

International Studies in Educational Administration

Journal of the Commonwealth
Council for Educational
Administration & Management



CCEAM

Volume 47 • Number 1 • 2019

International Studies in Educational Administration by the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM). Details of the CCEAM, its headquarters in Australia and its affiliated national societies throughout the Commonwealth are given at the end of this issue.

Enquiries about subscriptions and submissions of papers should be addressed to the editor, Associate Professor David Gurr via email at: admin@cceam.org; website: www.cceam.org.

Commonwealth

Members of CCEAM receive the journal as part of their membership. Other subscribers in Commonwealth countries receive a discount, and pay the Commonwealth rates as stated below. Payment should be made to the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM).

The rest of the world

Subscribers in the rest of the world should send their orders and payment to the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM).

Account details for all payments are as follows

Account name: Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration c/o Dr. Patricia Briscoe

Bank: Royal Bank of Canada, 2855 Pembina Hwy – Unit 26, Winnipeg, MB, R3T 2H5

Institution number: 003

Transit number: 08067

Account number: 1009232

Swift code: ROYCCAT2

Subscription rates for 2019

Institutions, Commonwealth	£150
Institutions, rest of world	£170
Individuals, Commonwealth	£30
Individuals, rest of world	£35

Contents

Editorial Note DAVID GURR	1
Social Justice Work as Activism: The Work of Education Professionals in England and Jamaica PAUL MILLER, NOLA P. HILL-BERRY, KADIA HYLTON-FRASER AND SHERNETTE POWELL	3
Successful Principalship: Beyond Leadership Practice and Teacher Agency JEANNE HO AND PAUL MENG-HUAT CHUA	20
Principals' Leadership Practices in Guiding Professional Learning Communities to Institutionalization YAMINA BOUCHAMMA, DANIEL APRIL AND MARC BASQUE	38
Research on Educational Administration Published in Arabic Language Educational Journals: A Systematic Review and Analysis AREF ATARI AND NUHA OUTUM	61
The Influence of Self-Efficacy on Principal Job Satisfaction: A Study of One Northeastern USA State KERRY L. POSTMA AND GERARD BABO	74
Headteacher-in-Residence: An Authentic Approach to Leadership Preparation MARGERY MCMAHON AND JACKIE PURDIE	89

Headteacher-in-Residence: An Authentic Approach to Leadership Preparation

Margery McMahon and Jackie Purdie

Abstract: *University-based leadership education can present a particular challenge as leadership educators need to combine a unique academic and professional knowledge base and skillset. This paper reports on and discusses how one university-based provider responded to this particular challenge as a new, national leadership programme for school principals was introduced and rolled out. ‘Headteacher-in-residence’ developed as a result of collaboration between Scotland’s largest education authority, Glasgow City Council and University of Glasgow, one of the providers of Scotland’s new Into Headship programme. The imperative to maintain a close connection to leadership practice underpinned aspirations for the new programme. It was from this that the model of ‘Headteacher-in-residence’ evolved. Conceptualised as similar to models such as artist or writer-in-residence, this paper reports on how the model has been operationalised, how it works in practice, the benefits it brings and the challenges which have been encountered. The paper concludes by arguing that the Headteacher-in-residence model represents a unique approach to overcoming the perceived theory-practice divide and to showing how, working with schools, school leaders and local authorities, leadership education can be realised in partnership.*

Keywords: Principals; leadership learning; partnership; ‘close to practice’; leadership education

Introduction

The formalising and credentialing of preparation for school principalship has highlighted the question of who should be involved in this and who leadership educators are. In many education systems principal preparation is provided through Schools and Faculties of Education in universities, through independent or semi-autonomous leadership colleges such as the recently established Centre for School Leadership in Ireland (CSL) or the National Academy for Educational Leadership in Wales. In Scotland, the context for this paper, the

Scottish College for Educational Leadership (SCEL) was set up in 2014 and was subsequently incorporated into Education Scotland (the national improvement agency) in 2017, similar to the fate of the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) which became part of the Department of Education in 2013 (Gov.UK online).

The Scottish College for Educational Leadership was established as one of the recommendations arising from a review of teacher education and school leadership in Scotland in 2011 (Donaldson 2011). This *Teaching Scotland's Future* (TSF) report also recommended that:

A clear, progressive educational leadership pathway should be developed, which embodies the responsibility of all leaders to build the professional capacity of staff and ensure a positive impact on young people's learning. Account should be taken of the relationship between theory and practical preparation, including deployment to developmental roles. (Donaldson 2011: 79)

The implementation of the Donaldson recommendations required a review of existing provision for principal and school leader preparation to align with a new *Framework for Educational Leadership* (SCEL 2019a). A new headship programme was planned by a National Design Group involving key stakeholders. This *Into Headship* programme would build on the original Scottish Qualification for Headship (SQH) programme that was introduced in 1998.

This paper explores how one university provider responded to the opportunity afforded by the development of the new programme to introduce a new model of programme delivery involving the secondment of a practising headteacher in a newly created role of Headteacher-in-residence. The paper begins with a discussion of the theoretical underpinnings of the model that was eventually adopted. It considers the question of who leadership educators are and how they become involved in these roles before turning to discuss the *Into Headship* programme and the collaborative model of Headteacher-in-residence which was adopted. In its conclusion the paper considers the impact of the approach and ways in which it could be developed further.

Theory into Practice; Practice into Theory

The theory-practice divide (Flores 2016) has persisted as an ongoing challenge in teacher and leader preparation in education. Pragmatic responses to this include short-term secondments and more fully developed models, for example, partnership models and professional development schools.

The *Teaching Scotland's Future* (Donaldson 2011) report placed strong emphasis on the need for greater partnership and collaboration with school-based staff. Specifically, Recommendation 24, relating to staffing, proposed that:

Flexible staffing models for initial teacher education, induction and CPD should be developed by local authorities and the universities to allow movement of staff

and dual appointments as well as potentially improving coherence (Donaldson 2011: 93).

Although this recommendation was seen to pertain to teacher education more broadly, the proposition of great fluidity across the sites of leadership preparation and the potential for dual appointments was apposite, given the timing of the redesign of headship preparation programmes as part of the TSF reform programme. Schön (1987), in particular, makes the case for those embarking on a profession to learn alongside a master practitioner. Earley (2009: 307) indicates that school leaders cite working alongside head teachers as the 'single most powerful learning opportunity in their development'. The inclusion of a 'Headteacher-in-residence' on headship preparation programmes is an innovation which facilitates this approach. Furthermore, one of the greatest challenges facing new headteachers is the emotional demands of the job, which seem to be at their most intense during the early period of professional and organisational socialisation. In redesigning our headship programmes it was therefore important to incorporate an emphasis on this area. Using the lived experience of the 'Headteacher-in-residence' was one means of doing this.

Particularly important is the fact that headship programmes involve preparation for a role where there are high degrees of unpredictability, which is challenging. It would be unrealistic to second-guess every conceivable crisis which could emerge in headship. What can be predicted, however, is that a crisis will transpire and thought as to how this is prepared for is a focus of our programmes. Frequently, there is no text-book response to such situations and headteachers then act from their value base and their tacit knowledge, based on what they have learned from the handling of previous unpredictable situations. They are operating in what Schön (1987: 6) describes as 'indeterminate zones of practice' (IZP) which escape technical rationality or solution, but which are pertinent to professional practice. Thus, our programme aims to prepare aspiring and novice headteachers for such indeterminate zones of practice.

In Vygostkian (1978) terms, we have given consideration as to what scaffolding can be put in place to prepare headteachers for, and support them through, these challenging times. In simple terms, openly discussing the perplexing aspects of headship helps demystify them by signalling they are a 'normal' part of growth and development in headship and not an indication of failure. In discussing IZP, we also consider the role of emotions in education decision making (Bolton & English 2010: 575). They aim to deconstruct the logic/emotion binary which has dominated leadership preparation, and to establish the role of emotions in decision making as normal: 'We believe that educational leadership curricula should similarly be recast to be more inclusive of the role of emotion as a response to a decision event' (p. 575). Again, the experience of the Headteacher-in-residence allows us to address this area, focusing on tacit knowledge gained from reflection on previous experience and explaining this to course participants.

In examining the artistry of professional practice, Schön (1987) contends that we need to consider what master practitioners do in indeterminate zones of practice and in some way make their tacit knowledge explicit. Tacit knowledge is crucial as it is the reserve from which experienced headteachers draw when they are operating in situations they have not previously experienced. As Wright (2009: 265) asserts, tacit knowledge and educational theory provide ‘... conceptual insights that inform thoughts about practice’ rather than providing templates for action which must be rigidly followed. Thus, both have to be accessed in headteacher preparation and this blending of theory and experience is crucial to our programme design.

Schön (1987) posits that developing professional artistry is best addressed by adopting the methods of design studios or musical conservatories, where there is freedom to learn from master practitioners in low risk circumstances (p. 17). Unfortunately, low risk circumstances do not at present exist for aspiring and novice headteachers, apart from those who have had some experience, in acting positions, where they temporarily cover an absence or vacancy. Creating a reflective practicum for aspiring and new headteachers is challenging, but vital, in supporting them (as well as acting and aspiring head teachers) in their early days in post. As well as providing practical and moral support, a crucial aspect of such a practicum would be in ‘demystifying’ some of the practice of headship, particularly where it relates to dealing with situations in indeterminate zones of practice.

If a practicum is ‘a setting designed for the task of learning a practice’ (Schön 1987: 37), the question arises as to how exactly one learns to become a headteacher, given that, for most new headteachers the greatest surprise of headship lies in the emotional intensity of the role and the realisation that the ultimate responsibility in the school lies with them. Since this emotional intensity seems to be something which actually has to be experienced, it cannot therefore happen until after appointment, which is problematic in creating a practicum. The key questions would appear to be how opportunities to operate within indeterminate zones of practice are to be provided for aspiring and novice head teachers and what support can be offered to new headteachers experiencing these indeterminate zones. The underlying content and format of the *Into Headship* programme aims to address this.

The Headteacher-in-residence model builds on the concept of leader maturity (Earley & Jones 2010) and endeavours to utilise this in the preparation of new headteachers:

Research by the Hay Group (2008) notes the differences between established leaders who show strengths in such matters as political awareness, indirect influencing, alliance-building skills and long-term thinking and planning, and emergent leaders and those on fast-track programmes who often do not... these qualities and skills are associated with leadership maturity... so how can leadership maturity be accelerated as well as leadership and management skills developed? (Earley & Jones 2010: 87)

Collins (2008) contends that people do not only learn from experience, but also their reflection on experience. Providing opportunities for reflection for new and aspiring headteachers is a

key issue in headteacher development and is fundamental to our headship programmes. Reflection on action creates a space in which the individual may increase their belief in their self-efficacy by considering the actions they took. For Rhodes (2012: 444) greater self awareness and promotion of self efficacy and self-belief is part of talent management and the journey to leadership, drawing from Bandura (1977) who suggests that self-efficacy has an important contribution to make to behaviour, particularly in challenging circumstances (Bandura 1977 as cited in Rhodes 2012: 444). This was confirmed by research undertaken by Purdie in 2014 where 'the head teachers have indicated that their confidence increased following the successful handling of early crisis situations, and their subsequent reflection on them' (p. 153). However, it is the interaction of reflection on such challenging circumstances and not simply the circumstances themselves that contribute to the development of self-efficacy. Thus, it is important that reflection on action takes place as it helps to make explicit the thought process, feelings and emotions involved in handling a variety of situations, particularly where these were complex or fraught. As thoughts are being articulated, the individual comes to a greater understanding of self and how they handled a particular situation. If the outcome is positive, this may also contribute to an increase in self-belief, which is important in establishing identity as a headteacher, particularly in the early days in post. Put succinctly, reflection helps people learn from experience (Brookfield 1995; Collins 2008; Dewey 1910; Earley & Bubb 2013; Schön 1983). Thus, there is an emphasis within the programme on the use of a reflective journal to support reflection on their work, particularly in relation to challenging circumstances.

That this need for reflection has great importance is discussed further by Schön (1987) who highlights an important area, which needs consideration in headship:

In the varied topography of professional practice, there is a high, hard ground overlooking a swamp. On the high ground, manageable problems lend themselves to solution through the application of research-based theory and technique. In the swampy lowland, messy, confusing problems defy technical solution. The irony of this situation is that the problems of the high ground tend to be relatively unimportant to individuals or society at large, however great their technical interest may be, while in the swamp lie the problems of greatest human concern. (p. 3)

Headship 'in the swamp' is openly discussed throughout our programmes, as, according to Wright (2009: 265), 'In the swamp, everyday experiences are rich sources of learning that may be provoked by tension, chaos, struggle, uncertainty, conflict and dilemma.' Open discussion of such difficult issues serves the purpose of making new and aspiring heads (who may be experiencing 'swampy' situations) aware of the fact that they are not alone. This is important particularly when they are dealing with the insecurities which arise during early socialisation experiences, both at a personal and an organisational level, when it is all too easy to make the assumption that they may have misjudged a situation. It is important that novice headteachers understand that such experiences are an essential and inevitable part of headship and not necessarily attributable to any failure on their part. This is about more than

raising awareness, however. It is about helping new headteachers understand their developmental journey.

Sergiovanni (2001: 2) elucidates Barth's (1980: xv) contention that, although problems and challenges of education may be similar, the solutions are particularly idiosyncratic and that, effective leaders 'have resigned themselves to the difficult task of having to create their practice in use as they make decisions' (Sergiovanni 2001: 2). If head teachers know about this in advance and understand that it is part of their developmental journey as a headteacher this may relieve some of the emotional intensity of the early days by reducing anxiety caused by 'swampy' situations.

Leadership Educators

As the discussion above has shown, there is a strong case for the involvement of experienced headteachers (Schön's master practitioner) in designing and facilitating principal/headship preparation courses. Leadership education presents a particular challenge as leadership educators need to combine a unique academic and professional knowledge base and skillset and the 'specificity of headship' adds a further specialist dimension. The need to be able to demonstrate successful and extended field experience as a school leader frequently conflicts with the recruitment requirements of universities where research publications and grant capture are important selection criterion. Qualification to doctoral level is usually seen as a minimum entry requirement.

Moving directly from headship/principalship to an academic position is unusual since the intense and all-encompassing nature of the headship role leaves little time to gain the additional requirements that an academic role requires. In the Scottish context the number of headteachers with a doctoral qualification remains small. Sometimes this can mean that staff involvement in leadership education occurs more by accident than design, where programmes may be led by academic staff with limited or little leadership experience in schools, with the risk that, as Johnson (2016 citing Farkas et al. 2003; Levine 2005) reported in the American context, 'many university educational leadership professors are unaware of the day-to-day experiences of principals' (p. 16).

One of Johnson's (2016: 27) conclusions from his research with 64 school leaders is that 'meaningful leadership preparation is a process, and universities are not the sole dispensers of preparation for leader candidates'. A partnership model which involves local authority / district bodies as well as other stakeholders is seen to be important. Johnson (2016: 27) argues that 'adequate preparation will require a continuum of aligned professional learning experiences collaboratively delivered through universities, state boards of education, local school districts, individual leaders in candidate needs, and community stakeholders'.

Young (2015: 3-10), in outlining the requirements for the Educational Leadership Preparation Award (ELP Award) lists among the areas applicants must address for the award as:

Partnerships: What kinds of partnerships inform the program? How have district personnel influenced and/or informed the program?

Faculty: How many faculty teach in this program? Do program faculty represent expertise from the research and practice communities? How does the program ensure that its faculty have the capabilities to prepare effective educational leaders? How do faculty members work together to design, improve, and deliver the program? (Young 2015: 7).

Young (2015) is optimistic that the quality of leadership preparation programmes has improved yet is realistic that ‘changing the reputation of educational leadership preparation will be no small feat’ since the criticisms of leadership preparation are deeply engrained (p. 5). Overcoming perceptions among principals that university-based programmes have not prepared them adequately is a particular challenge, with more job-embedded learning and coaching models seen to be more attractive (Johnson 2016: 26). From his review of the literature as part of his study, Johnson (2016: 26 citing Martin & Papa 2008) found that ‘theory was listed among the least-used areas taught in university leadership preparation programs and that this supports the belief that preparation programs are based too heavily in theory and, not in practice’.

The *Into Headship* programme, which is the focus of this paper, was introduced in 2015 and as yet there has not been an independent evaluation. However, an evaluation commissioned by Education Scotland in 2019 found that participants from across five cohorts valued input from experienced headteachers and that the programme supported growth in participants’ confidence in relation to strategic leadership (SCEL 2019b). The nature of the programme is now considered before exploring how the role of Headteacher-in-residence was conceived and developed.

Into Headship

The *Into Headship* programme was introduced in Scotland in 2015. The programme replaced the Scottish Qualification for Headship (SQH) which was the original programme for headship preparation, first introduced in 1998. *Into Headship* built on the SQH model but was designed to be responsive to policy and sector needs for a pipeline of new headteachers able to lead schools through a significant phase of change and improvement. While SQH was a 24-month programme at postgraduate diploma level, *Into Headship* was designed to be completed within one year as a postgraduate certificate. A new ‘In Headship’ programme was designed to provide further accredited learning for novice headteachers so that completion of *Into* and *In Headship* formed a postgraduate diploma award. While both programmes are optional, the expectation was that all new headteachers would have completed *Into Headship*, particularly as the qualification is to become compulsory for all new headteachers from 2020.

The redesign of the headship preparation programme was driven by a number of factors. Paramount was the need to recruit more leaders to headship roles. Although a small education system there has been a challenge, nevertheless, in recruitment to headteacher roles. In an effort to redress this a new 'Flexible Route to Headship' was introduced in 2007 where participants were required to demonstrate attainment of the *GTCS Standard for Headship* (GTCS 2012) but were not required to undertake a university-based programme. Nevertheless, future headteachers were not coming forward in the numbers that the system required resulting in the growth in shared and executive headships.

A study by MacBeath et al. (2009) identified key deterrents to be the scale and expectations of the role while the academic demands of the SQH were also reported. The challenge in designing a new programme for headship preparation was to address the system and sector requirements that also align with university requirements for academic programmes while meeting the individual needs of headteachers.

One of the criticisms, latterly, of the SQH and FRH, from both participants and employers, was that completion of the programmes for demonstrating attainment of the *Standard for Headship* took too long. This presented a particular challenge for the national design team for the new programme. A key question was how to design a programme that built on the most essential and successful features of SQH / FRH in reconceptualising a programme that was academically and professionally robust and benchmarked against international research and best practice. Drawing on research evidence from Scotland (MacBeath et al. 2009; Watt, Bloomer, Christie, Finlayson & Jaquet 2014) and internationally (inter alia, Bush & Glover 2014; Walker & Hallinger 2015), the *Into Headship* programme was designed as a one-year headship preparation programme, benchmarked against the *Standard for Headship* (GTCS 2012) and informed by research by a current headteacher on headship preparation (Purdie 2014). The programme combined a number of integrated elements: the university based programme, a school-based mentor, a coach, and, as part of the final assessment, a professional verifier (a local headteacher with at least five years' experience).

As a postgraduate certificate (60 credits)¹ the design model for the one-year programme was one 20 credit course on 'Developing as a strategic leader' and one 40 credit course on 'Leading Strategic Change'. The focus on strategic leadership, as an underpinning driver, reflected policy imperatives to attract and prepare new headteachers capable of responding to strategic priorities of the National Improvement Framework (NIF) (Scottish Government 2019) with a focus on closing the poverty-related attainment gap. Constructed in this way the programme needed to be 'close to practice' (Wyse, Brown, Oliver & Poblete 2018) and close to policy, while helping aspiring headteachers to be able to critique and respond to both, in the process of attaining the academic and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions to be able to undertake the role of headteacher. This represented a considerable mandate for *Into Headship*

¹ In the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework a postgraduate certificate constitutes 60 credits at Masters level.

providers and in the following section we discuss how one university provider sought to address this challenge.

Headteacher-in-Residence

University-based programmes for principal preparation seek to remain ‘close to practice’ (Wyse et al. 2018) in various ways and to varying degrees. This may be through adjunct faculty, for example, short-term secondments, appointments as full-time teacher fellows or sessional work post retirement. In such models, staff are no longer working actively day-to-day as a headteacher in school, whether on a temporary or full-time basis.

Headteacher-in-residence developed as a result of collaboration between Scotland’s largest education authority, Glasgow City Council and University of Glasgow, one of the providers of Scotland’s new *Into Headship* programme. Through Headteacher-in-residence we sought to test a model where the headteacher could do both roles – remain in their role as a Principal/Headteacher while also being part of the academic leadership team for the *Into Headship* programme.

As a key focus of the new programme is on strategic leadership, in a rapidly changing policy context, an underpinning concern in programme design was to ensure that the courses that aspiring headteachers would take would equip them to respond to this. A key question was how to ensure the university-based programme would address the needs of new headteachers and be designed in ways in which their learning on the programme could be translated into and applied to practice while providing scope and space within the programme to reflect critically on and process formative, and often challenging, leadership learning experiences.

From this, the model of Headteacher-in-residence was conceived and implemented. In redesigning the programme, the university-based team determined that their model of partnership needed to go beyond more traditional models of advice, consultation, co-design and even co-delivery. It needed to reflect the current, real life experiences of headteachers in the process of change. The Headteacher-in-residence model was designed to achieve this. This was seen to be different from a tutor role, nor was it a mentor role. In seeking to name this, the closest approximation seemed to be the model of artist or writer ‘in residence’ – an expert practitioner, *in situ*, who shares their accomplished practice with primarily, though not exclusively, novice practitioners, and who advises on initiatives and developments for the field and discipline which they represent.

The Headteacher-in-residence was seconded from a large local secondary school for initially one day per week. As the programme developed this was increased to two days per week. The exact nature of their contributions was nonprescriptive though ‘journeying’ with the cohort was an important underpinning feature. The Headteacher-in-residence was involved in the recruitment and selection of new programme participants. They were a central part of the programme team – advising on approaches that might be appropriate, recent policy

initiatives at a local level that were relevant and feeding back on participant experiences and learning. In the initial phase of the programme their contextual knowledge at local authority level was significant in setting up the programme for professional verification. Co-teaching was an important aspect including scaffolding and processing participants' reflective experiences and responses to school-based tasks.

Beyond this however the symbolism of the role was important. Previously in the SQH programme, most taught sessions took place off campus so the university's role in headship preparation seemed remote and less visible. In contrast, all taught sessions for *Into Headship* took place within the university and the Headteacher-in-residence helped to raise the profile of headship and leadership preparation within the School of Education. In addition to working directly with *Into Headship* participants, they participated in research seminars; engaging with postgraduate students and facilitating connections; contributing to marking and examination boards and attending design group meetings.

The Headteacher-in-residence has now 'journeyed' with five cohorts of *Into Headship* participants. Feedback from participants indicates that this is an important element in their headship learning. It has been particularly satisfying for the Headteacher-in-residence to follow the growth and development of the participants, particularly as they transition into post. The relationships built during the in-course learning have continued as an available source of support for the novice headteachers, if requested.

The model appears to be effective in bridging theory and practice and helping to translate practice to theory. In bringing the skills and expertise of headship to the academic world, as an effective organisational leader themselves, the Headteacher-in-residence could query and challenge university procedures and processes and help shape outward engagement with schools and school leaders. Insider knowledge of the local authority meant they were also a conduit between the local authority and the university. As an established headteacher with over 12 years' experience, the Headteacher-in-residence also brought insider knowledge of the role, with sound professional credibility across the local authority and with headteacher peers, which was important in supporting new and aspiring headteachers. The local authority partnership was further enhanced as the Headteacher-in residence had a role within the local authority in leadership development. This resulted in a suite of local programmes which are coherent with the *Into Headship* programme. Whilst not compulsory, these programmes have provided a useful bridging step for senior leaders contemplating the national programme.

A further dimension of the role was the new challenge that it provided for an experienced headteacher. One of the concerns of the Donaldson report (2011) was the need to provide advanced professional learning opportunities for experienced headteachers. Headteacher-in-residence provided opportunities to engage with wider academic and research activities within the university as well as presenting papers at national and international conferences. The impact for the school from which the Headteacher-in-residence was seconded was also important, enabling the deputy headteacher to gain further experience and responsibility.

Headteachers are required to commit to lifelong enquiry and learning, as well as ensuring a systematic approach to the culture of professional learning within their establishment (GTCS 2012); they are the lead learner within their school. The role of Headteacher-in-residence provides a practical means of demonstrating career-long professional learning. An additional benefit of the role is, by gaining knowledge within the university sector, the Headteacher-in-residence is better equipped to signpost members of school staff towards professional learning opportunities within the university.

Given the range of activities outlined above, managing the scale and scope of the role was important, with the risk that, depending on the model of the secondment, it could be two jobs. Communication and clarification about roles and responsibilities was important but as the role evolved it was clear that it transgressed multiple roles. Adjusting to and repositioning in a new (foreign) environment with little knowledge of university procedures/systems was also a challenge, as the functioning of a university clearly differs from that of a school where daily contact with the school community is an essential facet of school leadership. A degree of professional isolation therefore had to be overcome, adjusting to working alone as a new experience. A new aspect of professional identity for the Headteacher-in residence was the readjustment to teaching experienced practitioners (as opposed to young people) and a shift in focus from being the lead learner in a relatively cohesive environment.

Conclusion

Headteacher-in-residence was developed as an innovation between one university and local authority to try to ensure closer alignment and narrow the professional and academic interface. In some respects it pre-empted the recommendations of a Scottish government review of teachers' career pathways which was published in 2018 (Scottish Government 2018). Specifically, in relation to headteachers, it was recommended that 'new and developing career pathways for Headteachers within and beyond Headship should be recognised including new opportunities in system leadership' (p. 9). The review panel supported future initiatives to build the capacity and capability of experienced and established headteachers recommending that:

Opportunities should be created for placements or, where possible, exchanges with other key stakeholders such as Education Scotland, Scottish Government, GTCS, universities and professional associations. This would strengthen the connections between and enable greater shared learning among the key partners within Scottish Education and contribute to the empowered schools system while allowing experienced educationalists to build their career in new ways. (Scottish Government 2019: 9)

This is an ambitious vision which forms part of a national improvement agenda focusing on empowering schools and their communities through recently created regional improvement collaboratives (RICS) (Scottish Government 2019). It is a dynamic policy agenda in which the

role of the headteacher is enhanced through a new Headteachers' Charter. Headship preparation programmes need to be responsive to this, educating new headteachers to critique and enact policy in the context of their school communities. Headteacher-in-residence is one approach to realising this, ensuring leadership learning at this level is relevant and current to the needs of headteachers while providing a means for experienced headteachers to develop further, professionally and academically, as part of a university-based team.

Research evidence demonstrates that close partnership working contributes to effective leadership preparation programmes. Korach et al. (2019) recognise the balancing of priorities that this requires and so 'the tension between contextual training and conceptual development presents a rationale for university–district partnerships that are co-constructed' (p. 32). The Headteacher-in-residence model represents one approach towards realising such co-construction.

References

- Barth, R. S. (1980). *Run School Run*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bolton, C., & English, F. (2010). De-constructing the logic/emotion binary in educational leadership preparation and practice. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(5) 561-578.
- Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know? *School Leadership & Management: Formerly School Organisation*, 34(5) 553-571.
- Collins, N. (2008). Wise up or you'll find life's a snore. *Times Educational Supplement*, 4 January 2008.
- Dewey, J. (1910). *How We Think*. New York, NY: Heath & Co.
- Donaldson, G. (2011). Teaching Scotland's Future: Report of a Review of Teacher Education in Scotland (retrieved from <https://www2.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/337626/0110852.pdf>).
- Earley, P. (2009). Work, learning and professional practice: The role of leadership apprenticeships. *School Leadership & Management*, 29(3), 307-320.
- Earley, P., & Bubb, S. (2013). A day in the life of new headteachers: Learning from observation. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(6), 782-799.
- Earley, P., & Jones, J. (2010). *Accelerated Leadership Development*. London, UK: London Institute of Education.
- Flores M. A. (2016). Teacher Education Curriculum. In: J. Loughran & M. Hamilton (Eds.), *International Handbook of Teacher Education* (pp. 187-230). Singapore: Springer.
- General Teaching Council Scotland (GTCS). (2012). The Professional Standards. Edinburgh: GTCS (retrieved from <https://www.gtcs.org.uk/professional-standards/standards-for-registration.aspx>).
- Gov.UK. (2013). National College for School Leadership (retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/national-college-for-school-leadership>).
- Johnson, A. D. (2016). Principal perceptions of the effectiveness of university educational leadership preparation and professional learning. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 11(1) 14-30.
- Korach, S., Anderson, E., Hesbol, K., Tabron, L., Candelarie, D., Kipp, P., & Miller-Brown, E. (2019). Interdependence and reciprocity: Partnership ethos at the University of Denver. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 14(1) 31-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1942775118819679>

- MacBeath, J., Gronn, P., Opher, D., Lowden, K., Forde, C., Cowie, M., & O'Brien, J. (2009). *The recruitment and retention of headteachers in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government Social Research.
- Purdie, J. (2014). Key Factors in Early Headship Development in the Scottish Secondary School Sector: Analytical auto ethnography. Unpublished thesis, University of Glasgow (retrieved from <http://theses.gla.ac.uk/5718/>).
- Rhodes, C. (2012). Should leadership talent management in schools also include the management of self-belief? *School Leadership & Management*, 32(5), 439-452.
- Schön D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate.
- Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Scottish College for Educational Leadership. (2019a). SCEL Framework (retrieved from <https://www.scelframework.com/about/>).
- Scottish College for Educational Leadership (2019b). *Into Headship Evaluation* (unpublished).
- Scottish Government. (2018). Independent Report on Career Pathways for Teachers (retrieved from <https://www.gov.scot/publications/independent-panel-career-pathways-teachers-final-report/>).
- Scottish Government. (2019). National Improvement Framework (retrieved from <https://www.gov.scot/policies/schools/national-improvement-framework/>).
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *Leadership: What's in it for schools?* Oxon, UK: Routledge-Falmer.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (reprinted 1978). *Mind in Society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walker, A., & Hallinger, P. (2015). A synthesis of reviews of research on principal leadership in East Asia. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(4), 554-570.
- Watt, G., Bloomer, K., Christie, I., Finlayson, C., & Jaquet, S. (2014). Evaluation of Routes to Headship (retrieved from <https://www.webarchive.org.uk/wayback/archive/20170111102846/http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2014/03/8057>).
- Wright, L. (2009). Leadership in the swamp: Seeking the potentiality of school improvement through principal reflection. *Reflective Practice*, 10(2), 259-272.
- Wyse, D., Brown, C., Oliver, S., & Poblete, X. (2018). *The BERA Close-to-Practice Research Project: Research report*. London: British Educational Research Association.
- Young, M. (2015). Effective leadership preparation: We know what it looks like and what it can do. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 10(1), 3-10.

Author Details

Margery McMahon
 School of Education
 University of Glasgow
 Email: margery.mcmahon@glasgow.ac.uk

Jackie Purdie
 Headteacher-in-Residence,
 University of Glasgow and Glasgow City Council
 Email: Jacqueline.Purdie@glasgow.ac.uk