the Local Authority, a Private Education Consultancy, and 19 secondary schools in the Local Authority. The collaborative has a leadership group, and the research was through interviews with seven members of the group including: headteachers, deputies/assistant heads, local authority advisors, and a private consultant (Coulton 2006).

West Sussex Federation: The four schools comprising Rural Norfolk are a "soft" Federation where the joint Governing Committee have delegated powers (formed under School Governance (Collaboration) (England) Regulations 2003). Each school retains its own headteacher and governing body (DfES Standards Site 2007).

St Thomas More and St Edmond Campion Schools: The federation, consists of two secondary schools, operates through a committee with delegated powers under the Education Act 2002; and is led by an executive headteacher, who is ultimately responsible. Each school retains its own governance and leadership arrangements. The main aim has been to enhance links between the two schools with common aims and objectives: sharing good practice, common training, sharing policies. The federation is also enhancing links as well with primary schools, local community and parents.

Features: leadership, management and governance: the main outcome from the study is that governance based on community and stakeholder interests is being retained and strengthened. There is no clear evidence from the literatures or case studies of any new or innovative forms of governance taking place. With the exception of one example of two schools merging, all the schools have retained their own governing bodies. Essentially, headteachers are meeting, with some examples of one acting as the executive, and there are examples of governing bodies forming strategic cross school, town and city governing committees. This is based on interests in examining and improving provision in a strategic way, and it is being facilitated by moving decision-making upwards to embrace a wider geographical area. There is no evidence of bottom up activism from students, parents and communities who are aiming to set up their own schools or who want more of a role in the decision-making processes in existing schools or collaborations.

Similarly, there is no evidence of new forms of leadership or management. The examples from the various projects and case studies show the dominance of leadership as a feature of a senior role and position in the hierarchy. For example, in Ainscow and Howes (2007) study of Bradcastle, they show that while various patterns emerged within the partnerships: “it was mainly the school leaders, supported by the framework of the project, who determined what collaboration might mean in their group, and in their individual schools” (289). Ainscow et al’s (2006) study of an urban high school, shows that the new headteacher, in partnership with three local headteachers, ensured that the school undergoing improvement made the final decisions.

Other case studies also confirm the pre-eminence of the headteacher, but also provide some description on the part played by others. This is mainly examples of staff from across schools working together in various planning and delivery capacities. Coulton (2006) provides some description about this, where in Sector 3 in the East Midlands, there has been a process of both cultural as well as organisational collaboration. Here there the collaboration has worked on developing a shared purpose, as well as structures with a strategic group of heads and an operational group of deputy heads. The collaboration has appointed a co-ordinator who has school leadership experience. The case study says that heads were able to not only work in partnership with other heads but also distribute leadership of the project to others in the school. However, no detail is provided regarding what this means and how it works in practice.

While the sources suggest capacity building, particularly those that focus on schools where one is working with or merging with another to bring it up to standard, there is no actual detail of what this might mean. It is not clear if this capacity is the ability of work to be distributed or delegated to others, or if this are new experiences of working across schools to do joint planning and/or professional development. Also it is not always clear how those who are left to work in a school while others work in schools in challenging situations are affected, and how capacity might be affected in either productive or negative ways. Again there are assumptions of capacity but as the Wokingham Secondary Schools Federation website shows there has been joint training and subject groups have been formed, but what difference is being made is not a feature. There is a shortage of independent evaluation projects from federations. Work-life balance is not a feature of the research data, but the case studies show that a lot of additional work is taking place, and so people, particularly heads, are investing a great deal of time in making federations work. There is no major study in leadership effectiveness, though reports show the value of headteachers in enabling change for the better to take place (e.g. Ainscow and

Howes 2007). Again there is no evidence of research into value for money, though it clearly plays a part in decisions to save a school (e.g. Ainscow et al. 2006) or merge a school (e.g. Harris 2005).

There is no evidence in the case studies and reports of the role of students in decision-making for and about the federations and collaborations, and it seems that they remain the objects on which elite adults are meant to impact. This is central to the two papers that are independent of government remits and funding by Lumby and Morrison (2006, forthcoming). The paper uses distributed leadership to examine how partnerships are working and concludes that much of the theorising is inward within the school and is not developing an external collaborative orientation. The evidence suggests that schools promote their own interests, and also that student interests are not always uppermost. It is argued that Student interests are more rhetorical rather than a reality. The data shows that the school within a market place remains the dominant aspect of thinking and practice, and so collaboration is more about maintaining a strategic position in a competitive environment than about the public good. In their 2006 paper Lumby and Morrison show that current models of leadership are focused on organisational unity rather than networks and consequently are unable to engage with the emerging collaborative structures within federations. Consequently, there is a need to shift away from normative good practice of role and the benefits of collaboration to examine the micro-politics of trust. This raises issues about how leadership and management of secondary federations needs to be understood in terms of the expediency of handling the need to meet national standards in ways that do not undermine market advantage. It seems that the working of the regulated market is creating forms of leadership and management that is about keeping control of the school and at most collaborating on issues that enhance strategic advantage (or prevent damage in the market place).

Impact: there are no large-scale empirical studies that focus just on secondary federations. There are case studies with self-reported impact, where gains are listed in regard to improvements in meeting national standards, together with gains in the provision of resources. Educational provision for students is said to have developed with new courses, particularly 14-19. Research from those outside of the collaborations shows that gains can be made and the complexity of the process can be foregrounded. For example, Ainscow and Howes (2007) show how in Bradcaster gains were made in relation to attitude to the schools and reputations improved, and they go on to argue that while internal leadership is important for school improvement it is important to recognise the wider context that “inter-dependence” (298) can contribute. What this means in a regulated market is taken up by Lumby and Morrison (forthcoming), who focus on the moral aspects to leadership, particularly in regard to partnership, and they argue that it is an issue that needs further research. It is one thing to do leadership as a mechanical process of planning and delivering provision, but another to frame it as a moral activity. There is a need to examine the context in which partnership is taking place and how normative policy texts which advocate partnership may not recognise the contradictory situation in which schools and professionals are being exhorted to do it.

Policy and Regulatory Guidance: it is not possible to report on this in detail as it does not seem to be part of the remit of the various government funded projects and case studies. There is evidence of particular projects enabling school development e.g. Coulton (2006) argues that Excellence in Cities and federations in general are helpful. However, Ainscow et al. 2006 state that their research challenges the Fresh Start strategy by New Labour, and shows that partnership can be an alternative to closing a school and reopening under new management. Furthermore, like Lumby and Morrison, they show that the market and competition is not conducive to such partnerships. It is interesting to see that in some reports private sector companies are working as consultants, and their role and contribution needs to be researched.

1.3 All-through Schools (including primary/secondary/special federations)

Summary of Key Findings

- ❑ Restructuring of schools is taking place internally and externally with some relocation of decision-making.
- ❑ There is evidence of role redesign.
- ❑ There are no new forms of governance emerging.
- ❑ There are no new forms of leadership and management emerging.

The NCSL wanted to know about schools that are known as 'all-through' or 'all-age' where in a locality provision is arranged through the vertical integration (primary through to secondary) into one organisation. This allows for different forms of association with hard and soft federations of primary, secondary and special schools to be included with this category.

There is no published evidence on which this policy initiative and development is based. Overall, 28 sources have been identified and are listed in Appendix 3. Twenty-one of the sources are from government directed and financed projects and publications. The sources include two major government funded research projects: the DfES/PricewaterhouseCoopers (2007) study into School Leadership, and the evaluation of the Federations Programme (Lyndsay et al. 2007); and two review reports into the evidence base for collaboration (Arnold 2006) and models of shared headship (Glatter and Harvey 2006a,b). In addition, there are examples of small-scale projects reported by those involved (e.g. Banks et al. 2002; Barnes 2005; DfES Standards Site Case Studies 2007; Innovation Unit Case Studies of Federations 2007) or by those commissioned to research and report on activity (e.g. Ainscow et al. 2006; Chapman and Allen 2006; Ireson 2007; Swidenbank 2007). There is little research that is independent of the government and we only found three very different sources: a paper from James et al (2007) which is not about all-through schools but has interesting things to say about collaborations; an unpublished paper by Mongon (2007) on the development of systemic

leadership; and, a paper by Ridowski (2005) on the role of business interests in Federations. Evidence from abroad shows that there is interest in The Netherlands with a NCSL commissioned study (Collins et al. 2006) and a BERA paper from a headteacher (Lee 2007). We accessed three papers on projects abroad: two from the USA (Grubb and Flessa 2006; Wohlstetter et al. 2003) and one from Australia (Thomson and Blackmore 2006), each examining aspects of structural and cultural association between schools.

Following the protocol given to us by the NCSL we present an analysis of the evidence from this literature:

Features: the main outcome of the literature review is that authors are reporting that there are a variety of localised collaborative responses, and notably this is confirmed by the largest empirical study of Federations (Lyndsay et al. 2007).

There are three main examples of all-through schools (Banks et al. 2002, and two of the Innovation Unit case studies of Darlington and Serlby Park) which show that organisational changes in educational provision have been taking place. Banks et al. (2002) report on the Chalford Hundred Campus in Thurrock where there is a library, adult education, a nursery, primary and secondary school. Here there is a leadership team of two headteachers, two assistant headteachers, and a business manager. In the Darlington Education Village three schools (primary, secondary, special) have been brought together with one governing body, one management structure and a single curriculum. There is a strategic committee for each school which reports directly to the federation governing body. Similarly Serlby Park is one school made up of former infant, junior and secondary schools, where each site has a phase head and one acts as principal, with a single governing body.

The rest of the data shows that there is a range of organisational structures with single governing bodies through to autonomous schools with their own governing body and headteacher (Arnold 2006). The prevalence of schools retaining their own governing body and headteacher is evident where in 15 of the sources this is mentioned as a feature, where eight of the DfES and Innovation Unit cases studies fall into this category. For example, the Shrewsbury Partnership for Education and Training consists of 7 secondary schools; 1 special school; and 2 colleges. It is a “soft” federation where the joint Governing Committee have delegated powers (formed under School Governance (Collaboration) (England) Regulations 2003). The Governors have worked on developing a co-operative and joint approach through action planning, sharing of information, projects, personnel (e.g. clerk, project manager for subject co-ordinator meetings, CPD co-ordinator) and use of advisors (some from LEA, and media consultant). The Federation is separate schools and colleges, each with their own governance and leadership who have established a way of co-ordinating and collaborating on agreed aims and projects. A second example shows a more integrated approach where the Cumbria South Lakes Federation has formed a limited company. This Federation consists of 8 secondary schools, one special school and one further education college, and each organisation has retained its own governance and leadership structures. A Federation board comprising the head/principal of each institution has been formed with an executive of lead headteachers, an executive officer and consultants in teaching, learning and ITT. There are other leadership roles within the Federation: e.g. the formation of an enhanced Federation CPD group of senior leaders; and, a co-ordinated system of school self-evaluation and peer review. The Federation has enhanced links between the schools and the local community through the establishment of strategic partnerships involving education business partnerships, the local business education consortium, Connexions, Aimhigher, the LEA, HE and FE institutions, the LSC and work-based providers.

Features: leadership, management and governance: the main outcome from the study is that governance based on community and stakeholder interests is being retained and strengthened through often a wider representation of agencies. There is no clear evidence from the literatures or

case studies of any new or innovative forms of governance taking place, though as Mongon (2006) argues it is an imperative given the rapid emergence of a range of structural arrangements.

While Federation or All Through School governing committees or groups are being formed this is based on a reallocation of work from one group to another, rather than a fundamental rethinking of governance. Certainly issues raised by critical policy scholars such as Ridowski regarding matters of the border between public and private interests are not being explored in projects and case studies funded by the government. However, there seems to be some evidence from the Innovation Unit case studies (2007) of parents and community members who lead educational provision but there is insufficient research data and conceptual analysis to be able to make meaningful judgements about what this means for governance.

Similarly, there is no evidence of new forms of leadership or management. The main evaluation of the Federation programme (Lyndsey et al. 2007) shows that headteacher leadership (alongside DfES financing) is seen as crucial to the success of the Federations. The data shows that there is strong evidence of the dominance of headteachers in the formation and development of Federations. Directors of Federations who were not also headteachers were recognised as taking on a facilitative role. Middle managers were not very involved in initiating Federations. Patterns of involvement varied from those who had the opportunity to take on federation wide roles to those who did not witness any changes to their work or the classroom. Variation in governance structures remained, with different arrangements within even the 'hard' types of Federations. This is consistent with the two main literature reviews (Arnold 2006, Glatter and Harvey 2006a, b) who state that the formation and development of federations is dependent on strong leadership, and the study by James et al. (2007) makes the point that too much emphasis is placed on leadership within an organisation rather than seeking to understand leadership within a system.

There is no evidence of forms of leadership and management in the data from England that shows any radical thinking. Capacity building is essentially through the identification of new roles to deliver collaborative tasks, where more people are working vertically and horizontally between schools/agencies but there is no evidence of bottom up activism by teachers and students. Distributed leadership is mainly practiced as forms of delegation, particularly where heads are off site through federation/collaborative work and other members of staff take on previous headteacher roles. It is not clear how headteachers who are now in charge of a site within a federation view their change in status. Work-life balance is not a feature of research data but the case studies show a huge commitment to work and to making the federation/collaboration successful. There is no major study in leadership effectiveness within the literatures examined, the main focus is on elite adults who either write the accounts or are written about. There is no evidence about value for money. Overall, the literatures about England show that leadership remains a feature of role and hierarchy rather than a communal and relational concept (Gunter 2005). Hence we have found no evidence of: first, the type of approaches identified by Grubb and Flessa (2006) in the USA where they studied ten schools and found examples of rotating principals where decisions are made in teacher committees, and a case where four people run the school without a principal; second, the position of children in the decision-making processes to form federations and partnership is not written about, with only a few examples of case studies referring to student councils or parliaments involved in the operation of the collaboration.

So, the most prevalent organisational form is where the school retains its own governance, leadership and management structures, but then creates a partnership forum as a means of talking and working together. This can either be based on a crisis of helping out a school (Ainscow et al. 2006, Barnes 2005), or is more proactive through developing joint projects (DfES and Innovation Unit Case Studies 2007). In these projects there is a strong emphasis on e.g. professional development between schools, or working on extending provision, and this can mean that the

focus of leadership, in Mongon's (2007) terms can be 'federated' where issues of teaching and learning predominate; can be 'local' regarding 14-19 provision; or, can be 'community' and so be about delivering the *Every Child Matters* agenda. In more formal arrangements such as Federations, what is taking place is that decision-making is being relocated either upwards from the school to a co-ordinating body or person or downwards to middle leaders within and between schools. Hence roles and job descriptions are changing: new roles are being created, and established roles are being restructured. In Darlington Education Village (Innovation Unit Case Studies 2007) there is an executive director with various director roles such as Business Strategy and Development, and Community; and each of the former heads have Teaching and Learning Directorships at their schools. What seems to be happening is a scaling up from one school to a number of schools with a process of centralisation of decision-making which is reversing, to some degree, the decentralisation provisions that the 1988 Education Reform Act set in train.

Overall a process of organisational redesign is taking place which remains highly leader-centric, where the starting point for change is with the headteachers involved. Studies used to inform developments such as the interest in The Netherlands seem to be about what the implications are for headteachers (Collins et al. 2006) and/or is done by and with headteachers (Lee 2007). Questions do not seem to be being asked about how redesign can be, in Thomson and Blackmore's (2006) terms, more than technical with an emphasis on structural arrangements, job descriptions, line management accountability, and who is responsible. While there are phrases such as vision, moral purpose and values are dropped in to many of the case studies, it is difficult to ascertain how these feature in the formation and conduct of collaborations, and how ethical and political questions about wider purposes such as participation, citizenship, democracy, are foregrounded, understood, and practiced.

Finally, the case studies often hint at but are not explicit about the politics of collaboration. Research from the USA confirms the importance of this, where Wohlstetter et al. (2003) show that in Los Angeles the most effective leadership took place in networks or 'families' where there is a strong

connection between leadership, organisational capacity and performance. There is a need to inter-connect, support, communicate and buffer the 'family' from too much turbulence in the policy context (p423). They argue that leadership is a form of architecture with the building of teams and interconnections through brokering information, and so central to success are political processes. This type of analysis is missing from much of the literature that we have examined, where the dominance of government agency self reported case studies means that the emphasis is on success and advocacy rather than description. External researchers do investigate this, where Ainscow et al. (2006) report on the dynamics of working together, on deciding priorities as well as the means by which decisions will be made and legitimated. In particular, they identify the importance of "social learning" by those involved, and how time and experience can mean that collaborative processes mature in ways that enable free and frank discussion without threatening the existence of what has been created.

Impact: there is one empirical study of the Federations Programme (Lyndsay et al. 2007) and this provides detailed analysis of impact. The main points made are: first, Heads and governors are overwhelmingly positive about the impact of the leadership on the success of the federation. Second, respondents are very positive about the role of governors in the development of the Federation; third, the importance of personal characteristics in making Federations successful is noted as an important factor; and fourth, there is recognition that the impact of Federations is variable, and many initiatives based on the collaboration where not necessarily branded as such.

Overall, the large number of small case studies written by the people involved means that there is a lot of self-reported impact, with the gains of working together and can be grouped as follows: first, personal and group learning for adults and students; second, organisational efficiencies through pooling resources; and, third, an extension of provision through integration and joint staffing. Success tends to be based on varied combinations of personal leadership by the people involved, particularly the heads/principals; establishing protocols for working together; joint

histories of association through 'clusters' and 'families' of schools; and, processes such as the building of trust. The challenges are to do with the particular circumstances in which association takes place and whether it is based on a shared history combined with the headteachers who want to develop joint projects. For example, the Windsor and Maidenhead Federation formed to target students who are disengaged from school and has also enabled joint planning of inservice training for staff.

Policy and Regulatory Guidance: it is not possible to report on this in detail as it does not seem to be part of the remit of the various government funded projects and case studies. There is intermittent reference to issues that are connected such as the role of the local authority in either supporting or not supporting collaborations and federations, but beyond this we are unable to provide any sound judgements.

1.4 Academy Leadership

Summary of Key Findings

- ❑ Restructuring of schools is taking place internally and externally with some relocation of decision-making.
- ❑ There is evidence of role redesign.
- ❑ There is evidence of new forms of governance that show the dominance of the sponsor in strategic decision-making
- ❑ There are no new forms of leadership and management emerging.

The NCSL wanted to know about Academy leadership models, where these differ significantly from traditional models.

There is no published evidence on which this policy initiative and development is based. Overall, 13 sources have been identified and are listed in Appendix 4. Five of the sources are from government directed and financed projects and publications. The sources include the DCSF standards site which describes and provides examples of academies; the DfES/PwC (2007) study into school leadership; a vignette of the Harris Federation of South London academies on the Innovation Unit site and a leaflet distributed by the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust (Prentice 2007); and significantly the evaluation of the Academies Programme by PwC where the most recent fourth report has been accessed. The Academies programme seems to have attracted the attention of independent researchers more than the other categories: all the publications are about the policy initiative and the way it is operating, with scoping studies that examine the policy as a whole (Beckett 2007; Gorard 2005; Needham and Gleeson 2006; Rogers and Migniuolo 2007; Woods et al. 2007) or targeted analysis with a focus on local responses (Hatcher 2007; Wilby 2007; Woods et al. 2007-2008). The challenge faced by independent researchers is access, where the two trade union sponsored projects (Needham

and Gleeson 2006; Rogers and Migniuolo 2007) received few questionnaire returns. There is one independently funded project on leadership in academies by Philip Woods, Glenys Woods and Helen Gunter based on a case study academy. The report is due in late 2008.

Following the protocol given to us by the NCSL we present an analysis of the evidence from this literature:

Features: the main outcome of the literature review is that the number of academies is growing with plans for ongoing expansion. The DCSF has a site where academies are advocated with descriptions of what an academy is, there is a directory together with supporting documentation. The DfES/PwC (2007) report on school leadership provides an account of visiting an academy but there is little detail on what is distinctive about an academy in terms of governance, leadership and management. Similarly the PwC (2007) fourth evaluation report examines the progress of academies through the use of surveys, interviews and an examination of data sets, and again there is no evidence provided of how leadership, management and governance are distinctive from schools within Local Authorities.

Features: leadership, management and governance: the main outcome from the study is that governance is dominated by sponsors (Beckett 2007; Woods et al. 2007); with a form of governance based on the public conceptualised as consumers rather than citizens (Hatcher 2007). One case study from the DfES/PwC (2007) report shows that there is a division between strategy governance controlled by the sponsor and the local academy governing body where implementation decisions are taken. The sponsor need not have teachers on the governing body though there is evidence that they do. Rogers and Migniuolo (2007) do provide data about staff views that they have less involvement in decision-making. There are concerns about how sponsors may influence the curriculum.

There is some evidence that parent groups are operating in ways that challenge the accepted notion of governance as located in an officially constitute body. For example, Needham and Gleeson (2006) present evidence from case studies of parent interest groups and how parent power is operating in ways different to what New Labour is encouraging. Parents are: campaigning for community schools in areas where there is a gap in provision, saving schools threatened with closure, and against academies being set up. They go on to conclude that the academies need to be brought into partnership with local authorities so that governance arrangements can engage with issues that affect the strategic provision of schools, such as how to handle surplus places (61).

There is no evidence of any new or distinctive approaches to leadership and management within academies with the exception of the high turnover of principals which Beckett (2007) calculates as an average 'life expectancy' of six months (see also Needham and Gleeson 2006). The main thrust of official descriptions and reports about academies is a leader centric approach, where the DCSF/Standards Site (2007) identifies the key role of the Principal with a senior management team in "in leading their Academies towards excellence". The emphasis is on working with the sponsors and partners in developing the ethos and planning. No mention is made of teachers or the wider workforce in decision-making.

More detail is provided by the Harris Federation of South London Schools vignette with six schools and one board of trustees. There is a CEO and a single board of governors (Innovation Unit 2007). Christine Prentice (2007), in a four-page leaflet distributed by the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust, outlines the structure and outcomes of the Federation, with little mentioned about leadership and management. The gains outlined from federating are the same as Local Authority schools that our report has identified (see sections 1-3 in particular). The emphasis is on the principal rather than leadership, and Dan Moynihan (Principal of Harris City Academy) advocates school collaboration as a means of raising standards. There is an emphasis on strong identity for the students and staff being part of the Harris Federation logo, and it is stated that the new

principal of South Norwood, Carol English, “has spent this year at Harris CTC looking at all its systems and procedures – absorbing the ‘brand’” (4). Hence what may be ‘new’ for leadership and management is branded principalship where leadership is conducted and trained in ways that are particular to the culture and vision of that particular sponsored school network.

We are unable to comment on the remit requirements regarding capacity building, distributed leadership, work-life balance, leadership effectiveness or value for money as there is no data or commentary about these matters.

Impact: there is one commissioned evaluation of the Academies Programme (PwC 2007, fourth report) that provides evidence of impact. The report states that strong and stable leadership is critical in setting vision and strategy in the start up period. Sponsors are generally seen as a positive element, particular through their access to resources and networks. Some sponsor-principal relationships are based on mentoring and some are hands off. The report emphasizes the importance of strong leadership in transforming a previously failing school. Principals are generally highly regarded by sponsors, staff parents and pupils. Claims are made of new leadership models developing, particularly with executive principals supporting a group of schools. However, as our report shows, these are new organizational arrangements regarding school-to-school collaboration, rather than models of leadership. Furthermore, such arrangements are not a distinctive feature of academies as schools under Local Authority control are working in this way (see Ainscow et al. 2006). It seems that the literatures that are concerned to promote academies contain statements (e.g. Prentice 2007) and case studies (e.g. DCFS/Standards Site 2007) that are about advocacy with limited or no data. Importantly there are no comparative studies to show how what is being done is distinctive from other forms of schooling.

The impact of having sponsors dominate governance is identified by the independent studies regarding the transfer of public assets into private ownership and how private interests e.g. views about the purposes of schools and issues in community regeneration, are being given more attention via their investment than the wider public who live in those communities (Beckett 2007, Woods et al. 2007).

The independent research and analysis tend to focus on strategic issues related to the policy, and so leadership and management are not engaged with directly. However, Gorard (2005) raises questions about what can be claimed regarding standards, and he identifies that sponsors, governors, and principals can admit up to 10% of intake by selection and so this can impact on claims for improvement. Changes in GCSE outcomes can be attributed to fall in students who are eligible for FSM rather than “innovative approaches to management, governance, teaching and the curriculum” (375). Gorard argues that limited evidence at this stage has not prevented claims of success being made by the government and the academies. Research by Needham and Gleeson (2006) shows that principals are the main change agents and there is immense pressure to meet targets and national standards where they are described as being in a goldfish bowl.

Policy and Regulatory Guidance: it is not possible to report on this in detail as it does not seem to be part of the remit of the various government funded projects and case studies. The independent studies do provide a critical examination of how the regulations have been used in ways to advantage particular people and groups (Beckett 2007; Hatcher 2007). Rogers and Migniuolo (2007) also articulate concerns about the dominance of private interests, but they do note that in the DfES (2007) prospectus *400 Academies: Prospectus for Sponsors and Local Authorities*, it is clear that Local Authorities are being brought back in with acknowledgement in the title and the importance of the link between local provision and academies.

1.5 Trust Schools

Summary of Key Findings

- ❑ The evidence base is too limited to make any judgements.
- ❑ The DEMOS report provides an interesting framework for strategising changes in governance.

The NCSL wanted to know about Trust schools and leadership. There is no published evidence on which this policy initiative and development is based. The literature review revealed no empirical studies about this type of school. The three publications we have accessed are: first, the DfES (2006) booklet that outlines what Trust Schools are and how to go about securing Trust status; second, the DFES/PwC (2007) study of school leadership which acknowledges the development of Trust Schools; and third, a DEMOS (2007) report which examines the implications of Trust Schools for governance.

Both the DfES (2006) and DfES/PwC (2007) texts make the case for Trust Schools, and the former notes the importance of leadership. It is advocated that the approach to leadership needs to be 'strong' because it 'gives schools a clear sense of purpose and direction and makes sure that resources and effort are focused on increasing opportunity and raising standards' (p5). The document does not say who should exercise this leadership. The document goes on to say that the Governing body is the place to explore and agree a Trust status application.

Given the lack of evidence both for and about this initiative then we are unable to complete an analysis based on the required protocol. However, the DEMOS report is based on an examination of the implications of Trust Schools for governance, and so is a contribution towards the necessary thinking about this important issue. The report presents six scenarios:

Conglomerate or **branded schools** with entrepreneurial leadership, e.g. like Tesco with a CEO as the form of leadership

Community governance like a political federation e.g. USA. With leaders at different levels (macro, meso, micro), and so issues of the balance between the centre and locality need to be established.

An **Alliance** with collaboration and pooling of resources e.g. NATO. This form of leadership will need possible diplomatic or military models.

The **Self Organising network** e.g. peer review, Wikipedia, eBay. Leadership would emerge from within through peer recognition.

Employee owned school network: teachers would own the school in partnership. Leadership would be from partnership professionals.

Consumer Governed School with parent trusts governing and leading the school, e.g. Scandinavia and US. Governance would be through a school council, with parents being actively involved in performance management, budgets and could be balloted on policy changes.

The report goes on to argue that each of the scenarios has different implications for how leadership, leading and leaders are conceptualised. The key issue is authority: who has it, how is it exercised, and to what effect? Other important questions are: how do current governance and political arrangements interconnect with these scenarios? What are the issues of accountability, communication, decision-making. Importantly, these scenarios raise broader questions about existing structures for national and local governance? It is out of the scope of this report to engage any further with this paper, except to add that it provides a useful way of examining what is currently happening, with what might happen, and it stimulates questions of participation in the decisions about change.

1.6 Summary

Restructuring of schools is taking place internally and externally with some relocation of decision-making. In particular, there is evidence of role redesign for headteachers mainly, but also to varying degrees the wider workforce, including teachers. Overall, forms of local governance remain the same, but with some examples of changes to the location of decision-making. The only major change is in Academies where sponsor control in strategic decision-making is recognised as distinctive. There are no new forms of leadership and management emerging. The headteacher remains a dominant figure in school structures and this role is the reference point for any changes to organisational arrangements. Distributed leadership seems to be forms of delegation and role allocation but the literatures are very unclear about how spans of control and the underlying processes actually operate. The motivation to restructure seems to be based more on how a school is located in the market place than on how local democracy can develop further.

The funding and control of research into governance, leadership and management is dominated by the government and its agencies.

The type and range of evidence is very variable. There are no examples of large scale empirical studies that are funded independently of the government. Commissioned research from the Department or its agencies can be large scale, such as the evaluation of the Federations (Lyndsay et al. 2007) or the PwC report into Academies (2007); or it can be small case studies (often undated) written up (sometimes in the form of a power point presentation) on the Standards or Innovation Unit websites. The latter tend to be written by those involved and so they are about celebration of achievement and advocacy of the changes. There have been no randomised controlled trials to provide an evidence base for developments, particularly Academies and Trusts. There are no ethnographic studies or action research projects regarding the formation and development of forms of collaboration such as soft and hard federations.

Studies tend to be leader centric and begin with headteachers and governors, with little actual evidence of the experiences of teachers and the wider workforce included. Little attention is given to students as active participants in decision-making. While there are examples of this type of work taking place in England, it is often disconnected from conceptualisations of structure and roles. This type of approach tends to be undertaken abroad with research that examines more grass roots developments including students and teachers, and communities.

Part 2: Developing a research framework

The aim in this part of the report is to develop a framework to that enables both the current situation to be described and understood, as well as demonstrate the potential for policy development and research. We intend to do this by using a conceptual framework developed through research undertaken for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation by a team in the School of Education, University of Manchester (Raffo et al. 2007, Raffo and Gunter 2008). The conceptual framework was developed to interpret the literatures on the relationship between poverty and education. Raffo and Gunter (2008) have shown the relevance of this framework for organising the literatures around leadership and management, and we would argue it has the same potential in regard to governance.

Functionalist and Socially Critical Perspectives

Raffo et al. (2007) identified two main positions: functional and socially critical. Both positions accept that education is important and that change can be successful. Both differ in regard to how the current system is engaged with, particularly the purpose and focus of interventions.

The functional approach assumes that interventions can be made at one or more of the national (macro), local (meso), and individual (micro) levels in ways that can ensure the better functioning of society. Hence investments can be made, training can take place, policies can make certain changes mandatory, and as a result the desired outcome will take place. Raffo et al. (2007) locate mainstream school improvement and school effectiveness research and projects as a product of this functionalist position. Notably they argue that the two main rationales for professional practice are (a) *delivery focused processes* where the emphasis is on ensuring that reforms are secured using officially endorsed models of transformational and distributed leadership; and (b) *localising focused processes* where school leaders are more pragmatic and frame delivery around “making things work here”, particularly since local conditions require local solutions. The narratives generated from these

rationales tend to be instrumental (how to) and are about how governance, leadership and management ensure efficiencies and effectiveness, and deliver national standards. Hence the primacy of the single leader who is able to both implement and mediate reforms dominates. Increasingly autonomy is about accepting that strategy is determined nationally by government with the local determination of tactics, and so some of the narratives may move from instrumental towards more biographical accounts of how we did it and why it was necessary to do it that way.

The socially critical approach also identifies that interventions can be made at different levels, but the assumption is also made that what is taking place at these levels is itself inherently inequitable. This cannot be resolved as a technical problem by making the system function better but is about confronting the inequalities in the distributions of power and resources built into society. Hence this position points out the dysfunctions produced by functionalist interventions, and provides evidence of alternative ways of securing change through working against injustice and for social justice. Raffo and Gunter (2008) locate much practitioner and critical policy work on educational improvement and effectiveness in this position. The rationale for professional practice are (a) aspects of *localising focused processes* where the nature of context is central to thinking and how transformation is conceptualised; (b) *democratising focused processes* where people can engage with the decisions that affect them directly. The narratives generated from these rationales tend to be particularly biographical but also critical where the approach is to both question what is being required alongside a commitment to social justice. Hence taken for granted approaches are subject to challenge, where the focus is less on what do we have to do, and is more about what is it that we want to do to work for a more socially just experience and outcomes. It is about governance, leadership and management as a communal and relational process which enables more public participation in, and control of, the provision and purposes of services.

Figure 1 presents an application of this framework to develop understandings of the emerging forms of governance, leadership and management.

Fig 1	Functional	Socially Critical
Macro	<p>Centralised restructuring and regulation of governance, leadership and management of schools and schooling.</p> <p>Types: Academies (DCFS Standards Site 2007, DfES/PwC 2007, PwC 2007) Trusts (DfES 2006, DfES/PwC 2007)</p>	<p>Critique of functional approach (e.g. Beckett 2007, Hatcher 2007, Needham and Gleeson 2006, Ridowski 2005, Rogers and Migniuolo 2007, Woods et al. 2007, 2007-2008). Promotion of local autonomy for governance, leadership and management.</p> <p>Types: Scenarios for Development (Demos 2007) Different forms of entrepreneurialism (Woods et al. 2007) Local governance and participation (Hatcher 2007, Needham and Gleeson 2006, Rogers and Migniuolo 2007).</p>
Meso	<p>Restructuring of organisational arrangements for governance, leadership and management in the locality or network.</p> <p>Types: Co-Headship within the school (DfES/PwC 2007; Paterson 2006). Executive/Multi-headship between schools (Ainscow et al. 2006a, Barnes 2005). Senior Leadership Teams including non-QTS staff (DfES/PwC 2007; Gunter and Butt 2007a,b). Multi-Agency (DfES/PwC 2007, Banks et al. 2002). Inter-school collaborative groups and committees in locality or network (Ainscow and Howes 2007, Ainscow et al. 2006b, Chapman and Allen 2006,</p>	<p>Critique of functionalist restructuring (e.g. Gorard 2005, Lumby and Morrison 2007, forthcoming, James et al. 2007, Lee 2007).</p> <p>Promotion of evidence of local and network democratic development.</p> <p>Types: Teacher leadership/conjoint leadership (Court 2003, Grubb and Flessa 2006). Teacher and student designed and led innovations (Hollins et al. 2006). Principal redesign that connects role with wider picture of educational purposes and practices (Thomson and Blackmore 2006). Political models within networks (Needham and Gleeson</p>

	<p>Coulton 2006, DfES/PwC 2007, DfES Standards Site Case Studies 2007, Innovation Unit Case Studies 2007, Ireson 2007, Lindsay et al 2007, Prentice 2007).</p> <p>Integration of schools (Harris 2005, Swidenbank 2007)</p>	<p>2006, Wohlstetter et al. 2003).</p>
Micro	<p>Role and job redesign for heads and workforce.</p> <p>Types: Hierarchical with Headteachers retaining and expanding dominant role (Ainscow et al. 2006a, Barnes 2005, Butt and Gunter 2007, Coleman 2006, DfES/PwC 2007, DfES Standards Site 2007, Innovation Unit 2007, Ireson 2007, Lee 2007, Paterson 2006, Prentice 2007, PwC 2007).</p> <p>Staff and governor roles developed to include inter-school meetings, planning and delivery (Ainscow and Howes 2007, Ainscow et al. 2006b, Banks 2002, Chapman and Allen 2006, Collins et al. 2006, DfES Standards Site 2007, Innovation Unit 2007, Lindsay et al. 2007).</p>	<p>Critique of functionalist job redesign, and provision of evidence of new ways of developing roles.</p> <p>Types: Non-hierarchical with teachers, students and parents actively involved (Court 2003, Grubb and Flessa 2006).</p> <p>Redesign based on a 'repertoire... of modalities' for principals and staff (Thomson and Blackmore 2006).</p> <p>Processes are important (Wohlstetter et al. 2003).</p>

Raffo and Gunter (2008) argue that New Labour's approach to educational change is essentially functionalist in aims and strategies. The review of the literature in Part 1 of this report, and summarised in Figure 1, confirms this judgement in regard to the restructuring of education where the emphasis is on extending private interests into the control of schools combined with organisational redesign where decision-making may be relocated to supra local or branded networks. Some are local and are based on a town or locality, some are privately sponsored and are named after the investor/company. The single person as leader (headteacher, executive, director, principal) remains dominant in how the system

operates and organisational arrangements begin with this post as the reference post for any role or job descriptions. Hence conceptualisations of systemic forms of leadership, begin with the functionality and authenticity of the single person as leader of their school and the wider system.

Our reading of the literatures, particularly local case studies, suggests that the reasons for structural changes with new organisational arrangements tend to be in response to dysfunction e.g. a crisis in recruitment, threatened or actual school closure, failure to meet national standards, or a failure of headteacher leadership. Headteachers seem to be the prime movers behind the motivation and successes of any form of collaboration. The gains that are planned and are given recognition for also tend to be functional e.g. increased provision, particularly 14-19; co-ordinated continuing professional development; and, economies of scale such as the movement of staff and use of buildings. Indeed, some of the functional narratives around delivery regarding the need to redesign roles and relocate decision-making to a committee that covers a number of schools/providers tend to be what was criticised in the pre-1988 period when the case for site-based management was made.

While the socially-critical position is not directly informing government policy or fully visible, there is evidence of this influencing developments in the emerging structures. Notably, there is considerable evidence of critical engagement with policy interventions, particularly in relation to Academies where evidence and ideas are being developed about the power structures that are in operation, and how particular groups are being advantaged. In addition, research is showing that student achievement is the objective of interventions, but it is also argued that this is more rhetorical than a reality. It seems that the market dominates thinking more than matters of democratic development, particularly since students are not involved in the decisions to form a federation, to create an academy or trust school.

Socially critical work is also raising alternative approaches to how restructuring, with the consequent organisational arrangements might take place, and this is more hinted at in the English context. Studies of Federations in The Netherlands, for example, tend to be design and written through the lens of hierarchy (Collins et al. 2006, Lee 2007). While the Innovation Unit Next Practice (2007) brochure mentions parent groups there is little detail as to what this might mean. Much of the research literature we have accessed on new forms of governance, leadership and management come from abroad (Court 2003, Grubb and Flessa 2006, Thomson and Blackmore 2006). This type of research tends to examine issues of participation, and begins with bottom-up perspectives and innovations. Hence notions of systemic leadership begin with the legitimacy of participation and the authenticity of a collective approach and that education is a public good, not a marketable commodity.

Summary

What this review of the literatures about current educational restructuring shows is that there are two main approaches in play. The functional approach is the one that is currently dominant, and it provides a conceptualisation of systemic leadership that is about redesigning roles and structures, in order to deliver national reforms in ways that are localised and supported (see work by Hopkins). The socially critically approach is one that remains evident in England but is stronger internationally. It is about conceptualising systemic leadership as being grass roots where children, parents, communities, teachers, and public agencies can design and deliver educational provision in ways that enable citizenship to flourish (see Hatcher forthcoming).

Overall, what is regarded as 'new' in the functional approach is at best a reworking of hierarchy to enable top-down reform strategies to be implemented and performance managed. While there are glimpses of alternatives to this in the form of students involved in school decisions, and parental groups challenging education policy, and whole towns forming one school, there is little evidence as yet that these are producing genuinely new forms of governance, leadership and management. What is needed are forms of research and approaches to governance that look

at the issue as one of democratic opportunity and capacity building. A useful starting point would be the DEMOS report (2007) on governance, and the range of alternative ways in which the system might develop.

If you wish to reference this paper:

Gunter, H.M. (2020) *CEPaLS 08: New Models of Leadership: A Literature Review*. Manchester: The Manchester Institute of Education.

Appendix 1: Managed Structures

Source	Features: Emerging Structures	Features: Leadership, Management, Governance	Impact	Policy and Regulatory Guidance re the implementation of structural change
<p>Coleman, A. (2006) <i>Collaborative Leadership in Extended Schools</i>. Nottingham: NSCL.</p>	<p>The report aims to provide 'advice and guidance' for school leaders on multi-agency working (p5).</p> <p>Drawing from Paton and Vangen (2004) the report frames collaboration around 'collaborative advantage' (p10) which is rather like synergy: you gain from working together.</p> <p>The report uses Kotters (1995) model of change with eight steps for leaders:</p> <p>Establishing a sense of urgency; Forming a powerful guiding coalition; Creating a vision; Communicating a vision; Empowering others to act on the vision; Planning for and creating short term wins; Consolidating improvements and producing still more change; Institutionalising new approaches.</p> <p>Coleman uses this model to present an analysis of literature and empirical work as guidance for leadership.</p>	<p>The report presents an analysis of a complex situation with leadership opportunities for a range of people, but the single leader in control i.e. the headteacher is an enduring feature.</p>	<p>The impact on leadership from multi-agency working is:</p> <p>Complexity: more people and organisations to deal with.</p> <p>Creativity: the lack of a prescribed model means that there are creative opportunities for local development.</p> <p>Political and Moral leadership: relationships are highly political with power dimensions being uppermost.</p> <p>Transformational leadership: with an emphasis on how to bring about fundamental changes to beliefs and practices.</p> <p>Leading change: where the approach to change may be, in Daniel Goleman's terms, too pacesetting with the result of creating too much dependency on the single leader.</p> <p>Bonding and bridging: there is a need to put more emphasis on bridging between people and agencies than on bonding within an organisation.</p> <p>Distributed leadership: the need for a leader to promote distributed leadership within the school.</p> <p>Entrepreneurialism: the need to develop risk taking and independent thinking.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>
<p>Court, M. (2003) <i>Different Approaches to Sharing School Leadership</i>. Nottingham: NCSL.</p>	<p>Provides examples of shared leadership from Canada, England, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway and USA.</p> <p>The paper focuses on co-headship and teacher leadership, and the different</p>	<p>A range of leadership models from the usual hierarchy with two people in the post through to teacher leadership arrangements where a team of teachers took on the former principal leader work and responsibilities. This is</p>	<p>Success is based on:</p> <p>Open and honest communication.</p> <p>Scheduled time for professional critical reflection and debate.</p>	

	arrangements made for working with others: how this is done, purposes and outcomes.	known, following Gronn (2002) as 'conjoint leadership' where teachers are appointed from within a staff and develop democratic practices and cultures. Examples are from Oregon, Norway, and New Zealand.	Negotiation on learning philosophies and strategies. On-going experimentation, review and revision. Commitment to share responsibility and mutual accountability. Interpersonal respect and trust. (p3).	
DfES/PwC (2007) <i>Independent Study into School Leadership</i> . London: DfES.	Internal restructuring of schools to distribute roles and responsibilities. A key feature is the development of a diverse workforce that enables those with QTS to focus on teaching and learning.	The example of co-headship is used to illustrate how a job share can enable leadership responsibilities to be divided up. The example of the inclusion of non-teaching staff on the senior leadership team is used.	Co-headship does depend on the personal relationship of the people involved. The report concludes that: 'the evidence from this study along with other international evidence, shows that it can be an effective solution to current leadership challenges' (pxi).	No details provided
DfES/PwC (2007) <i>Independent Study into School Leadership</i> . London: DfES.	Internal restructuring of schools to include other agencies. Presented as a variant to the Managed Model and known as the Multi-Agency managed leadership models. This model embraces a range of agencies in the same premises together with membership of the school leadership team.	The example of extended schools is given to illustrate how this multi-agency model is developing. The report suggests that new ways of management may develop in order to co-ordinate multi-agency service provision. The report identifies that there are a range of approaches currently in operation. However, the continued significance of the headteacher remains.	The report identifies the gains for students in having a range of services on site: 'having nurses, social workers and/or psychologists working on the school site, although not without its difficulties, can generate significant efficiencies that ultimately contribute positively to pupils' educational achievement... we have seen some examples of the presence of such professionals on site in leadership roles ensuring pupils' wider social needs are dealt with in a holistic and timely manner' (pxi).	No details provided.
Gunter, H. and Butt, G. (2007a) A Changing Workforce, in: Butt, G. and Gunter, H. (eds) <i>Modernizing Schools: people, learning and organizations</i> . London: Continuum.	Empirical evidence from the TSW Pathfinder Project (see Thomas et al 2004) and post Project interviews of ongoing changes to the composition and role of the workforce.	Evidence of the development of the wider workforce and the incorporation of roles into the senior leadership team.	Additional evidence since the TSW Project shows that gains had been made in the organisation of the school, with reports of improvements in student outcomes. There is evidence that schools have continued to develop remodelling after the Project and funding finished.	Concerns raised by headteachers about how remodelling has lost its impetus nationally.
Gunter, H. and Butt, G. (2007b) <i>Leading a Modernized School</i> , in: Butt, G. and Gunter, H. (eds) <i>Modernizing Schools: people, learning and organizations</i> . London: Continuum.	Empirical evidence from the TSW Pathfinder Project (see Thomas et al. 2004) about the leadership of the pilot schools both during and after the project.	Evidence from case study headteachers of how their work and role has changed through the Project. Emphasis particularly put on the delegation of tasks and responsibility to other members of the work force such as the bursar.	Self reported impact on the Project outcomes for the role of the headteacher and the wider workforce. There is evidence that change is complex and that there are varied ways on achieving outcomes.	While the schools had sustained many of the aspects of the Project concerns were raised about funding.
Hollins, K., Gunter, H., and Thomson, P. (2006) <i>Living</i>	Case study of a school undertaking innovative change. Based on	Redesign of school change and leadership through innovation	Redesign and development of leadership roles and responsibilities for adults and students.	No details provided

improvement: a case study of a secondary school in England. <i>Improving Schools</i> . 9 (2) 141-152.	evaluation funded by the Innovation Unit, DfES. Empirical work with headteacher, governors, parents, staff, students.	teams and research. Involvement of a critical mass of staff in school change and innovation. Development of student as researchers and policy makers within school. Partnership with University researchers.	Student outcomes meet or exceed national standards.	
Innovation Unit Darlaston Collaborative Report date: Undated. www.innovation-unit.co.uk	Partnership established in 2004 to coordinate project for handling 'hard to reach' and 'excluded' students. Darlaston Community College Joseph Leckie Technology College Rhythm Rooms Arts and Media Centre Ground Work Black Country Meetings and planning to provide a range of provision for students who are at risk.	No details provided	No details provided	No details provided
Lance A., Rayner, S. and Szwed, C. (2007) Challenging and changing role boundaries, in: Butt, G. and Gunter, H. (eds) <i>Modernizing Schools: people, learning and organizations</i> . London: Continuum.	Empirical evidence from the TSW Pathfinder Project (see Thomas et al. 2004) and Doctoral dissertation about the development of Sencos and Teaching Assistants.	Evidence of changing roles and responsibilities in the schools for teaching assistants and Sencos.	Evidence that the emphasis has been put on the role of non-teachers, and there has not been sufficient attention to the role of the teacher. The Project was speedy and hence the pace of change can be problematic.	Concerns raised about the role of the teacher in the remodelling process.
NCSL (2006) <i>Leading Beyond the School. Evaluating the impact of the Primary Strategy Consultant Leaders</i> . Nottingham: NCSL.	Primary Strategy Consultant Leaders (PSCL) are current headteachers who work with other primary schools to develop teaching and learning with an emphasis on national standards. This is recognised as an example of system leadership. Interviews took place in 40 primary schools.	Emphasis is on the single headteacher who has the skills of leading a successful school. In particular, it is stressed that the single head can bring to another school the ability to work with that school rather than attempt to impose an approach. An important outcome has been the encouragement of networking.	Successes are identified as the ability of the PSCL to work productively with the headteacher and staff. The PSCL was identified as a 'colleague head' and not as an advisor (p7). Success was underpinned by appropriately negotiated working arrangements.	No details provided
Paterson, F. (2006) <i>New Models of Headship: co-headship</i> . Nottingham: NCSL.	Co-headships exist where there are job-shares (two part time heads) or joint headships (both heads work full	There is no evidence provided about how the leadership actually operates between the two people	The reported benefits are: Retaining experienced headteachers.	No details provided

	<p>time). See DfES/PwC (2007) report above where co-headship is given as an example of a managed structure.</p> <p>Refers to examples but notes that it mainly a south of England phenomenon. There are varieties of arrangements based on how much time is worked; or how in a federation there is an executive and an operational head.</p> <p>Some co-headships are married couples.</p>	<p>or how other members of the workforce have their roles and responsibilities affected by this arrangement.</p> <p>While positive impacts are noted, see the column to the right, problems have been noted in regard to role clarity and practice.</p>	<p>Attracting new heads to a job that is more congenial to work-life balance.</p> <p>Building capacity.</p> <p>Reducing risk, particularly with succession planning.</p> <p>Can enable more creative and collaborative leadership. (p4).</p> <p>The success of co-headship depends on: 'the leadership pairing and their match with the needs of the school... nevertheless, co-headship appears to offer a creative response to the challenges of contemporary school leadership and looming headteacher shortages' (p8).</p>	
<p>Rayner, S. and Gunter, H. (2007) <i>Remodelling Leadership</i>, in: Butt, G. and Gunter, H. (eds) <i>Modernizing Schools: people, learning and organizations</i>. London: Continuum.</p>	<p>Empirical evidence from the TSW Pathfinder Project (see Thomas et al. 2004) about the leadership of the pilot schools both during and after the project.</p>	<p>Evidence of the strong role by headteachers in leading innovation. Varied approaches to the delegation of work and responsibilities.</p>	<p>Case study Project evidence and self reported impact of change within the schools. Evidence of the challenge to become more distributed at a time when the Headteacher remains the key role for innovation and full responsible for student and school outcomes.</p>	<p>There is evidence of contradictions in policy, particularly the emphasis on performance and accountability alongside the normative promotion of distribution to a wider and more diverse workforce.</p>
<p>Woods, C. (2007) <i>School Business Director Programme Scoping Study</i>. Nottingham: NCSL.</p>	<p>Empirical evidence from Heads and School Business Managers (SBMs) about role and development.</p>	<p>SBMs have taken on important leadership roles in schools and in federations, and this could be developed further. Different views between those with/without QTS on how this role might develop. Particularly the proposal by the DfES/PwC (2007) that the executive role need not be someone with QTS.</p>	<p>SBMs are having a positive impact on schools, particularly in taking on responsibilities for e.g. finance, risk management, ICT, and human resources management.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>

Appendix 2: Secondary Federations

Source	Features: Emerging Structures	Features: Leadership, Management, Governance	Impact	Policy and Regulatory Guidance re the implementation of structural change
Ainscow, M. and Howes, A. (2007) <i>Working together to improve urban secondary schools: a study of practice in one city, School Leadership and Management</i> , 27 (3), 285-300.	<p>Study of a whole LEA collaboration of secondary schools in city known as 'Bradcastle'. Based on project for DfES.</p> <p>Twin track approach: first, short term initiatives to raise standards e.g. revision guides, booster classes; second, strengthening collaboration amongst secondary schools in city e.g. joint planning, building stronger relationships with LA through school improvement advisors.</p>	<p>Each school retained its governing body and headteacher. Grouping of schools according to stage in development with partnership arrangements.</p> <p>While various patterns emerged within the partnerships, it is concluded that "it was mainly the school leaders, supported by the framework of the project, who determined what collaboration might mean in their group, and in their individual schools" (289).</p>	<p>Change processes affected attitudes and expectations of staff. School reputations improved.</p> <p>Short and long term difficulties can be handled with partner schools to support and problem solve.</p> <p>While the authors have reservations about the reliance on outcome data, it does show an increase in KS4 standards.</p> <p>Ainscow and Howe argue that internal leadership is important for school improvement it is important to recognise the wider context that "inter-dependence" (298) can contribute.</p>	No details provided
Ainscow, M., West, M. and Nicolaidou, M. (2006a) <i>Supporting Schools in Difficult Circumstances: the role of school to school cooperation</i> . In: Ainscow, M. and West, M. (eds) <i>Improving Urban Schools</i> . Maidenhead: OUP.	<p>Study of urban high school located in challenging circumstances which partnered with three other schools in the same LEA.</p> <p>Standards and Effective Unit at the DfES funded the evaluation.</p>	<p>Each school retained its own governing body and headteacher.</p> <p>The partnership was between the four headteachers, the school in difficulty appointed a new headteacher who ensured that with the governing body that the school made the final decisions. Strong leadership by the new head plus range of skills from the three consultant heads.</p>	The research shows the complex process in undertaking this strategy, and it very much depended on the expertise of the four heads involved. In addition the boundaries between the new head and the three consultant heads was essential to making this work.	The research challenges the Fresh Start strategy by New Labour, and shows that partnership can be an alternative to closing a school and reopening under new management. Furthermore, the market and competition is not conducive to such partnerships.
Coulton, S. (2006) <i>Getting our heads together, shared leadership of a collaborative school improvement project</i> . Nottingham: NCSL.	<p>Study of five secondary schools in the East Midlands called Sector 3 who are collaborating on a school improvement project on raising attainment at KS4.</p> <p>The five secondary schools are part of a much larger collaboration including: the Local Authority, a Private Education Consultancy, and 19 secondary schools in the Local Authority.</p>	<p>Leadership and governance of each school remained, but there is collaboration on the project.</p> <p>The leadership of the collaboration is based on group and communication processes, the development of a shared purpose, and understanding about change.</p>	There is reported impact through three of the schools have been awarded specialist status, all schools were above the DfES floor targets at GCSE, no school was in an OfSTED category, and three schools had achieved their best results.	The policy strategy through e.g. Excellence in Cities, and the strategic initiatives through federations and the 14-19 consortia are noted as being helpful to the collaboration.

	<p>The collaborative has a leadership group, and the research was through interviews with seven members of the group including: headteachers, deputies/assistant heads, local authority advisors, and a private consultant.</p>	<p>The structures had been supported by the Leadership Incentive Grant and Leading Edge Partnership.</p> <p>The collaboration had appointed a co-ordinator who had school leadership experience.</p> <p>A leadership structure was established with a strategic group of heads and an operational group of deputy heads.</p> <p>Heads were able to not only work in partnership with other heads but also distribute leadership leadership of the project to others in the school.</p> <p>The collaboration received the support of the Local Authority, the DfES, and a consultant.</p>		
<p>DfES The Standards Site: Case studies.</p> <p>Confederation of Three Community Colleges, Plymouth.</p> <p>Report date: January 2006.</p> <p>www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk</p>	<p>Confederation between three schools established for 15 years.</p> <p>Joint aims regarding provision post 16.</p> <p>Joint planning (e.g. timetabling) and consultation (e.g. governors, leadership and curriculum teams) in the provision of post 16 education.</p> <p>Joint professional development and workforce innovations.</p> <p>Election of a Chair for meetings and to oversee the delivery of agreed action.</p>	<p>The Confederation is three separate schools with their own governance, leadership and management structures, but have collaborated through aligning aims, undertaking joint planning and developing an agreed strategy.</p>	<p>Self reported impact.</p> <p>There is recognition that the Confederation has been sustained even with changes in Governors and Principals.</p> <p>Through ongoing collaboration the Confederation is building joint strategies and thinking.</p> <p>Evidence of the impact of the Confederation on standards is recognised as an important next step.</p>	<p>Concentra are working with the Confederation on evaluation.</p> <p>Confederation is looking at Foundation Status.</p> <p>Confederation would like to move forward in an Educational Improvement Partnership. Wants to draw in partners to do this e.g. Learning and Skills Council</p>
<p>DfES The Standards Site: Case studies.</p> <p>Secondary School Federation, Cambridge.</p>	<p>Five secondary schools working together.</p> <p>Joint aims regarding standards.</p> <p>Federation operates through a "committee of the governing bodies". Developed a city</p>	<p>The Federation is five separate schools where they have set up a committee of the governing bodies, and have enabled staff to work together through joint projects and professional</p>	<p>Self reported impact.</p> <p>The Federation has had impact on two of the schools in special measures.</p> <p>Report of impact on teaching and learning</p>	<p>No details provided</p>

<p>Report date: undated.</p> <p>www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk</p>	<p>wide agenda and have focused on communicating the achievements of the federation within the community.</p> <p>Subject teams formed across the Federation with funded projects. Middle leadership development programme for subject leaders.</p>	<p>development.</p>	<p>through ICT, and use of ASTs.</p> <p>Targeting of resources through projects and by focusing on areas of weakness.</p>	
<p>DfES The Standards Site: Case studies.</p> <p>St Thomas More and St Edmond Campion Schools</p> <p>Report date: undated.</p> <p>www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk</p>	<p>The federation, consisting of two secondary schools, operates through a committee with delegated powers under the Education Act 2002; and is led by an executive headteacher, who is ultimately responsible.</p> <p>Main aim has been to enhance links between the two schools with common aims and objectives. sharing good practice, common training, sharing policies.</p> <p>Enhancing links as well with primary schools, local community and parents.</p>	<p>The two schools have their own governance and leadership structures.</p> <p>Mainly collaborative activity between people in the schools. Direct aim to improve St Edmond Campion through the expertise of staff at St Thomas More. Sharing of good practice through coaching at all levels from one school to the other. New pastoral system in place at St Edmond Campion.</p>	<p>External evidence of impact that St Edmond Campion has been turned around with improved results, changes in culture and in morale. Notably: 71% of students achieved 5+ A*-C grades or equivalent; 5+ A*-G from 21% to 51% 2005.</p> <p>A-Level - 99% pass rate of which 59% are A-C. The recent Ofsted report states that the school is good in all categories and outstanding in some. This is especially significant given the situation of school prior to the federation. The inspectors were amazed by the amount of progress made in only 3 years.</p> <p>St Thomas More provides self reported statements that there has been impact with time to reflect and the developing of coaching.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>
<p>DfES The Standards Site: Case studies.</p> <p>West Sussex Federation</p> <p>Report date: undated.</p> <p>www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk</p>	<p>The four schools comprising Rural Norfolk are a "soft" Federation where the joint Governing Committee have delegated powers (formed under School Governance (Collaboration) (England) Regulations 2003).</p> <p>There are no other details provided. However, there seems to have been collaboration and joint planning for professional development, ICT, and curriculum provision (14-19).</p>	<p>Each school retains its own governance and leadership structures.</p> <p>There is little detail about specifics, but there is a report of a school ICT Co-ordinator now seconded as e-learning Co-ordinator for Federation.</p>	<p>There is self-reported impact on:-</p> <p>Awareness raising on programmes and courses. Use of ICT Sharing materials and resources with joint planning. Joint CPD</p> <p>Improvement in provision and opportunities for students regarding careers and achievement.</p> <p>Improvement in community links, communication and development of new ideas. Closer working with Adult Education, Youth and Community.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>

<p>DfES The Standards Site: Case studies.</p> <p>Hard to Place Pupils</p> <p>Report date: August 2005</p> <p>www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk</p>	<p>Peak 11 is a federation of 11 secondary schools. It developed from a headteacher group and has a wide remit.</p> <p>A panel made up of heads and LEA representatives looks at disaffected pupils and works out strategies.</p> <p>Funds from LEA and Schools.</p>	<p>All the schools retain their own leadership and governance structures.</p> <p>Collaborate via the panel on an issue of provision that affects all the schools.</p>	<p>Schools have been able to make better provision for disaffected pupils. Been able to fund places at colleges and other work place providers for students.</p> <p>Aiming to set up a PRU linked to the panel.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>
<p>Harris, S. (2005) <i>Faith, Hope and Charity: setting out to create a new culture in merging schools</i>. Nottingham: NSCL.</p>	<p>A merger between two secondary schools that served a large outer ring estate. The schools were located on the same site divided by a fence.</p> <p>The local authority merged the two schools beginning with a new combined Year 7. Funds were used to create one school and refurbish the buildings. A new staff was drawn from across the LA with an emphasis on learning within a new curriculum.</p>	<p>A new leadership team was created but no details are provided of membership, structure or purposes.</p>	<p>A change process is outlined and the case study of the new school based on a merger is recognised as being challenging but at the time of writing gains were being identified.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>
<p>Innovation Unit</p> <p>VIP Valley Invicta Park</p> <p>Date of report: 2005</p> <p>www.innovation-unit.co.uk</p>	<p>Soft federation between a grammar school and a community high school.</p> <p>The aim is to improve the community high school through the federation with the grammar school. The particular emphasis is on leadership development and strategy.</p> <p>It is reported that the governing body ceded their powers to the Federation Board through a memorandum of understanding. The Federation Board is made up of governors from each school and the LEA. The executive headteacher led on the finances and strategic planning.</p>	<p>The two schools have retained their own governance and leadership systems. One of the headteachers acts as an executive headteacher of the second school.</p> <p>Executive headteacher worked on improving senior and middle management; teaching and learning; and ICT provision.</p> <p>Changes have taken place through three phases, and has seen the appointment of a new headteacher in the community high school.</p>	<p>The report outlines progress and gains in all the priorities identified by the federation. Visible gains in regard to students and learning through the Achievement Club, through to improved strategic planning and attitudes to the school through strong leadership.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>
<p>Innovation Unit</p> <p>The Darent Soft Federation of Schools.</p>	<p>Five schools from the Dartford area are in the federation.</p> <p>Strategy Group of heads and governors.</p>	<p>The five schools retain their own governance and leadership arrangements.</p> <p>There is evidence of strategic</p>	<p>There is self reported impact on:</p> <p>Improvement to pupil achievement throughout KS2-4.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>

<p>Date of power point report: undated</p> <p>www.innovation-unit.co.uk</p>	<p>KS 3, 4, and post 16 working groups.</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Group.</p> <p>Subject groups for Art and Music.</p>	<p>leadership regarding the vision and aims for the federation.</p> <p>There is evidence that the working groups provide opportunities for leadership of curriculum provision and change strategies.</p>	<p>Reductions in fixed term and permanent exclusions, and attendance.</p> <p>Increases in the number and range of externally accredited courses</p> <p>Improvements in post-16 stay on rates</p> <p>Improvements in skills and training offered to match future plans of the area</p> <p>Enhancements to continuing professional development for staff</p> <p>A greater sense of self-esteem, achievement and pride among the student body</p> <p>Improvements in the understanding and movement on curriculum flexibility, personalisation and innovation</p> <p>Improved relationships with other institutions in the area</p>	
<p>Lumby, J. and Morrison, M. (forthcoming) <i>Collective leadership of local school systems: power, autonomy and ethics.</i></p>	<p>Focus on forms of leadership by interviews with 219 14-19 year olds (from 27 secondary schools and five sixth form/FE colleges), 80 staff and 45 parents in relation to 14-19 provision in two English and one Welsh LA.</p>	<p>The paper uses distributed leadership to examine how partnerships are working. The paper concludes that much of the theorising is inward within the school and is not developing an external collaborative orientation.</p> <p>The evidence suggests that schools promote their own interests, and also that student interests are not always uppermost. Student interests are a mantra rather than a reality.</p> <p>The data shows that the school within a market place remains the dominant aspect of thinking and practice.</p>	<p>Thinking about and doing leadership remains located within a marketised system of provision and competition.</p> <p>The moral aspects to leadership, particularly in regard to partnership, is an issue that needs further research. It is one thing to do leadership as a mechanical process of planning and delivering provision, but another to frame it as a moral activity. There is a need to examine the context in which partnership is taking place and how normative texts which advocate partnership may not recognise the contradictory situation in which schools and professionals are being exhorted to do it.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>

<p>Lumby, J. and Morrison, M. (2007) <i>Leading a community in partnership: leadership theory under pressure.</i> Paper presented to the BERA conference, London, September 2007.</p>	<p>Focus on forms of leadership by interviews with 219 14-19 year olds (from 27 secondary schools and five sixth form/FE colleges), 80 staff and 45 parents in relation to 14-19 provision in two English and one Welsh LA.</p>	<p>The paper examines whether current leadership theory can enable practice and provide useful explanations of practice. The paper argues that current leadership theory is deficient as it focuses on the organisation and not the network.</p>	<p>There is a need to move away from normative theories of what is regarded as good practice (e.g. transformational models) as such models are likely to lead to disappointment. Instead there is a need to draw on theories that enable not only planned but unplanned interconnections to be understood, and to get to the heart of how people operate. The authors suggest gaming theory where the emphasis is on non-trusting behaviour.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>
<p>Wokingham Secondary Schools Federation www.wokinghamfederation.org.uk</p>	<p>A voluntary collaboration between 11 secondary schools.</p>	<p>Aims to develop capacity amongst staff teams, share good practice and widen provision. Have undertake collaborative training and formed subject groups e.g. science.</p>	<p>No details provided.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>

Appendix 3: All through schools (including primary/secondary/special federations)

Source	Features: Emerging Structures	Features: Leadership, Management, Governance	Impact	Policy and Regulatory Guidance re the implementation of structural change
<p>Ainscow, M., Muijs, D. and West, M. (2006b) Collaboration as a strategy for improving schools in challenging circumstances, <i>Improving Schools</i>. 9, 192-202.</p>	<p>Case studies of collaboration for the NCSL. The paper examines the evidence of impact and the factors associated with success.</p>	<p>Schools retain their own governing bodies, and leadership arrangements.</p> <p>Collaboration enables: solving immediate problems; meeting the needs of vulnerable learners; widening opportunities for the curriculum. The paper refers to evidence of leadership and management being directly involved in enabling this to happen, and in challenging different types of thinking.</p> <p>The authors stress the importance of "social learning" by those involved in collaborative processes. Collaborations can mature and processes can develop a productive relationship where they can disagree but not damage the partnership.</p>	<p>Leadership and management is seen as one of the factors in enabling collaboration to happen and work well: "this involves forms of shared accountability, often orchestrated through written agreements and then strengthened through experiences of learning how to work together. This, in turn, involves learning how to learn from difference, how to use evidence as an engine for change and how to identify areas that would benefit from collaborative action" (200).</p>	<p>Evidence that some schools form partnerships because of perceived weaknesses in LAs. Evidence that some partnerships have facilitated and strengthened partnerships.</p>
<p>Arnold, R. (2006) <i>Schools in collaboration: federations, collegiates and partnerships</i>. Sough: EMIE at NFER.</p>	<p>Studies examples of a range of types of collaborations, including federations.</p> <p>Presents case studies of: Dumfries and Galloway, Barnsley, Birmingham, Caerphilly, Coventry, Kent, Kirklees, Knowsley, North Somerset: the Weston Education Partnership, Manchester, Devon, Surrey,</p>	<p>A range of organisational and communication structures have been developed.</p> <p>There are examples within the cases of single governing bodies through to autonomous schools with their own governing body and headteacher.</p> <p>There are examples of staff being involved across schools to develop curriculum and to undertake professional development.</p> <p>Arnold concludes: 'Partnerships</p>	<p>The report sums up the global benefits of partnerships:</p> <p>Structured way to learn and share best practice;</p> <p>Opportunity for collective planning;</p> <p>More responsive learning opportunities for individual students within a more diverse provision;</p> <p>More cost effective and coherent curriculum;</p> <p>Joint staffing opportunities for the federation;</p>	<p>No details provided</p>

	Glasgow, Cheshire, Canterbury/Kent.	of whatever kind depend crucially for success on the quality of leadership'. (p37).	Improvements in senior and middle management; Economies of scale produced; Opportunities for further partnerships e.g. with FE. p4	
Banks, A., Finn, C., Bora, S., Lee, K and Watson, C. (2002) <i>Two Heads Better Than One?</i> Nottingham: NCSL.	Case study of Chafford Hundred Campus in Thurrock. Written by members of staff. Campus includes: library, adult education, nursery, primary and secondary school. Leadership team includes two headteachers, two assistant headteachers, business manager. Aim to fuse primary and secondary. Aimed to work in partnership with businesses, library, health and community etc.	Present the benefits of cross-phase team leadership: Wider range of strengths. Opportunity for specialisation. Range of people to support activity. Range of good practice to draw on. Opportunities for professional development. Development of futures thinking through challenging everything. Experimentation and change are normal.	While the report recognises challenges to this type of approach, e.g. shared understanding, different priorities, range of experience, and the existence of hierarchy through titles and pay structures, there is evidence that success is based on: Effective communication. Understanding what is core and what is peripheral. Strong people management skills. Values driven strategic planning. External Support.	No details provided
Barnes, I. (2005) <i>New Models of Headship, Primary Executive Heads. A study of heads who are leading more than one primary school.</i> Nottingham: NCSL.	This study focuses on headteachers who remain in post in their school and also take on the leadership of another school. Length of time doing this can vary from two terms to longer five year arrangements. Based on interviews with six executive headteachers. Outlines the negotiation process for both the host and partner schools: staff, governors and parents. The LEA has a clear role here.	Strong leadership role by the headteacher in order to ensure that the host school did not loose out and that the partner school developed rapidly in regard to national standards. With longer term arrangements there is a need to examine roles and responsibilities in ways that link the two schools. Emphasis is put on building leadership capacity within the partner school, with a	This approach is seen as demanding skills that might not be widespread within the profession.	

		reconfiguration of the senior leadership team.		
Chapman, C. and Allen, T. (2006) Collaborative reform for schools in difficulty. <i>Improving Schools</i> . 9 (3), 291-301.	<p>Presents case study federations:</p> <p>Hills federation: Federation principal and chair of governors do strategic and day to day leadership.</p> <p>Valley federation: one secondary and four primary schools, each with own head and governing body. Secondary head and chair of governors lead the federation.</p>	<p>Hills federation: evidence is presented of changes to the structures enabling more effective governance and leadership opportunities for staff. The bursar from one school became the financial director of the whole federation.</p> <p>The federation principal and infrastructure have taken over some decisions from the LA and individual schools e.g. movement of students around.</p>	Evidence of positive impact on co-ordination and provision through the federation, but concerns about decisionmaking. In federating a successful school with two struggling schools there are concerns that the former has lost out to the latter.	No details provided
Collins, A., Ireson, J., Stubbs, S., Nash, K. and Burnside, P. (2006) <i>New Models of Headship, Federations. Does every Primary School need a Headteacher? Key implications from a study of federations in The Netherlands</i> . Nottingham: NCSL.	<p>Interviews where undertaken with eight principals who lead more than one school and five superintendents in The Netherlands.</p> <p>A Federation is where two or more schools share a school board (governors).</p> <p>Some schools have their own head or principal; some principals take on the leadership of more than one school, and if so each school has a location leader for daily matters; a federation may have an educational professional as a superintendent who takes a strategic role in the federation.</p>	<p>A range of structures have developed, each with a board, and an emphasis on a single leader role. The exception is the arrangements where there is a school board but no overall leader.</p> <p>The report concludes that a school need not have a single leader/headteacher. A strength is seen as giving leadership opportunities to others in schools and the federation. However, it is also identified that each school needs to retain its individual identity.</p>	<p>While many strengths are identified for The Netherlands, the implications for primary schools in England have generated a number of issues:</p> <p>The leadership roles and responsibilities, and how this is incorporated into training.</p> <p>The tensions between leading an organisation including more than one school but at the same time keeping a focus on teaching and learning.</p> <p>The issue of whether each location or school needs a senior person in charge or not, and if not, what this means for teaching and learning.</p> <p>The type of skills needed by headteachers to take on a federation role is identified as a training imperative.</p> <p>The training and role of governors is identified as a key priority in federation development.</p>	No details provided
DfES/PwC (2007) <i>Independent Study into School Leadership</i> . London: DfES.	The report identifies a federated model where schools can in either 'hard' or 'looser' federations share resources and widen provision (p68).	<p>There are a range of structures outlined:</p> <p>Executive head reporting got an integrated governing body.</p>	Presents reports of impact on student outcomes, economies of scale, better student transition, and better career progression for the workforce.	No details provided

		<p>Possibility that the head may or may not have QTS.</p> <p>Two schools federate where one head is the executive because of their track record in school leadership.</p> <p>Informal collaborations are noted as an important way in which staff and resources can be shared.</p> <p>The emphasis given to collaboration is on the opportunities for distributed leadership.</p>		
<p>DfES The Standards Site: Case studies.</p> <p>The Shrewsbury Partnership for Education and Training</p> <p>Report date: undated.</p> <p>www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk</p>	<p>The Shrewsbury Partnership for Education and Training consists of 7 secondary schools; 1 special school; and 2 colleges. It is a "soft" federation where the joint Governing Committee have delegated powers (formed under School Governance (Collaboration) (England) Regulations 2003).</p> <p>Formation of a governing body forum with delegated powers under the Act. Worked on developing a co-operative and joint approach through action planning, sharing of information, projects, personnel (e.g. clerk, project manager for subject co-ordinator meetings, CPD co-ordinator) and use of advisors (some from LEA, and media consultant).</p>	<p>The Federation is separate schools and colleges, each with their own governance and leadership who have established a way of co-ordinating and collaborating on agreed aims and projects.</p>	<p>Self reported impact.</p> <p>Examples of joint professional development, curriculum points and visits, collaborative approach to behaviour, learning resources provision e.g. electronic whiteboards.</p> <p>Agreement for all federation schools to operate the same reporting, assessment and tracking system building on good practice.</p> <p>Claims made that increases in sixth form numbers and improvements in GCSE results in two of the seven schools is related to the Federation.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>
<p>DfES The Standards Site: Case studies.</p> <p>Windsor and Maidenhead Federation</p> <p>Report date: undated.</p> <p>www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk</p>	<p>Windsor and Maidenhead is a federation of 6 schools, 5 secondaries and 1 special school. It operates through a committee of the governing bodies with delegated powers under the Education Act 2002.</p> <p>Joint planning of inservice and provision for students.</p> <p>Federation activity is effectively targetted at students who are disengaged, disaffected or at</p>	<p>The Federation is six schools each with their own system of governance and leadership.</p> <p>The Federation builds on a longer established partnership.</p> <p>Mainly collaborative activity between people from the schools.</p>	<p>There are self reported perceptions that joint professional development and visiting schools has been beneficial.</p> <p>The Federation receives backing from RBWM to support pupils at risk of exclusion and also to assist vulnerable children within the local area schools.</p>	<p>No direct evidence of this. But the report notes the challenges in setting up the Federation and that they have sought the advice of the DFES.</p>

	<p>significant risk of failing to meet their potential.</p> <p>Aims to widen partnership to include primary schools.</p>			
<p>DfES The Standards Site: Case studies.</p> <p>Chesil Federation</p> <p>Report date: January 2007.</p> <p>www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk</p>	<p>Soft Federation of all 28 schools around Weymouth and Portland in Dorset.</p> <p>Work on collaborative projects and also to change the culture in regard to innovation and securing outcomes.</p> <p>Federation has a leadership group consisting of the headteachers and principals. The Federation has an Executive Director. The ED does the day to day work and this is supported by the Partnership Chair and Vice Chair who are two full time heads. The ED has a team of 3.8 full time positions: PA, ICT Manager, ICT Technician. Finance Officer and Extended Schools Co-ordinator.</p> <p>Established groups that are project focused and report back to the Leadership Group e.g. Primary MFL, Sencos, 14-19 management.</p> <p>Funded by schools/colleges, bids, and provision of full cost services such as training for out of partnership groups/organisations.</p>	<p>Each school retains its own governance and leadership.</p> <p>Established a Leadership Group, and importantly an Executive Director and Team from outside of education.</p> <p>Opportunities exist to participate and lead project groups.</p>	<p>There is self reported impact.</p> <p>The Federation has established:</p> <p>Compass Centre: new specialist inclusion unit.</p> <p>Primary College for Y6 students to improve transition to Y7. Evidence that transition dip has been eased as a result.</p> <p>CPD sessions and links made with NCSL.</p> <p>ICT technical support through employment of technicians.</p> <p>Collaborative work on 14-19 provision.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>
<p>DfES The Standards Site: Case studies.</p> <p>Cumbria South Lakes Federation</p> <p>Report date: undated</p> <p>www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk</p> <p>See also: DfES/PwC (2007) <i>Independent Study into School Leadership</i>. London: DfES. P72.</p>	<p>The Cumbria South Lakes Federation consists of 8 secondary schools, one special school and one further education college.</p> <p>A limited company has been formed, as well as a federation board comprising the head/principal of each institution, an executive of lead headteachers, an executive officer and consultants in teaching, learning and ITT.</p> <p>Federation activity is organised on a project basis involving detailed action plans with a clear focus and aims.</p> <p>In order to overcome difficult issues such as the</p>	<p>Each organisation retains its own governance and leadership structures.</p> <p>The Federation has established its own structures and systems for operating in a collaborative way e.g. federation board. A company has been formed, and the federation is serviced by an executive officer.</p> <p>There are other leadership roles within the federation: e.g. the formation of an enhanced</p>	<p>Main self reported impact has been on professional development and through leadership opportunities within the Federation.</p> <p>Collaboration has increased at strategic and operational levels.</p> <p>Curriculum provision at 14-16 has improved.</p>	<p>No details provided.</p>

	<p>number and range of institutions involved, capacity, funding and distance between institutions the Cumbria South Lakes Federation has placed an early emphasis on systematic development, established clear protocols, commissioned special consultants and effected the inception of other funding streams with federation resources.</p> <p>Main projects been on professional development; improving the range and quality of provision, e.g. 14-19.</p>	<p>federation CPD group of senior leaders; and, a co-ordinated system of school self-evaluation and peer review.</p> <p>The federation has enhanced links between the schools and the local community through the establishment of strategic partnerships involving education business partnerships, the local business education consortium, Connexions, Aimhigher, the LEA, HE and FE institutions, the LSC and work-based providers.</p>		
<p>DfES The Standards Site: Case studies.</p> <p>North Somerset 7</p> <p>Report date: undated</p> <p>www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk</p>	<p>North Somerset 7 is a federation of 6 specialist schools, 1 special school, 2 training colleges and 1 leading edge school. The federation works through a committee of the governing bodies with delegated powers under the 2002 Education Act.</p> <p>Governors have a steering group that deals with strategic planning and collaborations.</p> <p>Headteachers lead the Federation and the schools cannot afford to have an executive appointment to do the day to day work.</p> <p>There are two Federations in North Somerset and together with the LA there are a range of links, not least because the Federation has one more year left.</p>	<p>All the schools have their own governance and leadership systems.</p> <p>The Federation is a collaboration and co-operation has been, for example, to set up and deliver professional development activities.</p>	<p>There is self reported impact on the provision for students e.g. ICT portal, curriculum development.</p> <p>Impact on staff e.g. professional development sessions.</p> <p>Links with the other Federation and schools. There are discussions taking place, support for pupils at risk, and governor training.</p>	No details provided
<p>DfES The Standards Site: Case studies.</p> <p>West Wiltshire Federation</p> <p>Report date: undated.</p> <p>www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk</p>	<p>West Wiltshire's federation consists of 8 secondaries and 1 special school. It operates through a committee with delegated powers under the Education Act 2002, and is led by a federation project manager and a headteacher, who acts as permanent Chair of the federation.</p> <p>There is evidence of projects and collaborative work. The report does include concerns about how to involve and build trust.</p>	<p>All the schools retain their own governance and leadership structures.</p> <p>Report does talk about developing networks between people and schools, and the identification of group leaders.</p> <p>There are groups for: staff development co-ordinators;</p>	<p>There is self reported impact on:-</p> <p>It is expected that the coaching of teachers, Federation Quality Assurance, Strategy for behaviour management, 14-19 Curriculum will all have impact</p> <p>All students have seen benefit but no examples are provided.</p> <p>Teachers' professional development and</p>	No details provided.

	Collaborations seem to be about professional development of teachers; provision (14-19) and teaching and learning opportunities.	learning co-ordinators; literacy co-ordinators.	support has been through coaching, peer observation; sharing good practice; quality assurance. There are joint programmes for adult and child learners; support for members of the federation becoming extended schools; coordination of the 'specialist' community programmes of the different schools including both adult learners and primary schools.	
<p>Glatter, R. and Harvey, J. (2006a) <i>New Models of Headship, varieties of shared headship: a preliminary exploration</i>. Nottingham: NCSL.</p> <p>Glatter, R. and Harvey, J. (2006b) <i>New Models of Headship, varieties of shared headship: a preliminary exploration</i>. Nottingham: NCSL. Full Report.</p>	<p>A report of the current evidence about executive heads, federations and co- and dual headships.</p> <p>The authors identify that with the exception of federations there is limited evidence and what there is tends to be undertaken by those who are a part of the scheme.</p>	<p>Studies of executive heads focus on the leadership capacity and role of the single headteacher. There are varied views, though reports from the NCSL studies (e.g. Barnes 2005) claim positive impacts.</p> <p>The main study of the Federations by Lindsay et al. (2005) shows a range of approaches to leadership. Forming federations is challenging and requires strong leadership.</p> <p>Co- and dual headships: there are a range of models that vary from context to context. It is argued that there are no obvious patterns discernable across the schemes in operation.</p>	<p>While positive impacts are claimed there is little evidence about executive headship.</p> <p>There is a national evaluation of the federations programme and so the evidence base is more reliable. Overall, the impact of the federations is varied in regard to a range of organisational structures and leadership practices. An issue raised by this paper is the purpose of federations: 'are they only to nurse ailing schools back to health or is the model broader, for example, to conserve scarce leadership resource?' (2006a p5).</p> <p>Impact is difficult to discern regarding these models of headship. Not only because there are a number of schemes but also because the research tends to be done by those who are advocates.</p> <p>An important conclusion is that experiments with the design of headship may be helpful but more research is need, and it is important to examine the nature of the role and whether the demands could be reduced in order to retain those who hold single headships.</p>	No details provided
Grubb, W.N. and Flessa, J.J. (2006) A job too big for one: principals and other non-traditional approaches to school leadership. <i>Educational Administration Quarterly</i> . 42 (4) 518-550.	<p>Aim to find alternative designs to the hero principal role.</p> <p>Visit 10 schools who have a range of approaches to leadership. They examine the development of co-principals in a number of the schools. They</p>	<p>These cases show models of:</p> <p>Dividing the work of the principal up among two or more people.</p> <p>This can benefit through sharing</p>	<p>The benefits are:</p> <p>Sharing</p> <p>Always having someone with a leadership role on site.</p>	No details provided

	<p>also look at examples of rotating principals where decisions are made in teacher committees, and a school where four people run the school without a principal.</p>	<p>and also by enabling succession to be eased.</p> <p>There can be interchangeability where access is to more than one person as principal.</p> <p>There can be specialisation by the range of people in the principal/leader role.</p> <p>Rotating principals and team approaches mean that teacher leadership based on decision-making can be developed.</p>	<p>Succession can be eased when one person leaves.</p> <p>Morale and sense of community can be developed.</p> <p>However, the demands may not lessen for each person but might increase (like building a new road may not ease congestion but increases it!).</p> <p>Doing leadership on top of leadership means that it can lead to overload or 'distributed pain' rather than 'distributed leadership' (p535).</p> <p>Sharing can lead to higher costs in time and other resources. There has to be clarity in how people understand how to make the system work.</p> <p>The district (LA) has to support this and make it work.</p>	
<p>Innovation Unit</p> <p>Darlington Education Village – An All-Age School Federation</p> <p>Date of report: short statement on Innovation Unit Website, undated</p> <p>www.innovation-unit.co.uk</p> <p>See also:</p> <p>DfES/PwC (2007) <i>Independent Study into School Leadership</i>. London: DfES. p76-77.</p>	<p>Darlington Education Village is a 'hard governance' school federation, bringing together three schools - a primary, secondary and special - under one roof, one management structure and a single curriculum entitlement. The scheme has been part-PFI (Private Finance Initiative) funded and with a brand new build, with a single Governing Body. The Federation has developed a strategic committee for each school or 'phase' for overseeing individual school issues, reporting directly to the single Governing Body.</p>	<p>A diagram is available for the structure.</p> <p>There is an executive director, and underneath this role are:</p> <p>Director of Business Strategy and Development</p> <p>Director of Community. This role line manages: Extended School Leader and Specialist and Partner Schools Leader.</p> <p>Director of Inclusion, Teaching and Learning. Head of Beaumont Hill Special School. This role line manages: Head of Engagement and Intervention.</p> <p>Director of Teaching and Learning. Head of Springfield</p>	<p>No evidence in the web page information.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>

		<p>School. This role line manages: Foundation stage and wrap around care leader.</p> <p>Director of Teaching and Learning. Head of Houghton School. This role line manages: Head of Phase 2, KS2, 3; Head of Phase 3, 14-19; Pupil Progress and Standards Leader.</p>		
<p>Innovation Unit</p> <p>Serby Park – An All Age School</p> <p>Date of report: undated</p> <p>www.innovation-unit.co.uk</p> <p>See also: Elkin, S. (2007) Holds All Ages. <i>Teachers Magazine</i> May 2007, Issue 50. www.teachernet.gov.uk/teachers/issue50</p>	<p>Serby Park is a '3-18 Business and Enterprise Learning Community', an all-age school on three separate sites, from former infant, junior and secondary schools.</p> <p>Each school has a phase head (the former headteacher), with one as principal. There is a single governing body.</p>	<p>The school has an integrated governance and leadership system.</p> <p>There are cross phase teachers.</p> <p>It is reported that the all age means that instead of continuing the structures in the predecessor schools where traditionally there are more roles in secondary (due to funding) the aim is to develop a new form of leadership can be developed. It is reported that the intention is that leadership within the new school would be related to ability and the age of the pupils. With the aim that this can open huge benefits for talented and forward-thinking teachers. No details are provided as to what this looks like and how it works.</p>	<p>There are self reported gains in the creation of the all age school based on consultation. It is claimed that there are new attitudes to innovation and to focusing on teaching and learning.</p> <p>Low staff turnover is presented as a gain.</p>	<p>No details provided.</p>
<p>Innovation Unit</p> <p>Callington Federation in Cornwall</p> <p>Date of power point report: undated</p> <p>www.innovation-unit.co.uk</p>	<p>The Federation includes 11 primary and 1 secondary schools.</p> <p>The Federation is in two parts:</p> <p>(1) Three schools forming a 'soft federation' - Callington Community College, Delaware Primary School and Harrowbarrow Primary School. These are linked by an overarching Strategic Committee upon which representatives of all three governing bodies, staff and parents sit. Plan to become a hard federation with one governing body.</p>	<p>All the schools retain their own governance and leadership at the time of the report, but plan to become a hard federation.</p> <p>Evidence of collaborative management in provision of services and support.</p> <p>Sharing of teachers, working on transition arrangements, conferences and professional</p>	<p>Self reported evidence of impact around provision and changing cultures. Aim to apply to become a hard federation for the secondary plus 2 primary schools suggests that progress has been made through the soft stage of collaboration.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>

	<p>(2) Nine primaries are linked in a loose collaborative with this federation, sharing resources and linking ICT.</p> <p>Collaborate through joint aims, sharing resources, providing training etc.</p>	development.		
<p>Innovation Unit</p> <p>South Devon</p> <p>Date of power point report: undated</p> <p>www.innovation-unit.co.uk</p>	<p>Three schools: primary, secondary and special schools in federation.</p> <p>Collaboration between teachers to plan and deliver curriculum across the three schools.</p>	<p>Each school retains their own governance and leadership systems.</p> <p>Collaboration is through teacher and student movement between schools, and through joint curriculum planning between teachers in the schools. The opportunities for leadership exist through this collaborative work.</p>	Self reported evidence of activity such as joint planning, shadowing, and teaching.	No details provided
<p>Innovation Unit</p> <p>Next Practice in System Leadership Project with the NCSL.</p> <p>Undated. Accessed 2007.</p> <p>www.innovation-unit.co.uk/projects</p> <p>See also:</p> <p>www.ncsl.org.uk/research/nextpractice/</p>	<p>The Innovation Unit is conducting field trials.</p> <p>The brochure outlines examples of partnerships and federations e.g. Cumbria, West Wiltshire, Knowsley, Darlington, Leeds, Bedfordshire, Hartlepool, Chichester, Stevenage, Harris Federation in London, Winsford.</p> <p>A report has been produced that is undated but is called: <i>Leadership beyond a single institution, identification of next practice field trails</i>. This lists out:</p> <p>Central Leeds Learning Federation. Cumbria 14-19 Strategic Partnership. Darlington Education Village. Extended services in North Hartlepool. Knowsley System Leadership and Governance. Remaking Learning, Barnsley. Winsford Education Partnership. Yewlands Family of Schools, Sheffield. Chichester Community Alliance. Hailsham Partnership. Harris Federation of South London Schools. Haven, North East Essex. Queens Park Alliance, Bedford.</p>	<p>As yet there is no analysis of these trails or synthesis of emerging patterns.</p> <p>Main models presented are:</p> <p>Head of a school or unattached head take over federation leadership.</p> <p>Executive director oversees the strategic direction with directors taking on federation responsibilities.</p> <p>A single head or groups of heads jointly lead a failing school.</p> <p>Heads in a federation focus on teaching and learning, with a strategic Executive Head and expert governors take on the other work.</p> <p>Parents and community</p>	<p>As yet not outcomes formally presented. Short vignettes of what is happening are presented, and some are presented as case studies on the Innovation Unit Website, and these are presented as separate examples in this literature report.</p>	No details provided

	<p>Stevenage 14-19 Partnership. West Wiltshire Federation. 3Es Coalition: south east and west midlands.</p>	<p>members lead and manage community provision without a school. Learning will be experienced in the community, workplaces, voluntary organisations and the home.</p> <p>Provision of SEN and behaviour strategies across a number of schools led by a SEN headteacher.</p> <p>Creation of a new 14-19 agency where three heads hand over responsibility for provision to this organisation.</p>		
<p>Ireson, J. (2007) <i>A study of hard federations of small primary schools</i>. Nottingham: NCSL.</p>	<p>Study of four federations: Coedmor, Lampeter, Wales; Western Downland CE Aided, Hampshire, England; Dunbury, Dorset, England; Middleton and Beswick and Watton, East Yorkshire, England.</p> <p>While this is not an all through federation, it does provide some useful perspectives. In particular how small schools in a cluster can federate to protect and develop without a secondary school being involved.</p>	<p>The emphasis is on the headteachers leading the federation process. The four interviewed are committed to federating and see it as a moral imperative. The local authority is seen as being vital to enabling the federation be established and develop.</p> <p>There is self reported evidence of distributed leadership where roles and responsibilities had been developed for middle leaders.</p>	<p>Self reported gains in working conditions and achievements across the federations e.g. working in a collegiate way, succession planning, improving student learning, and keeping schools open. Finances are healthier.</p> <p>Concerns raised are about personal relationships, work-life balance when setting up the federation, some additional costs, travel time between sites, and the complexity of working across a range of communities with particular needs instead of one.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>
<p>James, C., Connelly, M., Dunning, G. and Elliott, T. (2007) Systemic leadership for schools and the significance of systemic authorization, <i>Educational Management Administration and Leadership</i>. 35 (4), 573-588.</p>	<p>Study of 18 high performing primary schools in Wales. While this is primary schools only there is interesting material here that is applicable to thinking about federations and all through schools.</p>	<p>The paper critiques the emphasis on leadership within an organisation. The paper uses examples of task (what a school has to do to survive) and roles (practices, positions). Examining task and roles with a system perspective requires a different approach to how authority is understood and practiced.</p>	<p>There is strong evidence of mutuality and support between schools and communities.</p> <p>When approaching systemic leadership there is a need to:</p> <p>Recognise local variation in the role of parents and the LA.</p> <p>Leadership in schools can enable community leadership and vice versa.</p> <p>Market based systems and policies restrict systemic leadership.</p>	

			There is a need to be more explicit about systemic relationships i.e. 'leadership for schools' rather than 'leadership of schools' (p584).	
Lee, A. (2007) <i>Leading in a collaborative context: experiences of headship in federated school structures in The Netherlands and the UK</i> . Paper presented to the BERA conference, London, September 2007.	<p>Study of one federation in England: five RC schools with two lower schools, two middle schools and one upper schools. Interviews have taken place with four headteachers, where the head of one of the middle schools is also the co-ordinator of the federation. Alan Lee is the head of the secondary school.</p> <p>The federation had been created due to concerns about the middle schools (rolls and outcomes).</p>	<p>The federation is emerging with collaboration between the heads. While gains have been made through joint planning, concerns are raised about the operation of the governing body that is large and may not know each individual school. In contrast with the Netherlands system a number of problems are highlighted:</p> <p>Lack of negotiation and consultant of role in the English federation compared with The Netherlands.</p> <p>Lack of time and increased stress in the English federation in comparison with The Netherlands.</p>	<p>A positive impact has been through the co-ordination and deployment of support staff.</p> <p>Varied views on whether impact had taken place in learning.</p> <p>The federation is seen as being 'early days' but the problem identified is that it had been created as a result of a crisis in the middle schools and so the type of planning and preparation evident in The Netherlands had not taken place.</p>	No details provided
<p>Lindsay, G., Muijs, D., Harris, A., Chapman, C., Arweck, E., and Goodall, J. (2007) <i>Evaluation of the Federations Programme. Final Report</i>. London: DfES.</p> <p>Nb. This is a final draft. Nb. The report does not differentiate between Federations which include a range of schools and Federations which are secondary only.</p>	<p>Nine case studies and questionnaire survey of 27 Federations.</p> <p>Comparison of KS outcome and absence rate data with non-project schools.</p> <p>A range of structures, models, approaches and experiences are presented in this study.</p>	<p>Headteacher leadership (alongside DfES financing) is seen as crucial to the success of the Federations.</p> <p>There is strong evidence of the dominance of headteachers in the formation and development of Federations.</p> <p>Directors of Federations who were not also headteachers were recognised as taking on a facilitative role.</p> <p>Middle managers were not very involved in initiating the Federation. Patterns of involved varied from those who had the</p>	<p>Heads and governors are overwhelmingly positive about the impact of the leadership on the success of the federation.</p> <p>Respondents are very positive about the role of governors in the development of the Federation.</p> <p>The importance of personal characteristics in making Federations is noted as an important factor in success.</p> <p>Recognition of the impact of the Federation is variable, and many initiatives based on the collaboration where not necessarily branded as such.</p>	No details provided

		<p>opportunity to take on federation wide roles to those who did not witness any changes to their work or the classroom.</p> <p>Variation in governance structures remained, with different arrangements within even the 'hard' types of Federations.</p> <p>Distributed leadership arrangements are varied.</p>		
<p>Mongon, D. (2007) Notes on next practice system leadership. Unpublished.</p>	<p>Notes made on systemic leadership.</p>	<p>Presents an analysis of leadership structures, themes and processes.</p> <p>Structures: Federated leadership Locality leadership Community leadership</p> <p>Themes: Federated leadership is associated with leadership for teaching and learning. Locality leadership is associated with leadership for 14-19 collaboratives. Community leadership is associated with ECM.</p> <p>Processes, can be across structures and themes: Leadership can: put theme before structure, put strong emphasis on outcomes; tolerates slow burn as have a shared history; engages system sponsor; nurtures networks; uses external challenge; is comfortable with distributed authority; places high premium on student and community voice.</p>	<p>This thinking is helpful in regard to issues such as responsibility. Concludes that next practice system leadership needs new forms of governance, not least because of federated governing bodies, ad hoc boards, brokerage boards, and not for profit companies.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>

<p>Rikowski, G. (2005) <i>Federation Starships? The Evolution of Federations of Schools in England</i>. Paper presented to the Education Policy Research Seminar, University College Northampton, February 2005.</p>	<p>The paper charts the emergence and development of Federations.</p>	<p>The emphasis in the paper is on how private business interests can be advantaged through the Federations programme. Hence leadership is about developing a business culture based on contracting and profit making.</p>	<p>The trends identified in the paper are for the growth of private sector involved in the delivery of educational provision.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>
<p>Swidenbank, H. (2007) <i>The Challenges and Opportunities of Leading and Managing an All-Age School</i>. Nottingham: NCSL.</p>	<p>Study of all-age schools by interviews with senior and middle leaders in four of the five all-age, single institution state schools.</p>	<p>No description is given of the organisation or leadership roles and responsibilities. The interviewees are reported as talking about how the opportunities for leadership had happened through distributed leadership.</p>	<p>No evidence provided.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>
<p>Thomson, P. and Blackmore, J. (2006) Beyond the power of one: redesigning the work of school principals. <i>Journal of Educational Change</i>. 7, 161-177.</p>	<p>Australian Research Council funded project on principal supply. This paper focuses on redesign of the role of the principal in a range of Australian schools.</p> <p>Aims to reconnect leadership and management through examining the process and product of professional attitudes and practices.</p>	<p>The paper presents a number of case studies:</p> <p>Sharing pedagogical knowledge construction: formation of research and project teams in schools to develop teaching and learning.</p> <p>Sharing responsibility and resources to create greater access and equity: formation of a formal curriculum and staff sharing network.</p> <p>Co-principalship for a family friendly workplace: sharing of the role and the workload.</p> <p>Multi-campus: with one principal, seven campuses and five sites; seven deputy principals/campus leader-managers. One business manager and seven finance officers, one for each campus. One governing body. Joint staff development. Senior managers (principals, campus manager and finance managers) meet weekly.</p>	<p>While redesign can be technical and based on looking at the nature of work, it is more effective if redesign is linked to the bigger picture. Notably redesign on a large scale needs to have 'a coherent and meaningful ethical and political (spiritual and moral perhaps) purpose' (p175). Hence they argue that 'principal professional development might well turn its attention to building a repertoire of redesign modalities which support and build up principal agency, rather than reiterating research findings and one-best formulae' (p176).</p>	<p>No details provided</p>

		Community based leadership: indigenous community give authority to principal, and give guidance. Principal must listen to teachers, parents and community.		
Wohlstetter, P., Malloy, C.L., Chau, D. and Polhemus, J.L. (2003) Improving Schools Through Networks: a new approach to Urban School Reform. <i>Educational Policy</i> , 17 (4), 399-430.	<p>Presents case study of The Annenberg Challenge and Los Angeles.</p> <p>Established collaborations across grades, schools and disciplines. Emphasis on sharing information about the curriculum, instruction and students by parents and educators.</p>	<p>Establishment of leadership roles and teams to bring about reform. Different models some had decision-making teams and some where about communication.</p> <p>Most effective leadership took place in networks or 'families' where there is a strong connection between leadership, organisational capacity and performance. There is a need to inter-connect, support, communicate and buffer the 'family' from too much turbulence in the policy context (p423). Leadership was like architecture with the building of teams and interconnections through brokering information.</p>	<p>Networks, formal organisations and collaborative practice can be successful in bringing about reform, but this needs leadership as a form of architecture, brokerage and facilitation. Where the power to make decisions is devolved then this form of leadership is essential.</p>	No details provided

Appendix 4: Academies

Source	Features: Emerging Structures	Features: Leadership, Management, Governance	Impact	Policy and Regulatory Guidance re the implementation of structural change
Beckett, F. (2007) <i>The Great City Academy Fraud</i> . London: Continuum.	Study of the historical and contemporary development of the academy programme.	Shows the dominance of the sponsor in the selection and sustainability of the principal in post. Presents evidence of high turn over of Principals with an average of time in post as six months (p127). Presents evidence of the domination of the governance of academies by sponsors.	Provides evidence and raises concerns about the aims and outcomes of the academies programme for the provision of public education. Identifies that much of what is taking place is not open to public scrutiny.	No details provided
DCSF/Standards Site www.dcsf.gov.uk	Description of academies: what they are, a directory of academies and supporting documentation.	Identifies the key role of the Principal with a senior management team in “in leading their Academies towards excellence”. The emphasis is on working with the sponsors and partners in developing the ethos and planning. No mention of teachers or the wider workforce in decision-making.	Two examples of innovation are provided: City of London Southwark Academy (opened September 2003) where student involvement in decision-making is emphasized through the work of the school council. Unity City Academy, Middlesbrough (opened September 2002) where the emphasis is on developments in teaching and learning.	This website outlines the rationale for and process of becoming an academy.
DfES/PwC (2007) <i>Independent Study into School Leadership</i> . London: DfES.	Reports visiting an academy where ‘there was both a local school-level governing body and a ‘meta’ or ‘parent’ board working across a number of Academies’ (p75).	A case study is provided that explains how the parent governing body or Academy sponsor decides policy and the local school governing body decides how to implement. The parent governing body decides on finance, and local governing body deals with school day, curriculum, timetable and recruitment. The local governing body is made up of parents, staff, and sponsor	No evidence is provided.	No details provided

		representatives.		
Gorard, S. (2005) Academies as the 'future of schooling': is this an evidence-based policy? <i>Journal of Education Policy</i> 20 (3), 369-377.	Study of DfES data from the annual school census and standards website, focusing on three (Bexley, Haringey, and Middlesborough) academies.	No particular focus on the organisational arrangements in the academies. However, the paper identifies that sponsors, governors, principal can admit up to 10% of intake by selection and so this can impact on claims for improvement.	Changes in GCSE outcomes can be attributed to fall in students who are eligible for FSM rather than "innovative approaches to management, governance, teaching and the curriculum" (375). However, limited evidence at this stage has not prevented claims of success being made by the government and the academies.	No details provided
Hatcher, R. (2007) <i>Selling Academies: local democracy and the management of 'consultation'</i> . Paper presented to the BELMAS conference, Reading, September 2007.	Case study of the formation of one academy in Bradford. Was a successful school and academy status has faced opposition.	Using the process of the setting up of the academy to show that governance is based on the public as consumers rather than decision-makers.	Hatcher shows through an analysis of the consultation process is "an example of a governance network in action, designed to construct compliance in consumerist terms and exclude opposition" (p5).	No details provided
Innovation Unit (2007 accessed) <i>Next Practice in System Leadership Project with the NCSL</i> . www.innovation-unit.co.uk/projects	Vignette of the Harris Federation of South London Schools, London. This is a hard Federation of six academies, which operates with one board of trustees. There is a CEO, a single board of governors.	Leadership is a priority and there is a bespoke federation wide masters programme. There is flexible leadership deployment and federation succession management strategies.	No evidence provided.	No details provided
Needham, C. and Gleeson, D. (2006) <i>Academy Schools: case unproven</i> . London: Catalyst and Public World collaborative report for the NASUWT.	A study of the development and evidence about academies based on published evidence and interviews.	No specific focus on governance, leadership and management, but does highlight the concerns about terms and conditions of service, and accountability. Evidence is presented from case studies of parent interest groups and how parent power is operating in ways different to what New Labour would like: campaigning for community schools, saving schools threatened with closure, and against academies being set up.	The interviews show that: (a) principals are leading change; (b) there is immense pressure to meet targets and national standards; (c) they are in a goldfish bowl of being under a lot of scrutiny. The report notes the high turn over in academy principals. The report concludes that: "academies need to be developed as partners with local schools, rather than competitors, which requires sensitivity to a range of issues, including how to deal with surplus school places" 61.	No details provided
Prentice, C. (2007) <i>The Harris Foundation of South London Schools</i> . London: SSAT.	Leaflet circulated by the SSAT. This outlines what the Harris Federation is about, information about governance and how it operates.	Governance: Lord Harris chairs the Federation Board which sets central policies. Each academy has its own governing body that implements policies. No information is provided about	Too early to make clear judgements on the whole of the Federation. Longer standing members of the Federation e.g. Harris CTC are noted as having received an 'outstanding' OfSTED report in 2007.	No details provided

		leadership and management. Emphasis is placed on Principals as being appointed to and trained with the brand.		
PricewaterhouseCoopers (2007) <i>Academies Evaluation, Fourth Annual Report</i> . London: DfES.	Study of the progress of academies through surveys, interviews, examination of data sets.	Evaluation of structures and roles with a hierarchy of decision-making: sponsors, governors, principal.	The Executive Summary states that strong and stable leadership is critical in setting vision and strategy in start up period. Sponsors are generally seen as a positive element, particular resources and networks. Some sponsor-principal relationships are based on mentoring and some are hands off. The report emphasizes the importance of strong leadership in transforming a previously failing school. Principals are generally highly regarded by sponsors, staff parents and pupils. Claims are made of new leadership models developing, particularly with executive principals supporting a group of schools.	No details provided
Rogers, M. and Migniuolo, F. (2007) <i>A New Direction, a review of the school academies programme</i> . London: TUC.	The TUC commissioned The Children's Services Network to review the academies programme. They contacted all 46 Academies open in January 2007, and received replies from eight.	Responses show that staff feel they have less involvement in decision-making. The sponsor need not have teachers on the governing body though there is evidence that they do. Concerns exist about how sponsors may influence the curriculum. The report recognises the way that principals/headteachers of academies have 'turned round' failing schools.		DfES (2007) prospectus <i>400 Academies: Prospectus for Sponsors and Local Authorities</i> , is analysed in this report, and the argument is made that Local Authorities are being brought back in with acknowledgement in the title and the importance of the link between local provision and academies. However, the report does highlight continued concerns over the dominance of private interests through the academies programme.
Wilby, P. (2007) Multiple Choice. <i>EducationGuardian</i> , Tuesday 20 th November 2007, p5.	Report on Oldham which is responding to racial unrest and division in the town by focusing on social cohesion. Reports on plans to set up multi-faith academies.	The report focuses on the types of sponsors and also how existing heads are considering the issue of the location of schools and enabling mixing.	One example of a multi-faith academy in London is reported as having failed to bring about mixing in 2005. The aim in Oldham is seen as ambitious but also a risk worth taking.	No details provided
Woods, P., Woods, G. and Gunter, H.M. (2007) "Academy schools and entrepreneurialism in education" <i>Journal of Education Policy</i> . 22, (2) 263-285.	The paper is a web based survey of the setting up of academies in England. The emphasis is on sponsors and the conceptualisation of entrepreneurialism.	The research shows the dominance of sponsor values and aims in the setting up of academies. The emphasis is on the sponsor as lead person or organisation in establishing the values and purposes of the academy.	The research shows that there is a lack of diversity in sponsorship with the dominance of male entrepreneurs and Christian faith groups.	No details provided

<p>Woods, P., Gunter, H. and Woods, G. Project funded by the British Academy 2007-2008, titled: <i>Entrepreneurialism, leadership and organisational reform in the public sector: the case of an independent state school in the inner city.</i></p>	<p>This project is examining the setting up and development of a case study academy in an urban area. The study has a specific focus on leadership.</p>	<p>The project has only just begun and so there are no published findings as yet. A paper was given at BELMAS in 2007 which outlined the pre-project baseline work with the senior staff and sponsors. This early work shows the strong role of sponsors and the emphasis of the principal as a transformational leader.</p>	<p>Not yet applicable.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>
--	---	--	----------------------------	----------------------------

Appendix 5: Trusts

Source	Features: Emerging Structures	Features: Leadership, Management, Governance	Impact	Policy and Regulatory Guidance re the implementation of structural change
<p>DfES (2006) <i>Trust Schools Toolkit</i>. London: DfES.</p>	<p>The policy overview identifies the gains that a range of partners can bring through a Trust school.</p>	<p>The approach to leadership is that it needs to be 'strong' because it 'gives schools a clear sense of purpose and direction and makes sure that resources and effort are focused on increasing opportunity and raising standards' (p5). The document does not say who should exercise this leadership.</p> <p>Governing body is the place to explore and agree a Trust status application. A trust can be a collaboration or a federation.</p>	<p>No details are provided of evidence of impact as a support for this policy.</p>	<p>How to establish a Trust School is the main aim of this document.</p>
<p>Demos (2007) <i>School Governance Scenarios</i>. London: Demos.</p>	<p>The development of trust schools has implications for governance: new partners, freedom to innovate, federations, opportunities for dynamic school leadership.</p>	<p>The report presents different scenarios:</p> <p>Conglomerate or branded schools with entrepreneurial leadership. E.g. like Tesco with a CEO.</p> <p>The Community or like a political federation (e.g. USA), with community governance. Questions are raised about the location of power between the centre and the locality i.e. can a head veto?</p> <p>The Alliance e.g. NATO with collaboration and pooling of resources. Will need diplomatic forms of leadership and possibility military styles in order to get things done on the ground.</p> <p>The self organising network e.g. peer review, Wikipedia, eBay. Leadership would emerge from within the community, through peer recognition.</p>	<p>Each of the scenarios has different implications for how leadership, leading and leaders are conceptualised. The key issue is authority: who has it, how is it exercised, and to what effect?</p> <p>How do current governance and political arrangements interconnect with these scenarios? Issues of accountability, communication, decision-making. Is there a role for the local authority? Is there a role for central government?</p>	<p>No details provided</p>

		<p>Employee owned school network: teachers would own the school in partnership. Leadership would be from partnership professionals.</p> <p>Consumer Governed School with parent trusts governing and leading the school. Common in Scandinavia and US. Governance through a school council, with parents being actively involved in performance management, budgets and could be balloted on policy changes.</p>		
<p>DfES/PwC (2007) <i>Independent Study into School Leadership</i>. London: DfES.</p>	<p>The report notes the case made for Trust schools:</p> <p>'an individual school working with a Trust; a group of local schools in a Trust arrangement; and a geographically dispersed group of schools; while partners in the Trust arrangements could include (amongst others): local businesses; higher and further education institutions; and voluntary or charitable groups' p75.</p>	<p>No particular details are provided.</p>	<p>No particular details are provided.</p>	<p>No details provided</p>

References

- Ainscow, M. and Howes, A. (2007) Working together to improve urban secondary schools: a study of practice in one city, *School Leadership and Management*, 27 (3), 285-300.
- Ainscow, M., Muijs, D. and West, M. (2006) Collaboration as a strategy for improving schools in challenging circumstances, *Improving Schools*. 9, 192-202.
- Ainscow, M., West, M. and Nicolaidou, M. (2006) Supporting Schools in Difficult Circumstances: the role of school to school cooperation. In: Ainscow, M. and West, M. (eds) *Improving Urban Schools*. Maidenhead: OUP.
- Arnold, R. (2006) *Schools in collaboration: federations, collegiates and partnerships*. Sough: EMIE at NFER.
- Banks, A., Finn, C., Bora, S., Lee, K and Watson, C. (2002) *Two Heads Better Than One?* Nottingham: NCSL.
- Barnes, I. (2005) *New Models of Headship, Primary Executive Heads. A study of heads who are leading more than one primary school*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- Beckett, F. (2007) *The Great City Academy Fraud*. London: Continuum.
- Chapman, C. and Allen, T. (2006) Collaborative reform for schools in difficulty. *Improving Schools*. 9 (3), 291-301.
- Coleman, A. (2006) *Collaborative Leadership in Extended Schools*. Nottingham: NSCL.
- Collins, A., Ireson, J., Stubbs, S., Nash, K. and Burnside, P. (2006) *New Models of Headship, Federations. Does every Primary School need a Headteacher? Key implications from a study of federations in The Netherlands*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- Coulton, S. (2006) *Getting our heads together, shared leadership of a collaborative school improvement project*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- Court, M. (2003) *Different Approaches to Sharing School Leadership*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- Demos (2007) *School Governance Scenarios*. London: Demos.
- DfES (2006) *Trust Schools Toolkit*. London: DfES.
- DfES/PwC (2007) *Independent Study into School Leadership*. London: DfES.

- DfES/PwC (2007 accessed) *DfES Standards Site: Case Studies*. www.standards.dcsf.gov.uk
- Elkin, S. (2007) Holds All Ages. *Teachers Magazine* May 2007, Issue 50. www.teachernet.gov.uk/teachers/issue50
- Gorard, S. (2005) Academies as the 'future of schooling': is this an evidence-based policy? *Journal of Education Policy* 20 (3), 369-377.
- Glatter, R. and Harvey, J. (2006a) *New Models of Headship, varieties of shared headship: a preliminary exploration*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- Glatter, R. and Harvey, J. (2006b) *New Models of Headship, varieties of shared headship: a preliminary exploration*. Nottingham: NCSL. Full Report.
- Grubb, W.N. and Flessa, J.J. (2006) A job too big for one: principals and other non-traditional approaches to school leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 42 (4) 518-550.
- Gunter, H. and Butt, G. (2007a) A Changing Workforce, in: Butt, G. and Gunter, H. (eds) *Modernizing Schools: people, learning and organizations*. London: Continuum.
- Gunter, H. and Butt, G. (2007b) Leading a Modernized School, in: Butt, G. and Gunter, H. (eds) *Modernizing Schools: people, learning and organizations*. London: Continuum.
- Harris, S. (2005) *Faith, Hope and Charity: setting out to create a new culture in merging schools*. Nottingham: NSCL.
- Hatcher, R. (2007) *Selling Academies: local democracy and the management of 'consultation'*. Paper presented to the BELMAS conference, Reading, September 2007.
- Hatcher, R. (forthcoming) Systemic leadership, networks and the question of power. Forthcoming.
- Hollins, K., Gunter, H., and Thomson, P. (2006) Living improvement: a case study of a secondary school in England. *Improving Schools*. 9 (2) 141-152.
- Innovation Unit (2007 accessed) *Case studies of federations*. www.innovation-unit.co.uk
- Innovation Unit (2007 accessed) *Next Practice in System Leadership Project with the NCSL*. www.innovation-unit.co.uk/projects
- Ireson, J. (2007) *A study of hard federations of small primary schools*. Nottingham: NCSL.

- James, C., Connelly, M., Dunning, G. and Elliott, T. (2007) Systemic leadership for schools and the significance of systemic authorization, *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*. 35 (4), 573-588.
- Lance A., Rayner, S. and Szwed, C. (2007) Challenging and changing role boundaries, in: Butt, G. and Gunter, H. (eds) *Modernizing Schools: people, learning and organizations*. London: Continuum.
- Lee, A. (2007) *Leading in a collaborative context: experiences of headship in federated school structures in The Netherlands and the UK*. Paper presented to the BERA conference, London, September 2007.
- Lindsay, G., Arwek, E., Chapman, C., Goodall, J., Muijs, D. and Harris, A. (2005) *Evaluation of the Federations Programme*. London: DfES. First and Second Interim Reports.
- Lindsay, G., Muijs, D., Harris, A., Chapman, C., Arwek, E. and Goodall, J. (2007) *Evaluation of the Federations Programme*. London: DfES.
- Lumby, J. and Morrison, M. (2007) *Leading a community in partnership: leadership theory under pressure*. Paper presented to the BERA conference, London, September 2007.
- Lumby, J. and Morrison, M. (Forthcoming) *Collective leadership of local school systems: power, autonomy and ethics*.
- Mongon, D. (2007) Notes on next practice system leadership. Unpublished.
- NCSL (2006) *Leading Beyond the School. Evaluating the impact of the Primary Strategy Consultant Leaders*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- Needham, C. and Gleeson, D. (2006) *Academy Schools: case unproven*. London: Catalyst and Public World collaborative report for the NASUWT.
- Paterson, F. (2006) *New Models of Headship: co-headship*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- Prentice, C. (2007) *The Harris Foundation of South London Schools*. London: SSAT.
- PricewaterhouseCoopers (2007) *Academies Evaluation, Fourth Annual Report*. London: DfES.
- Rayner, S. and Gunter, H. (2007) Remodelling Leadership, in: Butt, G. and Gunter, H. (eds) *Modernizing Schools: people, learning and organizations*. London: Continuum.
- Rikowski, G. (2005) *Federation Starships? The Evolution of Federations of Schools in England*. Paper presented to the Education Policy Research Seminar, University College Northampton, February 2005.

- Rogers, M. and Migniuolo, F. (2007) *A New Direction, a review of the school academies programme*. London: TUC.
- Swidenbank, H. (2007) *The Challenges and Opportunities of Leading and Managing an All-Age School*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- Thomas, H., Butt, G., Fielding, A., Foster, J., Gunter, H., Lance, A., Pilkington, R., Potts, E., Powers, S., Rayner, S., Rutherford, D., Selwood, I., and Szwed, C. (2004) *The TSW Pathfinder Project: Final Report*. Report to the DfES. 157 pages.
- Thomas, H., Butt, G., Fielding, A., Foster, J., Gunter, H., Lance, A., Pilkington, R., Potts, E., Powers, S., Rayner, S., Rutherford, D., Selwood, I., and Szwed, C. (2004). *The TSW Pathfinder Project: Final Report*. 32 individual reports to the Pilot Schools. About 40 pages each.
- Thomson, P. and Blackmore, J. (2006) Beyond the power of one: redesigning the work of school principals. *Journal of Educational Change*. 7, 161-177.
- Wilby, P. (2007) Multiple Choice. *EducationGuardian*, Tuesday 20th November 2007, p5.
- Wohlstetter, P., Malloy, C.L., Chau, D. and Polhemus, J.L. (2003) Improving Schools Through Networks: a new approach to Urban School Reform. *Educational Policy*, 17 (4), 399-430.
- Woods, C. (2007) *School Business Director Programme Scoping Study*. Nottingham: NCSL.
- Woods, P., Woods, G. and Gunter, H.M. (2007) "Academy schools and entrepreneurialism in education" *Journal of Education Policy*. 22, (2) 263-285.
- Woods, P., Gunter, H. and Woods, G. (2007-2008) *Entrepreneurialism, leadership and organisational reform in the public sector: the case of an independent state school in the inner city*. Project funded by the British Academy.