Department for Education

Evidence on school leadership in an international context

Research report

August 2018

Professor David Greatbatch and Sue Tate

GSR
GOVERNMENT SOCIAL RESEARCH
Social Science in Government

Contents

Table of figures 5

Executive summary 9

- Research objectives 9
- Scope of the review 9
- Methodology 9
- Key Findings 10

Chapter 1 Introduction 12

- Background 12
- Research aims and objectives 12
- Structure of the report 13

Chapter 2 Methodology 14

- Selection of Countries 14
- Review protocol 14

Chapter 3 Estonia 16

- Overview 16
- Leadership Demographics 17
- Styles of Leadership 21
- Leadership Activities 23
- Continuing Professional Development 25

Chapter 4 Finland 28

- Overview 28
- Leadership Demographics 29
- Styles of Leadership 32
- Leadership Activities 36
- Continuing Professional Development 38

Chapter 5 Germany 43

- Overview 43
- Leadership Demographics 44
- Styles of Leadership 47
- Leadership Activities 50
- Continuing Professional Development 53

Chapter 6 The Netherlands 54
Overview 54
Leadership Demographics 55
Styles of Leadership 58
Leadership Activities 62
Continuing Professional Development 64
Chapter 7 Canada 67
Overview 67
Leadership Demographics 69
Styles of Leadership 78
Leadership Activities 80
Continuing Professional Development 87
Chapter 8: Singapore 89
Overview 89
Leadership Demographics 90
Styles of Leadership 94
Leadership Activities 96
Continuing Professional Development 97
Chapter 9 Comparisons between the countries 101
Initial training requirements and professional experience 101
Recruitment procedures 102
Age 103
Gender 104
Employment status 105
Salary 105
Leadership Styles and Activities 108
Continuing Professional Development 109
Chapter 10 Conclusion 111
Chapter 11 Evidence gaps 113
Appendix A: Summary of findings for selected countries 114
Bibliography 127
Estonia 127

Finland 128
Germany 129
The Netherlands 131
Canada 132
Singapore 135
Comparisons and conclusions 136

Table of figures

Table 3.1: Teaching experience and training required before appointment as a school principal in Estonia....17

Table 3.2: The employment status of school principals in lower secondary education in Estonia (TALIS 2013) 19

Table 3.3: The percentage of school principals in lower secondary education in Estonia in different age groups (TALIS 2013)....19

Table 3.4: Gender of school principals in Estonia (2015) 20

Table 3.5: Gender of school principals at the lower secondary level in Estonia (TALIS 2013) 20

Table 3.6: Average salary for a school principalin an Estonian public school, 2012. 21

Table 3.7: percentage of principals of lower secondary schools in Estonia who report a shared responsibility for the following leadership activities/tasks: (TALIS 2013) 21

Table 3.8: School principals instructional leadership activities in lower secondary education in Estonia (TALIS 2013) 22

Table 3.9: The proportion of 15-year old students in schools in Estonia where principals reported a high frequency of certain management activities during the last school year (TIMSS 2011) 24

Table 3.10: Percentage of principals of lower secondary schools in Estonia who report having engaged in the following activities related to a school development plan in the 12 months prior to the survey (TALIS 2013) 24

Table 3.11: Professional development for school principals in Estonia 25

Table 3.12: Participation rates, types and average number of days of professional development reported to be undertaken by principals of lower secondary school Estonia in the 12 months prior to TALIS (2013) 26

Table 4.1: Teaching experience and training required before appointment as a school principal in Finland 29

Table 4.2: The employment status of school principals in lower secondary education in Finland 30

Table 4.3: The percentage of school principals in lower secondary education in Finland in different age groups (TALIS 2013)....31

Table 4.4: Gender of school principals in primary and secondary education (basic education) in Finland (EUROSTAT)....31

Table 4.5: Gender of school principals in primary and secondary education in Finland (2017) 31

Table 4.6: Gender of school principals at the lower secondary level in Finland (TALIS 2013) 32

Table 4.7: Minimum and maximum annual gross statutory salaries for school principals (in EUR) in Finland, 2013/14....32

Table 4.8: percentage of principals of lower secondary schools in Finland who report a shared responsibility for the following leadership activities/tasks: (TALIS 2013) 33

Table 4.9: Percentage of students in schools in Finland whose principal reported that he/she engaged with staff in certain activities (PISA 2012) 34

Table 4.10: School principals instructional leadership activities in lower secondary education in Finland (TALIS 2013) 35

Table 4.11: Percentage of school principals of lower secondary schools in Finland who report having engaged in the following activities related to a school development plan in the 12 months prior to the survey (TALIS 2013) 35

Table 4.12: The proportion of grade 4 and grade 8 students in Finland whose school principals report that they spend ‘no time’, ‘some time’ or ‘a lot of time’ monitoring students’ learning progress to ensure that the school’s educational goals are reached ..37

Table 4.13: The proportion of grade 4 and grade 8 students in Finland whose school principals report that they spend ‘no time’, ‘some time’ or ‘a lot of time’ initiating educational projects or improvements: 37

Table 4.14: The proportion of 15-year old students in schools in Finland where school principals reported a high frequency of certain management activities during the last school year (TIMSS 2011) 38

Table 4.15: Professional development for school principals in Finland....38

Table 4.16: The proportion of grade 4 and grade 8 students in schools in Finland where school principals participated in professional development activities specifically for school principals....40

Table 4.17: participation rates, types and average number of days of professional development reported to be undertaken by principals of lower secondary school Finland in the 12 months prior to TALIS (2013)....41

Table 5.1: Frequency of instructional activities for school principals in Germany 48

Table 5.2: School principals with Grade 4 students in Germany: time spent monitoring certain activities (EU average in brackets)....51

Table 5.3: Proportion of 15-year old students in schools in Germany where school principals reported a high frequency of certain management activities during the last school year, 2009 51

Table 5.4: School principals’ priorities in Germany 52

Table 6.1: School leader competence standards for primary and secondary education in the Netherlands 56

Table 6.2: Employment status of school principals in the Netherlands 57

Table 6.3: Minimum and maximum annual basic gross statutory salaries for school principals in the Netherlands (in EUR) 58

Table 6.4: Shared responsibility for leadership activities in lower secondary education in the Netherlands 59

Table 6.5: Collaboration between teachers and principals in lower secondary education in the Netherlands (TALIS 2013) 60

Table 6.6: School principals in the Netherlands with Grade 4 students: time spent monitoring certain activities (EU average in brackets) 62

Table 6.7: Proportion of 15-year old students in schools in the Netherlands where school principals reported a high frequency of certain management activities during the last school year, 2009 63

Table 6.8: Percentage of school principals in the Netherlands who report having engaged in the following activities related to a school development plan in the 12 months prior to the survey 63

Table 6.9: School principals' recent professional development in lower secondary education in the Netherlands 64

Table 7.1: School principal demographics in Alberta, Canada.....69

Table 7.2: School principal certification requirements and responsibilities in Canada 71

Table 7.3: School principals' perceptions of the match between the actual and the ideal level of responsibility for selected tasks in Canada.....83

Table 8.1: Teaching experience and training required before appointment as a school principal in Singapore 90

Table 8.2: The employment status of school principals in lower secondary education in Singapore (TALIS 2013) 91

Table 8.3: Age of school principals in primary education in Singapore (2015).....91

Table 8.4: Age of school principals in secondary education in Singapore (2015) 92

Table 8.5: Age of school principals in primary and secondary education combined in Singapore (2015) 92

Table 8.6: The percentage of school principals in lower secondary education in Singapore in different age groups (TALIS 2013).....93

Table 8.7: Gender of school principals in Singapore (2015) 93

Table 8.8: Gender of vice principals in Singapore 93

Table 8.9: percentage of school principals of lower secondary schools in Singapore who report a shared responsibility for the following leadership activities/tasks (TALIS 2013) .95

Table 8.10: School principals instructional leadership activities in lower secondary education in Singapore (TALIS 2013) 96

Table 8.11: Percentage of principals of lower secondary schools in Singapore who report having engaged in the following activities related to a school development plan in the 12 months prior to the survey (TALIS 2013) 97

Table 8.12: Professional development for school principals in Singapore 98

Table 8.13: Participation rates, types and average number of days of professional development reported to be undertaken by principals of lower secondary school Singapore in the 12 months prior to TALIS (2013) 100

Table 9.1: Professional experience and initial training requirements 101

Table 9.2: Recruitment procedures 103

Table 9.3: Age profile of school principals (TALIS 2013) 104

Table 9.4: Gender of school leaders 104

Table 9.5: Gender of school leaders in primary schools 104

Table 9.6: Gender of school leaders in Lower secondary schools 105

Table 9.7: Employment status of school principals 105

Table 9.8: Basic annual statutory salary of school principals 107

Table 9.9: participation rates, types and average number of days of professional development reported to be undertaken by principals of lower secondary schools 12 months prior to TALIS (2013) 109

Executive summary

Government recognises the vital importance of school leaders in the education system. This review is designed to inform policy development in this area by providing a comprehensive review of school leadership demographics, practices and Continuing Professional Development (CPD) in six countries with high-performing school systems.

Research objectives

The aims of the review were to:

- Understand the demographics of school leadership in the selected high-performing countries
- Understand the evidence of 'what works' in these countries, in relation to the selection and development of school principals and the styles of leadership used in schools

Scope of the review

The review focussed on 6 countries with high-performing systems of education: Estonia, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Canada and Singapore.

Methodology

Review protocol

The evidence review was guided by a protocol that detailed the procedures to be followed in the review in relation to: search terms/keywords; sources of evidence; the screening process each study should pass through for inclusion in the review; and the processes for recording and storing references and summarising literature.

Literature searches

Evidence was gathered through searches of online bibliographic databases and the websites of national and international organisations in the field of education. The searches were limited to evidence reported in the English language.

Study Selection

Once studies had been identified, they were assessed for eligibility against the research questions, using a three-stage approach to reviewing the title, abstract and full text.

Potentially eligible articles were then collected and examined more closely to assess their quality.

Synthesis and analysis

The findings from the individual studies included in the review were summarised, synthesized and critically evaluated under the key headings and research questions agreed with DfE.

Key Findings

With the exception of Singapore, the countries have an ageing workforce and are experiencing difficulties attracting and retaining school principals. This is consistent with the situation in many countries with established education systems.

In many OECD[1] and non-OECD countries, shortages of school leaders may be exacerbated by gender imbalance, with women making up the majority of teachers but the minority of school leaders. This may be the case in Finland, the Netherlands and Canada (Alberta) where the proportions of female principals are lower than the OECD average. It is noteworthy, however, that Estonia is facing a shortage of school leaders despite having substantially more female than male principals at both primary and secondary levels.

In Canada, Estonia, Finland, Germany and the Netherlands aspiring school leaders can self-nominate to train as a school principal - without a guarantee of a job - and then apply for a position in a school. Singapore, however, uses a markedly different approach, which involves the Ministry of Education identifying and developing school teachers who demonstrate leadership potential and establishing a ‘pipeline’ that provides a steady flow of school leaders.

In Estonia, Finland, Singapore and some provinces of Canada aspiring school principals are required to have a recognised leadership qualification before they can be appointed as the head of a school. This is not the case in Germany, the Netherlands and the remaining Canadian provinces; however most aspiring principals do nonetheless complete a relevant training course in these countries.

Aspiring principals must have teaching experience in Estonia, Singapore, Germany, and some Canadian provinces. Teaching experience is not generally required in the

[1] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

remaining Canadian provinces, the Netherlands or Finland - although those selected for a permanent post in Finland are usually recruited from among experienced teachers.

School principals in Finland, Germany and Alberta (Canada) are considerably more likely than those in Singapore, the Netherlands and Estonia to have teaching responsibilities.

School principals are on average paid substantially more in the Netherlands and Canada than in Estonia, Finland and Singapore. Comparable figures are not available for Germany.

There appears to be an emphasis on distributed leadership - in which a range of staff in schools share the school principals' traditional responsibilities - across all the countries considered in the review, apart from Germany. However, it is difficult to draw lessons on the potential impact of the use of distributed leadership because the term is used to refer to diverse arrangements, which involve varying degrees of involvement of stakeholders in decision-making processes.

Instructional leadership - which involves school principals focusing on student learning and teacher practice - is generally valued amongst school principals in the six high performing countries. Nonetheless, it is not widely practiced due to a range of factors, including lack of time available to principals and, in some countries, the pedagogical independence of teachers and/or delegation of instructional leadership.

In Estonia, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands and Canada, professional development for school principals from pre-primary to upper secondary education is optional and is not necessary for promotion. In contrast, Singapore applies a systematic and compulsory approach to the leadership development of school principals.

Currently there is a varied array of CPD programmes for school leaders on offer across and within the countries.

Singapore and Estonia have put systems in place that are designed to ensure that CPD programmes are linked to key leadership competencies. There is less consistency in the approaches adopted in the other countries, although there have been calls for this issue to be addressed in Finland.

There is a lack of research on the suitability of borrowing and adapting elements of CPD models in countries with high performing education systems as a basis for reform in other countries (including England).

Chapter 1 Introduction

Background

Teachers and leaders in schools are the bedrock of our education system. Evidence suggests that teacher quality and the quality of school leaders in particular is of paramount importance. Consequently, the Department for Education (DfE) has undertaken evidence gathering and reviews on aspects of school leadership and commissioned this research in order to increase understanding of international practices.

Research aims and objectives

The report is based on a rapid review of evidence on leadership in six countries with high performing education systems. The aims of the evidence review were to:

1. Understand the demographics of school leadership in the selected high-performing countries
2. Understand the evidence of 'what works' in these countries, in relation to the selection and development of school leaders and the styles of leadership used in schools

The specific objectives of the review were to:

- Summarise evidence concerning the initial training and professional experience, recruitment, employment status, age, gender and salary profile of school principals in the selected countries.
- Bring together evidence on the use of distributed leadership (the ability of school principals to incorporate different stakeholders in their decision-making processes) and instructional leadership (the involvement of principals in improving teaching and learning), both of which are widely seen as key aspects of effective school leadership.
- Examine the literature on school principals' initial training and professional development in the selected countries.
- Synthesise and critically assess the evidence and identify evidence gaps.

The outcomes of the evidence review will be used to inform policy development and to help deliver to the Department's ambition for preparing the workforce in England for leadership.

Structure of the report

The report structure is as follows:

Chapter 1 Introduction

Chapter 2 Methodology

Chapter 3 Estonia

Chapter 4 Finland

Chapter 5 Germany

Chapter 6 The Netherlands

Chapter 7 Canada

Chapter 8 Singapore

Chapter 9 Comparisons between the countries

Chapter 10 Conclusion

Chapter 11 Evidence gaps

Appendix A Summary of findings by country

Bibliography

Chapter 2 Methodology

Selection of Countries

We selected the six countries included in this review for the following reasons:

- They are amongst the 12 countries identified by the Center on International Education Benchmarking as having high performing school systems based on students' achievement in science, mathematics and reading in the 2015 PISA results
- These countries also feature in either the World Economic Forum's 2016 Global Competitiveness Report[2] (Estonia), NJ Med's World Top 20 Education Poll in 2016 (Germany, Canada,) or both (Finland, the Netherlands, Singapore)
- Finland, Germany, the Netherlands and Estonia are geographically close to England
- Canada and Singapore, like England, have two cycles rather than three in compulsory education
- Like England, Estonia and Finland have a national curriculum, while Canada has common curricula (which are set by provincial governments rather than at national level)

Review protocol

The evidence review was guided by a protocol that detailed the procedures to be followed in the review including: the search terms/keywords; the locations/sources to be searched; the screening process each study will pass through for inclusion in the review; and the processes for recording and storing references and summarising literature. This ensured consistency and transparency in the execution of the review.

Literature searches

Evidence was gathered through online searches, relevant bibliographic databases and reference searches. The searches were limited to studies published in the English

[2] https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-competitiveness-report-2016-2017-1

language. Admissible literature included research studies (qualitative and quantitative), relevant reports and articles from authoritative sources.

Study Selection

Once studies had been identified, they were assessed for eligibility against the following inclusion criteria (using a three-stage approach to reviewing the title, abstract and full text):

- Includes reference to school leadership in the selected countries
- Considers leadership demographics, styles of leadership, leadership activities, CPD

Once all potentially eligible articles had been collected, the articles were examined more closely to assess their quality. This was done to ensure that the best available evidence was used in the review.

Any potential disagreement between the reviewers were recorded and resolved by further discussion.

Records of searches

Full text manuscripts were retrieved for those that met the inclusion criteria. Details of articles not meeting the inclusion criteria were set aside and saved, but not deleted. For excluded studies, the practical reasons for their non-consideration were noted. This permitted backtracking and re-evaluation of the inclusion criteria and protocol during the review.

On-going records were maintained, not only on the reference information of each publication but the date of retrieval and keywords that led to retrieval.

Synthesis and analysis

The findings from the individual studies were summarised, synthesised and critically evaluated under the key headings and research questions agreed with DfE. This involved mapping the relations between studies in terms of demographics, styles of leadership, leadership activities and CPD. It also involved assessing the robustness of the studies, for example based on methodological considerations and critiques by other researchers and authors.

Chapter 3 Estonia

Overview

Education system

Estonia has a comprehensive schooling system from age 7 to age 17 that covers all compulsory education and is integrated within a single structure. Primary and secondary teachers have below-average class sizes and teaching time. Students in Estonia have fewer hours of compulsory instruction time than the average of their peers in other OECD countries: 661 hours annually in primary education (compared to the OECD average of 804 hours) and 823 hours in lower secondary education (compared to the OECD average of 916 hours).

In Estonia, governance of the education system is shared between central and local authorities. The state sets national standards and establishes principles of education funding, supervision and quality assessment. However, schools have a high level of autonomy to make decisions on resource allocation, the curriculum and hiring and dismissing teaching staff. Early childhood education is managed by local authorities, and most decisions in lower secondary education are taken at the school level. Estonia's expenditure on educational institutions as a percentage of GDP and per student (for all education levels combined) is below the OECD average, with a higher share of public funding than the OECD average.

A national education plan - the Estonian Lifelong Learning Strategy 2020 - was adopted in 2014. This emphasises the importance of competent and highly motivated teachers and school principals, calls for an alignment of lifelong learning opportunities with labour market needs, and aims to guarantee lifelong learning opportunities for everyone. The Lifelong Learning Strategy is the basis on which the government will make decisions for educational funding up to 2020 (Ministry of Education and Research of the Republic of Estonia, 2015). The role of school leaders features prominently in the strategy, with one of the five strategic goals being to develop competent and motivated teachers and school leaders (Santiago, et al., 2016).

The main challenges facing the Estonian education system are to:

- Adapt to demographic trends, including rapidly declining numbers of school-age children
- Increase the attractiveness of the teaching profession in order to attract more high-quality candidates, particularly in mathematics and science, in the context of an ageing teaching profession
- Further reduce early school leaving

- Narrow the performance gap between Estonian-speaking and Russian-speaking students (European Commission, 2016a; OECD, 2016d)

The OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) (2013) indicates that the ratio of teachers to management or administrative personnel in Estonian lower secondary schools was 6.7, compared to the international average of 6.3 (OECD, 2014b).

Performance

Estonia is an overall high performer in PISA[3]. Estonia achieved high performance in mathematics, reading and science compared to other OECD countries. Its performance relative to previous PISA cycles has increased in reading and remained unchanged in mathematics and science. Students' socio-economic background had a lower impact on performance than the OECD average in PISA 2012.

Leadership Demographics

Initial training requirements and professional experience

240 hours of compulsory training is required before appointment as a school principal in Estonia (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013). Professional teaching experience is also a basic condition for appointment. At least three years of teaching experience is required when a person has undertaken pedagogical higher education; a person who has undertaken other types of higher education is required to have at least five years' teaching experience (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013). These requirements apply from pre-primary to upper secondary education (ISCED 0, 1, 2 and 3).

Table 3.1: Teaching experience and training required before appointment as a school principal in Estonia

Teaching experience	Initial training requirements
3-5 years of teaching experience is required before appointment as a school head	240 hours of compulsory training is required before appointment as a school head

Source: Eurydice, 2013

[3] Programme for International Student Assessment

School owners may specify additional requirements. Santiago, et al. (2016) cite the example of the municipality of Jõhvi that has set competency criteria of knowledge of computers and at least conversational Russian and preferably ability in one more language.

Recruitment procedures

School principals are selected through open recruitment, which means that schools are responsible for publicising posts and selecting candidates (European Commission/ EACEA/Eurydice, 2013). Estonia is one of only four of the countries included in OECD's data and research on education without a distinct career structure for school leaders (the other countries are Denmark, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia) (OECD, 2013b, Table 7.A.2).

The 'head of the school' or 'school director' is employed by the school owner. For schools providing general education, the school leader in a municipal school may be employed by the rural municipality or the city mayor; the school leader in a state school is employed by the Minister of Education and Research; and a school leader in a private school is employed by a private entity. In the case of mayors and the Minister, an authorised official may actually conclude the contract (Santiago, et al., 2016).

The owner of the school declares the competition for filling a vacant position of the head of the school. They then establish the procedure for organising the competition and submit the procedure to the board of trustees beforehand so that the board of trustees can express its opinion on it. An employment contract with the head of a municipal school will be concluded by the rural municipality or city mayor or an official authorised by the mayor. An employment contract with the head of a state school will be concluded by the Minister of Education and Research or an official authorised by the Minister (Ministry of Education and Research of the Republic of Estonia 2015).

The Basic Schools and Upper Secondary Schools Act does not specify any requirements on the length of contract for a school leader. In public schools, school leaders are appointed for an unspecified term (OECD, 2013b).

Employment status

Principals of schools are responsible for the general state of the school, financial matters, the school development plan, communicating with the school owner and the families of students, recruiting and releasing staff, and supervising schooling and education (Ministry of Education and Research of the Republic of Estonia, 2015).

Typically, in addition to school directors and their deputies, Estonian schools employ head teachers who have responsibility for teaching and learning within the school (Santiagoet al., 2016). The main duties of head teachers include assuring the quality of

studies, assuring that school and national curricula are followed and supervising teachers (Ministry of Education and Research of the Republic of Estonia, 2015).

In lower secondary education just under 70% of school principals are employed full time without teaching obligations, compared with the OECD average of 66%.

Table 3.2: The employment status of school principals in lower secondary education in Estonia (TALIS 2013)

Employment status	Estonia	OECD Average
Full time without teaching obligations	69.5%	66%
Full time with teaching obligations	25.4%	33.3%
Part time without teaching obligations	2.0%	1.0%
Part time with teaching obligations	3.0%	2.5%

Source: OECD, 2016a: 461

Age

In Estonia, 22.3% of lower secondary school leaders are aged 60 years or over and this proportion more than doubled between 2008 and 2013. The average age of a lower secondary school leaders is around 51 years. Comparable figures are not available for primary education.

Table 3.3: The percentage of school principals in lower secondary education in Estonia in different age groups (TALIS 2013)

Age group	Estonia	OECD Average
Under 30	0%	0.1%
30-39 years	5.1%	6.3%
40-49 years	29.4%	28.4%
50-59 years	43.2%	47.8%
60 years or more	22.3%	17.4%

Source: OECD, 2016a: 460

Compared to the average of the countries that participated in the TALIS[4] 2013 survey, the proportion of people under the age of 40 is smaller and the proportion of people above 60 is larger in Estonia. Also in comparison with other Northern European countries Estonia has the highest proportion of school principals aged 60 years or more (Ministry of Education and Research of the Republic of Estonia, 2015). TALIS 2013 reported that the Estonian school leaders in schools providing lower secondary education were on average 0.7 years older than their counterparts in other countries (OECD, 2014b). In contrast to TALIS in 2008, the TALIS sample in 2013 indicates a higher proportion of Estonian school leaders who are aged 60 years or older and a smaller proportion of younger school leaders (OECD, 2014b).

Gender

The Ministry of Education and Research of the Republic of Estonia (2015) reports that the 92% of principals of schools are women. In 2013 Estonia had a larger proportion of female principals in lower secondary education than most other countries that participated in TALIS (2013): 60.2%, compared to the TALIS/OECD average of 49.4%. This represented an increase of 7% since the previous TALIS in 2008, when the proportion of female principals of schools in Estonia was 53% (Ministry of Education and Research of the Republic of Estonia, 2015).

Table 3.4: Gender of school principals in Estonia (2015)

Female	Male
92%	8%

Source: Ministry of Education and Research of the Republic of Estonia, 2015: 89

Table 3.5: Gender of school principals at the lower secondary level in Estonia (TALIS 2013)

	Estonia	OECD average
Female	60%	49%
Male	40%	51%

Source: OECD, 2016a: 460

Salary

There is no specific framework for school leader salaries, which are determined by school owners. According to Eurydice (2015) the annual average salary for an Estonian school principal was EUR 14,833 in 2013-14, that is EUR 1,236 per month. The Eurydice

[4] Teaching and Learning International Survey

data (2015) do not include minimum and maximum annual gross statutory salaries for school principals.

Table 3.6: Average salary for a school principalin an Estonian public school, 2012.

	Per month	Per annum
Average salary	EUR 1,236	EUR 14,833

Source: Santiago et al., 2016: 163.

On average, Estonian school leaders earn around the same amount as GDP per capita (Eurydice, 2015). According to Santiago et al (2016), on this indicator, the school leader career in Estonia is less attractive than in other European countries.

Styles of Leadership

There is evidence to suggest that a substantial percentage of school principals in Estonia share responsibility for leadership activities/tasks with other members of staff. As Table 3.7 shows, TALIS 2013 indicates that the percentages of principals of lower secondary schools in Estonia who report sharing responsibility for leadership activities/tasks with other members of the school management team, teachers who are not part of the school management team, a school's governing board, or a local or national authority is higher than the OECD average across a range of dimensions.

Table 3.7: percentage of principals of lower secondary schools in Estonia who report a shared responsibility for the following leadership activities/tasks: (TALIS 2013)

	Estonia	OECD Average
Appointing or hiring teachers	63.8%	41.5%
Dismissing or suspending teachers from employment	39.9%	31.0%
Establishing teachers' starting salaries, including setting pay scales	33.3%	15.6%
Determining teachers' salary increases	55.6%	20.1%
Deciding on budget allocations within the school	67.7%	49.0%

	Estonia	OECD Average
Establishing student disciplinary policies and procedures	75.3%	63.0%
Approving students for admission to the school	50.8%	37.3%
Choosing which learning materials are used	53.6%	47.5%
Deciding which courses are offered	74.8%	59.3%

Source: OECD, 2016a: 464

However, as can be seen in Table 3.8, TALIS (2013) indicates that lower secondary school principals are less inclined to engage in instructional or pedagogical leadership, with the percentages of principals reporting they engaged with teachers on pedagogical issues being substantially below the OECD average.

Table 3.8: School principals instructional leadership activities in lower secondary education in Estonia (TALIS 2013)

	Estonia	OECD Average
Collaborate with teachers to solve classroom discipline problems	41.3%	62.1%
Observe instruction in the classroom	6.7%	40.5%
Take action to support co-operation among teachers to develop new teaching practices	41.3%	60.1%
Take action to ensure that teachers take responsibility for improving their teaching skills	52.0%	63.7%
Take action to ensure that teachers feel responsible for their students' learning outcomes	53.0%	71.4%

Source: OECD, 2016a: 462

Moreover, although school leaders have considerable room to develop the competencies of their teaching bodies through internal teacher appraisal, they seem not to be doing this to a great extent. According to TALIS (2013) data, only 58% of principals of lower secondary schools reported they had worked on a professional development plan for their school in the 12 months prior to the survey, the fifth lowest figure among TALIS countries against an average of 79.1% (OECD, 2014b). The use of student performance and evaluation results was reportedly more regular but still lower than on average internationally (82% of school leaders in Estonia; 89% of school leaders internationally) (OECD, 2014b). Notably, Estonian school leaders appear to less frequently observe instruction in the classroom compared to counterparts in other OECD countries, despite this being the major tool for ensuring the quality of teaching and learning and a core part of effective self-evaluation activities (OECD, 2013b).

Leadership Activities

Estonian school leaders are in charge of administrative and pedagogical leadership activities (although head teachers oversee teaching and learning), manage their school's financial resources in co-operation with a supervisory body and the Students' Board, sign staff employment contracts, establish teachers' salaries, and organise job interviews for vacant teaching posts. They have the major responsibility for school quality assurance and development (OECD 2016c; Santiagoet al. 2016).

Schools benefit from a high level of autonomy with a strong role for school leaders and staff in practice compared to other OECD countries. Estonian schools and their leaders enjoy higher levels of autonomy in all major aspects of school organisation and operation, and particularly with regard to personnel and resource management. Estonian school leaders in lower secondary education report that, in practice, the hiring and firing of staff is a matter for the school leader and teachers with no external involvement. This is also largely the case for deciding on budget allocations within the school, although the board of trustees (the majority of whose members are parents and people external to the school) comments on the draft school budget and this is approved by the school owner (also represented on the board of trustees) (Santiagoet al., 2016).

In a survey of general education schools in Estonia, school principals reported that the most time-consuming activities within their working time were supervising schooling and education and preparing the development plan of the school. Less time-consuming activities were considered to be recruiting and releasing personnel and communicating with the owner of the school and the families of students (The Ministry of Education and Research of the Republic of Estonia (2015: 110).

The following table sets out the frequency of particular leadership tasks in comparison with the OECD average:

Table 3.9: The proportion of 15-year old students in schools in Estonia where principals reported a high frequency of certain management activities during the last school year (TIMSS 2011)

	Estonia	EU-27 Average
I make sure that the professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals in the school	92.4%	90.8%
I give teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching	57.6%	71.2%
I ensure that there is clarity concerning the responsibility for coordinating the curriculum	86.7%	86.4%
I take over lessons from teachers who are unexpectedly absent	24.1%	33.3%

Source: Eurydice, 2013: 122

The following table demonstrates that, in Estonia, principals are less likely than in other OECD countries to spend time on developing school priorities through the evaluation of performance data, and significantly less time on observing teachers in the classroom.

Table 3.10: Percentage of principals of lower secondary schools in Estonia who report having engaged in the following activities related to a school development plan in the 12 months prior to the survey (TALIS 2013)

	Estonia	OECD Average
Used student performance and student evaluation results (including national/ international assessments) to develop the school's educational goals and programmes	81.5%	89.3%
Observe instruction in the classroom	58.0%	77.4%.

Source: OECD, 2016a: 463

Continuing Professional Development

In Estonia, a competence framework for school leaders has been developed and CPD modules based on it are targeted at principals already serving in their positions (Golubeva, 2014). The competency model provides a framework for three areas:

- Self-evaluation of the principals of educational institutions for planning personal development
- Training a head of an educational institution
- Evaluating the work of a head of an educational institution (Ministry of Education and Research of the Republic of Estonia, 2015)

The professional development programmes directed at principles and aspiring principals are summarised in Table 3.11.

Table 3.11: Professional development for school principals in Estonia

Phase	Training programme
Preparatory training for aspiring principals	240 hours of compulsory training is required before appointment as a school head A 24-month development programme for future school leaders is open to school staff, plus individuals from other sectors. Participants are selected via a competition. Each participant has a mentor and performs field training in schools. The programme offers different modules, including an introduction to pedagogy and the management of learning for those not in the education sector.
Induction of new principals	Programme for new school leaders A programme designed to help new school leaders with implementing their responsibilities and to shorten their introduction period. It provides an overview of legislation, financial management, innovation in education, trends, etc. and provides a co-operation network.
In-service training for serving principals	School team development programme A 12-month management training programme for the school leader and two other staff members, covering different school management topics. Each module includes tasks which form the basis of a school development project. There is a follow up six months after the end of the programme to observe how the project is being implemented.

Source: Santiago et al., 2016

The European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2013) report that, as of 2011/12, CPD for school principals from pre-primary to upper secondary education (ISCED 0, 1, 2 and 3) was optional rather than regarded as a professional duty and was not necessary for promotion[5].

Compared internationally, Estonian school leaders report having received good levels of formal training for their position. As Table 3.13 below shows, virtually all Estonian school leaders sampled in TALIS 2013 reported they had followed a school administration or principal training programme or course. This compared to 85% internationally on average. Also, CPD appears to be more wide spread among Estonian school leaders. 63% of Estonian school leaders reported having followed formal training in instructional leadership after they had taken up their position at the school, compared to 53% internationally on average. (Santiago et al., 2016).

Table 3.12: Participation rates, types and average number of days of professional development reported to be undertaken by principals of lower secondary school Estonia in the 12 months prior to TALIS (2013)

	Estonia	OECD Average	Average number of days among those who participated	OECD Average
Principals did not participate in any professional development	5.1%	8.9%	N/A	N/A
Principals participated in a professional network, mentoring or research activity	54.1%	52.6%	7.7 days	15.3 days
Principals participated in courses, conferences or observation visits	93.9%	85.2%	10.2 days	11.1 days
Principals participated in other types of professional development activities	48%	32.5%.	6.9 days	10.2 days

Source: OECD, 2016a: 465

[5]Professional duty is defined as a task described as such in working regulations/ contracts/ legislation or other regulations on the school head profession (The European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice).

There is a systematic allocation of central funding to support school leaders' and teachers' professional development activities. Until 2015, this equated to 1% of the central allocation for the labour costs of school leaders and teachers and amounted to EUR 1.8 million in 2014. Since 2015, funds for professional development have been determined on the basis of a per student model. This amount is allocated to the local level for distribution to the schools (Ministry of Education and Research, 2015).

An international survey in 2010-11 indicates that Estonia is one of only 7 out of 36 education systems within the OECD where schools make decisions on the allocation of resources for both school leader and teacher professional development (OECD, 2012). Twenty-three education systems in the OECD set requirements for teacher professional development, but only eight of these, including Estonia, have a separate school budget allocated for professional development (Santiagoet al., 2016).

Chapter 4 Finland

Overview

Education system

Finland has nine years of basic education (comprehensive school) which offers flexibility at upper secondary level between general and vocational education and training options that both lead to tertiary education. Education is currently compulsory from ages 7 to 16.

Governance of the education system is shared between central and local authorities. The Finnish Government defines and sets educational priorities, while municipalities (local authorities) maintain and support schools and also have significant responsibility for organising education, funding and curriculum and for hiring personnel (OECD 2015). All schools in Finland operate under the same basic guidelines created by the National Board of Education, which is a part of the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture and is in charge of primary, secondary and adult education. In addition to developing and implementing general guidelines of education policy, the National Board of Education approves a national curriculum that municipalities and their schools need to follow. However, municipalities and schools are obliged to prepare local curricula based on the National Core Curriculum, and pedagogical development strategies are constructed in both the municipalities and schools by the chief education officers, principals and teachers. A New National Core Curriculum was introduced in 2016 (Soini et al., 2016; Mirinova, 2016).

Decisions in schools are made by either the local government or the school, depending on how decision-making is organised in the municipality. Schools in Finland have average autonomy over the use of curriculum and assessment compared to other OECD countries and a below-average level of autonomy over resource allocation. Teachers are trusted professionals required to have a masters degree that includes research and practice-based studies. In primary and secondary education, their salaries are slightly above the OECD average, and their teaching time is below average. A much higher proportion of teachers in Finland than the TALIS average considers that the teaching profession is valued in society and would choose to work as teachers if they could decide again. The Finnish education system has no national standardised tests or high-stakes evaluations (OECD, 2015: 224).

Because the Finnish system places so much emphasis on school and teacher autonomy, there are no clearly defined career ladders. Teachers have control over their classrooms, lesson plans, and hours outside of teaching, so moving up the ladder does not necessarily affect their job autonomy or allow them to make broad changes within the school. Successful teachers may become principals, who are appointed by the local municipal authority.

Finland's expenditure on educational institutions as a percentage of GDP (for all education levels combined) is above the OECD average, with one of the highest shares of public funding among OECD countries (OECD, 2015: 224).

Performance

Finland's education system has outperformed most countries in international testing for various reasons, including a student-centred approach for teaching, a well-educated and highly trained teaching workforce that is selected from the best students in the country and social values, which emphasise equality, cooperation, and a strong commitment to providing strong welfare programs for all its citizens (Morgan, 2014). Although students score very highly on international tests, such as PISA, Finland has very few external accountability measures, and teachers spend less time in classrooms than in many other countries (Morgan, 2012).

Leadership Demographics

Initial training requirements and professional experience

Principals are generally required to have obtained a higher academic degree and teaching qualifications. In addition, they are required to have a Certificate in Educational Administration or have completed a university programme in educational leadership, which includes the Certificate in Educational Administration. There is no specific criterion for work experience, but those selected for a permanent post are, in practice, required to have prior experience from supervisory duties. As a general rule, principals are recruited from among experienced teachers (Finnish National Board of Education, 2012).

Table 4.1: Teaching experience and training required before appointment as a school principal in Finland

Teaching experience	Initial training requirements
There is no specific criterion for work experience, but as a general rule, school principals are recruited from among experienced teachers.	School principals are required to to have at least a masters degree and teaching qualifications.

Source: Finnish National Board of Education, 2012

Recruitment procedures

School principals are selected through open calls or nominated by the Municipal School Board. Class teachers are selected in a similar way, but the school principal is usually interviewed by the Municipal School Board before a final decision is made (Saarivirta and Kumpulainen, 2016). There are no common regulations for a consultation procedure, but teaching staff and representatives of parents are often consulted when defining a new

principal's competencies or also while comparing applicants for the post. In addition to interviews, the use of psychological tests to compare candidates is becoming more common. Principals are initially appointed to their posts for a six-month trial period on a fixed-term basis (Finnish National Board of Education, 2012).

Employment status

In Finland, principals at comprehensive schools and general upper secondary schools have teaching responsibilities determined at the public sector collective agreement level, which are tied to the school size (for instance, the minimum at general upper secondary school is 4 weekly lessons per year). In some cases, teaching responsibilities may be waived for reasons such as working in several units or in a unit covering different school levels. Nonetheless, 71% of full-time principals of lower secondary schools in Finland have teaching obligations, compared with an OECD average of 33.3%.[6]

Table 4.2: The employment status of school principals in lower secondary education in Finland

Employment status	Finland	OECD Average
Full time without teaching obligations	25.2%	66%
Full time with teaching obligations	71%	33.3%
Part time without teaching obligations	1.6%	1.0%
Part time with teaching obligations	2.1%	2.5%

OECD, 2016a: 461

Age

Based on a survey answered by 43,000 teachers, the Finnish National Agency for Education (2017) reports that the teaching workforce in Finland is ageing; in 2016 60% of principals were over fifty, compared to 39% of teachers. TALIS 2013 revealed that the mean age of school principals in lower secondary education in Finland is 51.2 years,

[6]Assistant principals are mostly teachers, who are relieved of 10–40% of their teaching responsibilities due to administrative duties. Specific posts for assistant principals with fairly limited teaching responsibilities are becoming increasingly common at large schools (Finnish National Board of Education, 2012).

which is slightly below the OECD average of 52.2 years. Comparable figures are not available for primary education.

Table 4.3: The percentage of school principals in lower secondary education in Finland in different age groups (TALIS 2013)

Age group	Country	OECD Average
Under 30	0.6%,	0.1%
30-39 years	8.0%	6.3%
40-49 years	33.0%	28.4%
50-59 years	45.6%	47.8%
60 years or more	12.8%	17.4%

Source: OECD, 2016a: 460

Gender

In 2013, 42% of school principals in primary and secondary education in Finland were female. In contrast to many other countries (where there are significantly more female principals in primary schools) the percentages of female school principals in primary, lower secondary and upper secondary schools were almost identical: 43%, 41% and 41% respectively (European Commission/ EACEA/ Eurydice, 2013). The figure given for lower secondary was consistent with TALIS 2013 which indicated that 40.6% of principals of lower secondary schools in Finland were female, compared to the OECD average of 45.1%. In 2017, the Finnish National Agency for Education's (2017) survey revealed that the proportion of female principals in primary and lower secondary education was 49% (compared to 77% of teachers). The percentages for teachers and principals by gender are set out in tables 4.4 to 4.6 below.

Table 4.4: Gender of school principals in primary and secondary education (basic education) in Finland (EUROSTAT)

Female	Male
42%	58%

Source: European Commission/ EACEA/ Eurydice, 2013:123

Table 4.5: Gender of school principals in primary and secondary education in Finland (2017)

Female	Male
49%	51%

Source: Finish National Agency for Education, 2017

Table 4.6: Gender of school principals at the lower secondary level in Finland (TALIS 2013)

	Finland	OECD average
Female	40.6%	49%
Male	59.4%	51%

Source: OECD, 2016a: 460

Salary

Table 4.7 sets out the salary ranges for school principals in each phase of education in Estonia:

Table 4.7: Minimum and maximum annual gross statutory salaries for school principals (in EUR) in Finland, 2013/14.

	Minimum	Maximum
Primary	48,372	58,663
Lower secondary	46, 526	56,425
Upper secondary	53,224	64,548

Source: Eurydice, 2015

Styles of Leadership

School principals play a key role in distributing leadership responsibilities. The school principal may establish a leadership group and teams of teachers within the school, which can be set up and disbanded in a flexible way according to current themes or other school needs. The principal leads the school together with the leadership group, which can also plan school development. Members of the leadership team are often the leaders of teaching teams, where the actual implementation of decisions takes place (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013).

Table 4.8 below shows the extent to which school principals report that the responsibility for activities/tasks is shared with other members of the school management team, teachers who are not part of the school management team, a school's governing board, or a local or national authority. With two exceptions, school principals in Finland report a greater degree of shared responsibility than the OECD average, with the differences most substantial for activities/tasks that involving the hiring and remuneration of teachers and deciding on the course offer to students.

Table 4.8: percentage of principals of lower secondary schools in Finland who report a shared responsibility for the following leadership activities/tasks: (TALIS 2013)

	Finland	OECD Average
Appointing or hiring teachers	39.5%	41.5%
Dismissing or suspending teachers from employment	23.3%	31.0%.
Establishing teachers' starting salaries, including setting pay scales	6.4%	15.6%
Determining teachers' salary increases	14.3%	20.1%
Deciding on budget allocations within the school	36.9%	49.0%
Establishing student disciplinary policies and procedures	58.3%	63.0%
Approving students for admission to the school	26.0%	37.3%
Choosing which learning materials are used	47.6%	47.5%
Deciding which courses are offered	59.9%	59.3%

Source: OECD, 2016a: 464

Table 4.9 sets out the frequency that Estonia's principals spend on particular leadership tasks in comparison with the OECD averages:

Table 4.9: Percentage of students in schools in Finland whose principal reported that he/she engaged with staff in certain activities (PISA 2012)

	Principals provide staff with opportunities to make decisions concerning the school	Principals engage teachers to help build a culture of continuous improvement in the school	Principals ask teachers to participate in reviewing management practices
Never or 1-2 times during the year	3.6% (OECD average – 5.8%)	6.7% (OECD average – 7.6%)	62.8% (OECD average – 48.8%)
3-4 times during the year	9.1% (OECD average – 22.6%)	18.6% (OECD average – 21.7%)	17.7% (OECD average – 22.1%)
Once a month to once a week	70.4% (OECD average – 53.4%)	53.9% (OECD average – 47.3%)	15.8% (OECD average – 23.6%)
More than once a week	16.8% (OECD average – 18.2%)	20.9% (OECD average – 23.4%)	3.6% (OECD average – 5.5%)

Source: OECD, 2016a:466

Principals in Finland appear to be particularly ’hands off’ when it comes to instructional leadership, registering well below the international norms. Finland’s principals are known to defer to teachers on instructional decisions. Only 18 percent of students in Finland attend schools in which principals monitor teachers’ implementation of school (Brown Centre on Education Policy at Brookings, 2016). This may be reflected to some extent in TALIS 2013 in which the percentage of principals in lower secondary schools in Finland that reported they engaged in instructional leadership activities was, with the exception of dealing with classroom discipline problems, below the OECD average (see Tables 4.10 and 4.11 below).

Table 4.10: School principals instructional leadership activities in lower secondary education in Finland (TALIS 2013)

	Finland	OECD Average
Collaborate with teachers to solve classroom discipline problems	70.2%	62.1%
Observe instruction in the classroom	10.7%	40.5%
Take action to support co-operation among teachers to develop new teaching practices	56.6%	60.1%
Take action to ensure that teachers take responsibility for improving their teaching skills	40.0%	63.7%
Take action to ensure that teachers feel responsible for their students' learning outcomes	44.0%	71.4%

Source: OECD, 2016a: 462

Table 4.11: Percentage of school principals of lower secondary schools in Finland who report having engaged in the following activities related to a school development plan in the 12 months prior to the survey (TALIS 2013)

	Finland	OECD Average
Used student performance and student evaluation results (including national/ international assessments) to develop the school's educational goals and programmes	73.7%	89.3%
Observe instruction in the classroom	39.7%	77.4%

Source: OECD, 2016a

Internationally, there is evidence to suggest that on average, women are stronger advocates of instructional leadership than men. This is particularly evident in Australia, Japan, Norway and Portugal, but female principals are more engaged in instructional leadership actions than males in about two-thirds of all countries participating in TALIS

(2013). In contrast, female principals in Finland give less attention to instructional leadership than males (OECD, 2016).

Leadership Activities

In Finland, schools providing basic education and general upper secondary education, as well as vocational institutions, all have a principal and a vice principal as well as one or more assistant principals as the school size increases. The leadership structure depends on the discretion of the maintaining organisation and there is no legal basis for the solutions. One principal may be in charge of more than one school, or a principal's duties may also cover broader responsibilities (head of department, director of municipal educational and cultural services, etc.). Vocational institutions often have directors and principals of education and department principals in addition to principals and assistant principals. Large educational consortia may complement unit-specific principals or assistant principals through a system of faculty principals where each principal is responsible for a certain field of education within the entire consortium (Finnish Board of Education, 2012).

National legislation describes principals' tasks broadly, including administrative matters, financial management, pedagogical matters (student assessment, formative evaluation of staff), personnel administration and teaching (OECD, 2013). According to OECD (2013), school principals have wide-ranging responsibilities and tasks, within a framework of considerable autonomy (OECD, 2013). However, while principals have autonomy over some issues (e.g. schools' budgets), in other areas (e.g. hiring new teachers), their opinion is taken into account, but the municipalities make the final decision.

Table 4.12 indicates that significantly fewer principals in Finland report spending 'a lot' of time monitoring students' progress in comparison with the EU average.

Table 4.12: The proportion of grade 4 and grade 8 students in Finland whose school principals report that they spend 'no time', 'some time' or 'a lot of time' monitoring students' learning progress to ensure that the school's educational goals are reached

	Finland	EU average
Grade 4		
Not at all / a little	10.9	5.1
Some	77.4	46.8
A lot	11.7	48.1
Grade 8		
Not at all / a little	5.7	2.0
Some	66.6	32.5
A lot	27.6	65.5

Source: Eurydice, 2013

Similarly, as Table 4.13 shows, principals in Finland spend less time than the EU average on initiating projects or improvements in their schools.

Table 4.13: The proportion of grade 4 and grade 8 students in Finland whose school principals report that they spend 'no time', 'some time' or 'a lot of time' initiating educational projects or improvements:

	Finland	EU average
Grade 4		
Not at all / a little	14.5	3.7
Some	57.5	54.8
A lot	27.8	41.5
Grade 8		
Not at all / a little	6.2	3.1
Some	72.8	50.1
A lot	21.0	46.8

Source: Eurydice, 2013

Table 4.14 below shows that, while principals in Finland spend less time than generally in the EU on instructional leadership activities including on the professional development of their teaching staff, they are more likely than the average to stand-in for absent teachers.

Table 4.14: The proportion of 15-year old students in schools in Finland where school principals reported a high frequency of certain management activities during the last school year (TIMSS 2011)

	Finland	EU-27 Average
I make sure that the professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals in the school	63.7%	90.8%
I give teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching	40%	71.2%
I ensure that there is clarity concerning the responsibility for coordinating the curriculum	76.5%	86.4%%
I take over lessons from teachers who are unexpectedly absent	39.2%	33.3%

Source: Eurydice, 2013: 122

Continuing Professional Development

As can be seen in Table 4.15, in Finland school leadership programmes are divided into three core categories: Principal preparation or qualification programmes, induction programmes and in-service programmes (Shantal et al., 2014).

Table 4.15: Professional development for school principals in Finland

Phase	Training programme
Preparatory training for aspiring principals	In Finland, aspiring principals are required to obtain the Certificate in Educational Administration, which attracts government funding. The Certificate, based on the qualifications requirements adopted by the Finnish National Board of Education, can be completed as a separate qualification or through a university basic study module entitled 'Educational administration and management', which also includes the Certificate in Educational Administration. The Certificate in Educational Administration covers the following subject areas:

Phase	Training programme
	1. Basics of public law 2. General and municipal administration 3. Educational administration 4. Human resources administration 5. Financial administration The compulsory areas of Finnish principal training focus on knowledge of legislation. In recent years, actual pre-service training in leadership has been increased in order to facilitate the transition from a teacher to a principal. The opportunity to include principal training as part of initial teacher education expands the recruitment base of new principals. In comparison with other countries, Finland represents the average level in terms of the scope of pre-service training. Pre-service training programmes do not include practical training, but many new principals have already worked in leadership positions, such as assistant principals, prior to taking up a principal's post.
Induction of new principals	Induction training plays an essential and long-term role in Finnish principal training and attracts government funding. Principals' induction programmes are mainly organised by universities and Educode Oy (formerly National Centre for Professional Development in Education). The responsibilities are divided such that universities have organised programmes in their own locations and focused on practical applications of theory, whereas Educode has concentrated on solution of everyday problems and organises programmes in different parts of the country. The core content of the government-funded induction training programme is as follows: 1) School organisation, administration and finances. 2) School curriculum and learning results. 3) Human resources management and leadership 4) Strategic planning
In-service training for serving principals	In Finland, legislation or collective agreements do not determine any training obligations for principals, but training courses assigned by municipal HR departments are compulsory in practical terms. The minimum annual requirement for development training is three days. However, in practice the number of training days varies between 5 and 10 days per year, depending on the principal's position and municipality, and themes are related to development

Phase	Training programme
	of the municipal governance system, financial and HR management and new technological solutions (IT solutions for financial and HR management, etc.), but there is minimal focus on strengthening principals' competencies as leaders of educational and teaching work. The most significant training providers are university continuing education centres and Educode Oy (formerly the National Centre for Professional Development in Education). The University of Jyväskylä is home to the Institute of Educational Leadership, which provides principal training from basic studies to a doctoral degree. These training organisations have organised long-term professional development programmes in particular, for which the Finnish National Board of Education has granted funding. Various leadership team training programmes are also highly popular. The programmes have complied with the policies on topical contents and modes of implementation specified by the Finnish National Board of Education in its invitation to tender. Principals associations are important partners in planning and implementation of programmes.

Sources: Finnish National Board of Education, 2012; Schleicher, 2012

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2013) indicates that, in Finland, professional development for school principals is viewed as optional and is not necessary for promotion or regarded as a professional duty.

Table 4.16: The proportion of grade 4 and grade 8 students in schools in Finland where school principals participated in professional development activities specifically for school principals

	Finland	EU average
Grade 4		
Not at all / a little	9.2	10.4
Some	68.1	58.5
A lot	22.7	31.1
Grade 8		
Not at all / a little	12.6	8.6
Some	71.1	62.5
A lot	16.3	28.9

Source: Eurydice, 2013

Table 4.17 shows the participation rates, types and average number of days of professional development reported to be undertaken by principals of lower secondary schools in Finland in the 12 months prior to TALIS2013. It reveals, inter alia, that the average numbers of days of professional development undertaken by school principals that engaged in professional development was below the OECD average in relation to the three groups of activity considered.

Table 4.17: participation rates, types and average number of days of professional development reported to be undertaken by principals of lower secondary school Finland in the 12 months prior to TALIS (2013)

	Finland	OECD Average	Average number of days among those who participated	OECD Average
Principals did not participate in any professional development	8.3%	8.9%	N/A	N/A
Principals participated in a professional network, mentoring or research activity	48.1%	52.6%	4.4 days	15.3 days
Principals participated in courses, conferences or observation visits	87.7%	85.2%	5.8 days	11.1 days
Principals participated in other types of professional development activities	36.2%	32.5%.	3.7 days	10.2 days

Source: OECD, 2016a: 465.

According to Shantal et al. (2014: 46):

> "Even though the results of Finnish schools are very good as reflected in the Programme for International Students Assessment (PISA), much is still to be done by training providers in preparing current and future school leaders for desired results to be sustained or improved. (…) Most training programmes need to re-design their structure and curriculum to incorporate more interactive teaching methods and curriculum which would better prepare principals to tackle present and future school leadership challenges. Likewise, networking and collaborations between the different training providers in Finland should be taken more seriously, providing harmony in content, duration of training, course fees, and entry requirements of the different training programmes that currently exist in Finland. During the course of training, candidates' suggestions could be sampled and information gathered could assist programmes to implement timely adjustments to improve the learning process of trainees. Policies should be implemented to ensure regular provision of leadership training as well as professional development courses for Finnish principals".

Based on an extensive literature review, Saarivirta and Kumpulainen (2016) reach similar conclusions, especially in relation to preparatory training for aspiring principals:

> "(P)rincipal training is one of the key issues for future schooling in Finland, since the prevailing principal training system does not sufficiently support principals (Pusa, 2014). The Finnish National Board of Education organises principal training that is, in fact, the main qualification diploma for principals. This diploma can be obtained by passing a few book exams and provides only administrative information for current and future principals on how to run a school (a teacher must already have passed the diploma before applying for a principal' s position). Many of the acting principals feel that this diploma does not help them in their daily routines and further training is definitely needed. It seems to be common practice for principals to seek training from independent providers by participating in external leadership and managerial programmes (Pusa, 2014)".

Chapter 5 Germany

Overview

Education system

Germany has a decentralised education system, with responsibilities shared between the Federation, the Länder (states) and local authorities. Schooling decisions are mainly made at the Länder level, while vocational education and training (VET) is a joint responsibility of the Federation and the Länder, with the strong engagement of social partners. Investment in educational institutions is below the OECD average and has remained stable despite the economic crisis. Funding is provided mainly by public sources, with large contributions from the private sector in vocational secondary programmes (OECD 2014).

Education is compulsory from ages 6 to 18 in Germany (two years more than the OECD average).

In Germany 37,900 public and 5,500 private schools (school year 2011/12) offer different types of programmes for academic or vocational education starting in lower secondary education. The dual vocational system is a pillar of education in Germany that contributes to above-average attainment rates in upper secondary education (OECD, 2014). It offers students both knowledge and practical skills: Students in the dual system typically spend 3-4 days per week in a training firm and 1-2 days at school.

Tracking and grouping are common in Germany: A majority of secondary students sampled in PISA 2012 underwent a selection process to enter schools where student performance or recommendations from feeder schools were used as criteria, and ability grouping is also becoming more common (only 32% of students are in schools that do not do it, down from 54% in 2003) (OECD, 2014).

Tracking starts at an early age in most Länder (at age 10, compared to the OECD average of 14), and some Länder have strategies to limit its potentially negative effects on equity. To delay early tracking, different Länder have adopted one or a combination of the following strategies: introducing comprehensive secondary schools that offer the range of qualifications (not in all Länder); postponing tracking from the age of 10 to 12 (e.g. Berlin, Brandenburg); merging the two lower-level tracks (Realschule and Hauptschule) into one school and improving the quality of education in these tracks; making tracks equivalent to allow students from all tracks to access any type of upper secondary education; and facilitating transitions between different tracks, including between academic and vocational tracks (OECD, 2014).

Evaluation and assessment frameworks exist in each of the 16 Länder, and the Standing Conference of Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs (KMK) aims to provide an

overarching strategy. State supervisory authorities, statistical surveys carried out by the Federal Statistical Office and the Statistical Offices of the Länder, as well as educational research in subordinate institutes all contribute to system evaluation (OECD, 2014). Self-evaluation has been initiated, but, contrary to most other OECD countries, it is not a component of external evaluation (OECD, 2014).

Performance

Germany has become an above-average performer in PISA with significant improvement in reading and mathematics over the years. Germany achieved above-average mathematics scores in PISA 2012, and its performance has improved significantly since 2000. Reading and science scores are also significantly above OECD average and have increased since PISA results in both 2000 and 2003. Germany is one of only three OECD countries where both mathematics scores and equity indicators have improved since 2003.

Equity indicators show considerable improvement since 2000. Germany was an above-average performer in all areas examined in PISA 2012, including problem solving, and the share of low achievers in mathematics has decreased significantly (from 21.6% in 2003 to 17.7% in 2012, below the OECD average of 23%).

Equity has improved, as the impact of socio-economic factors on student performance is now only slightly above the average across OECD although special population groups remain at lower proficiency levels. Nonetheless, Germany faces challenges to support students with disadvantaged and migrant backgrounds and to continue reducing the impact of socio-economic background on student outcomes while raising performance in academic and VET provision. Students with an immigrant background scored 25 points less in mathematics than native students in PISA 2012 (OECD, 2014).

Leadership Demographics

Initial training requirements and professional experience

Among the requirements for becoming a school head, a minimum period of professional teaching experience is common. In most countries, the required minimum period is between three and five years. In Germany, teaching experience is required but the duration is not stipulated (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013).

Formal leadership training is not a requirement in Germany and is generally only provided after appointment as a principal. School leadership training organised and funded by the government is only accessible to those who have been approved as principal candidates (Taipale, 2012). As there is no formal requirement for school principals to have a masters degree in school management or any other formal management training, a certain number of school principals lack thorough knowledge

specifically revolving around school leadership (Tulowitzki, 2015). However, preparation courses for leadership are available for interested teachers. A number of universities offer masters programs for aspiring school principals and serving school principals are encouraged to participate as well.

Huber (2013) describes a modularised four-phase course (intended for all levels of school management, including principal, vice principal and other leadership roles in schools) that is available in the states of Thuringia, Saxony-Anhalt and Saxony that include assessments as a learning opportunity:

- In phase 1, orientation is provided for teachers interested in school leadership
- Phase 2 is the preparatory program for aspiring school leaders
- Phase 3 is the induction phase for newly appointed school leaders
- In phase 4 a variety of smaller programs are offered to experienced school leaders

In the orientation phase, participants have opportunities to reflect on their individual competencies and interests and to compare them with the demands and challenges of school leadership. The phase is spread over six months and consists primarily of one-day courses/workshops and short internships. Feedback, which is followed up by development exercises, is intended to improve the self-selection as part of recruitment for school leadership. It is worth noting that 25% of respondents to a survey prior to starting phase 1 answering that they wanted to become an assistant principal changed their opinion during the program. Of the participants who answered in the initial survey that they did not desire an assistant principal's position, 66% changed their opinions, stating in the concluding survey that they now want to become assistant principals.

In Baden-Württemberg, a three-week continuing education course is organised for those appointed as principals. The first week, introduction, is organised during school holidays. The second week, assessment and guidance, takes place during school days in October/November. The remaining sections are HR development, quality management and teamwork, which can be taken within two years of starting work at the discretion of each participant. The courses are provided free of charge and funded by the State Ministry of Education (Taipale, 2012).

Recruitment procedures

School principals in Germany are usually experienced teachers. They apply for school principal or deputy principal positions and are usually vetted and appointed by the Ministry of Education in charge. Applicants are usually expected to have some sort of management experience or qualification, be it through their job (i.e. having taken over special duties during their time as teachers at schools) or through further training (Tulowitzki, 2015).

Germany is one of only four countries (the others are Greece, Cyprus and Luxembourg) that use the candidate list - a system in which applications for employment as a school head are made through submitting candidates' names and qualifications to a top level or intermediate level authority as the only recruitment channel (Eurydice, 2013). In Germany, the local school authority prepares a proposal for selection in a multiphase process that involves consulting school representatives and also requires candidates to give teaching demonstrations. The selection decision is confirmed by the relevant State Ministry of Education (Taipale, 2012).

Hancock et al., 2012 report that, like many countries, Germany struggles to attract and retain school principals.

Employment status

While there are no official anglophone sources, teachers in Germany can either be civil servants or employees, depending on which state they are in. The ratio of civil service to employed teachers varies from state to state. In Bavaria, almost all the teachers have civil servant status, in North Rhine Westphalia it's 80 percent, whereas in Berlin it's about half[7]. Civil service status gives greater job security to teachers but less flexibility for employers.

Although authoritative statistics are not available, historically principals in Germany are teachers and continue to have teaching responsibilities when they assume leadership responsibilities (Tulowitzki, 2015).

Age

Searches have found no information on the average age of school principals in Germany in English language sources.

Gender

Based on the available data, women are often over-represented as principals of primary schools. This percentage, however, declines rapidly at secondary education level; in many other countries for which data is available, this percentage is below 50 for upper secondary schools. This contrasts sharply with the percentage of women teachers at the same level (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013). Eurydice (2013) does not provide data for the gender split for principals in Germany but Brauckmann and Schwarz (2015) comment that about 85% primary schools are led by women (source not stated).

[7] http://www.dw.com/en/two-different-classes-of-german-teacher/a-18291823

Salary

No published data for school principals' salaries in Germany was found in searches.

Styles of Leadership

OECD (2004) noted that:

> "it is perhaps the area of school management and leadership that demonstrates in the most striking way how resistant the German system has been to change. In spite of some significant recent developments, there is little widespread evidence of the school management and organisational changes seen in other OECD countries." (p. 39).

OECD (2004) noted that some of the Länder had made efforts to develop school-level quality management and self-evaluation schemes but principals were rarely expected to lead processes like school development or school-based self-evaluation. Rather, principals were viewed as having a part time administrative job along with teaching duties. Principals did not generally observe teaching and learning in action in order to give feedback to teachers nor did they take the lead in planning the in-service training of school staff:

> "Principals seem to be expected to act as loyal teacher colleagues, who do not disturb other teachers with new and challenging initiatives, but who act as buffers between the teachers and external demands" (OECD, 2004. p. 40).

Since then, things have changed and school leadership is considered a central agent in the implementation of 'New Governance' concepts which have been introduced in Germany by means of accountability measures, decentralisation and a growth of autonomy and competition (Brauckmann and Schwarz, 2015). PISA 2012 found that school leaders in Germany now focus more on instructional leadership tasks than the OECD average (OECD, 2014). The German education system is slowly but steadily moving towards the instructional model of school leadership, especially given that instructional ability is the prevailing mode of elevating someone to principalship (Brauckmann et al., 2016). However, while school leaders do play a key role in shaping the pedagogical profile and vision of a school, this role is counter-balanced by the pedagogical freedom of teachers (Tulowitzki, 2015).

Brauckmann et al. (2016), in a literature review, defined the goals of instructional leadership as:

1. The improvement of the teaching profession and teachers
2. The promotion of effective teachers

3. The genuine improvement of the deep learning that takes place in schools.

In Germany, the researchers found few documented findings of school leadership styles in the past 15 years, and most that they did find originated from school improvement studies or re-analyses of large-scale assessments, such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) or the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS). During this period, only six studies provided analysis with indications of instructional leadership by principals in Germany.

One study (Pietsch, 2014 - referenced by Brauckmann et al., 2016) compared instructional leadership at 50 schools in Hamburg in 2014 with findings from a national, non-representative online survey of teachers (the *Gewerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft*, or GEW, survey) conducted by the national union of teachers (Demmer and von Saldern, 2010) and data from the 2008 Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) (OECD 2009).

The table below compares responses from the Hamburg survey with the GEW survey and TALIS 2008 based on teachers' responses that the activities described took 'rather often' or 'very often' responses.

Table 5.1: Frequency of instructional activities for school principals in Germany

	Hamburg OECD/	**TALIS-GEWa**	**EU-TALISb**
The principal ensures that teachers work according to the school educational goals.	66	31	76
The principal ensures that teachers are informed about possibilities for updating their knowledge and skills.	72	44	70
When a teacher has problems in his/her classroom, the principal takes the initiative to discuss the matter.	57	30	54
The principal gives teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching.	31	10	35
The principal or someone else in the management team observes teaching in classes.	26	5	34

Sources: Pietsch, 2014: 25; Demmer & von Saldern, 2010; Schmich & Schreiner, 2009 quoted in Brauckmann et al. , 2016.

Brauckmann et al. (2016) note that, somewhat surprisingly, the level of instructional leadership in schools in Hamburg was roughly equal to the school leadership average in OECD countries and the EU-TALIS countries. The authors speculate that the high scores in Hamburg might be attributable to the fact that the city recently became the first competent authority in Germany to grant schools the right to decide for themselves whether or not the members of a leadership team should teach. Leaders might therefore be able to spend more time on other matters.

Länder responsibilities include the organisation, planning, management and supervision of the school system, detailed regulation of the schools' mission, personnel recruitment, and the remuneration of teachers. The organisation of instruction, any grouping of pupils, the choice of textbooks and the ongoing assessment of pupils' work lies mainly with the schools. The autonomy of schools has decreased in recent years as some of the decisions were transferred from school level to local or sub-regional level. The percentage of decisions made in lower secondary schools decreased from 31% in 2003 to 23% in 2011, below the OECD average of 40% (OECD, 2014). This contrasts with the findings of Gessler and Ashmawy (2014) for vocational schools where they found that schools had more autonomy than before the reforms of 2006 onwards in the teaching environment, personnel management, financial management and in purchasing, maintenance and repair.

The relationship between school autonomy and performance in mathematics in the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) varies according to the degree to which principals collaborate with teachers throughout the system (OECD, 2013). In systems where teachers and principals collaborate more frequently in managing schools, autonomy is positively related to performance in mathematics. PISA 2012 asked school principals to report how frequently various actions and behaviours related to managing their school occurred in the previous academic year. Principals' responded to three questions about their engagement with teachers in school management: providing staff with opportunities to make decisions concerning the school; engaging teachers to help build a culture of continuous improvement in the school; and asking teachers to participate in reviewing management practices. Responses to these three questions are combined to develop a composite index, the index of teacher participation in school management. Ranking the 42 countries in terms of descending order of teachers' participation in school management, Germany is at number 20, suggesting an average level of participation in collaborative leadership. In vocational schools, teachers participate in the decision-making process regarding pedagogical issues but seldom in strategic issues (Gessler and Ashmawy 2014).

Gessler and Ashmawy (2014), through conducting structural interviews with 15 school principals of vocational schools in the states of Bremen and Lower Saxony in Germany, concluded that decentralisation since 2006 had led to the creation of elected bodies through which various stakeholders are involved in the decision-making process. As a consequence, school leaders had adopted a participatory leadership model.

Brauckmann and Schwarz (2015) note that the function of a school leader is not standardised in Germany. In Brandenburg, Hesse and North Rhine- Westphalia for example, school legislation distinguishes between school leadership tasks on the one hand and the school leader's tasks on the other. Collegial types of school leadership are outlined in school legislation in Berlin, Brandenburg, Lower Saxony and North Rhine-Westphalia. Hamburg has waived such an option from its school legislation and leadership responsibilities are concentrated on the principal.

Tulowitzki (2015) found that, despite the fact that research has been advocating shared and distributed leadership structures for some time, there is little indication that this has had an impact on the way schools are led in Germany. Brauckmann et al. (2016) note that excellence in teaching has been the main prerequisite for becoming a school principal in a process of 'natural' progression in contrast to other countries where principalship was constructed first and foremost as a managerial/administrative position. They suggest that this is not likely to change and may possibly even be enforced in the thinking of policy-makers in German states in view of research on principalship suggesting that the instructional/pedagogical style of leadership is the main vehicle for the academic improvement of students. However, pedagogical leadership should go hand-in-hand with organisational management, thus producing the 'new ideal' for school principalship in Germany.

Leadership Activities

School leaders' roles and responsibilities differ across the Länder, but generally include staff and budget management, external relations, teacher appraisal and the development of a school-specific profile (OECD, 2014). Principals often carry out teaching duties, and their salaries depend on the size of the school. In recent years, school leaders have benefited from increased autonomy with regard to school budgets, staffing decisions and programmes and curriculum.

In the TIMSS[8] 2011 survey, school principals were asked how much time they had spent, approximately, on specific activities. Data for all participating European countries show that the percentage of grade 4 students whose school principals reported that they spent 'some time' on monitoring students' learning progress to ensure that the school's educational goals are reached is, on average, 46.8 %. In most countries, the response rate 'no time spent' to this question was very low. Only in Germany, Austria and Finland, was the proportion of grade 4 students whose school principals reported that they spent 'no time' on monitoring students' learning progress over 10 %.

[8] Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study

In Germany, 18% of Grade 4 principals said they spent little or no time on professional development activities – a much higher proportion than the EU average. Fewer principals in Germany reported spending a lot of time on both monitoring students' progress and initiating projects or improvements compared with European averages.

Table 5.2: School principals with Grade 4 students in Germany: time spent monitoring certain activities (EU average in brackets)

Activity	Not at all/a little	Some	A lot
Monitoring students' learning progress to ensure that the school's educational goals are reached	13.4% (5.1%)	68.9% (46.8%)	17.7.3% (48.1%)
Initiating educational projects or improvements	6.2% (3.7%)	69.7% (54.8%)	24.0% (41.5%)
Participating in professional development activities specifically for school principals	18% (10.4%)	64.9% (58.5%)	17.1% (31.1%)

Source: IEA, TIMSS 2011 international database

Eurydice (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013) also reports on the proportion of school principals in schools with 15-year-olds enrolled reporting a high frequency of certain management activities:

Table 5.3: Proportion of 15-year old students in schools in Germany where school principals reported a high frequency of certain management activities during the last school year, 2009

	I make sure that the professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals in the school	I give teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching	I ensure that there is clarity concerning the responsibility for coordinating the curriculum	I take over lessons from teachers who are unexpectedly absent
Germany	82.2%	52.6%	72.9%	42%
EU Average	90.8%	71.2%	86.4%	33.3%

Source: OECD, PISA 2009

Principals in Germany report a lower frequency than for the majority of principals across all European countries in three of these activities.

Brauckmann and Schwarz (2015), based on a sample of 153 school leaders from six German federal states found that organisational and personnel management were

viewed by respondents to be most important for leadership activity. However, these stated priorities were not reflected in the researchers' observed distributions of workload over fields of activity. Rather, a vast amount of time – as far as it is not absorbed by lessons – is spent on administrative tasks. A shift of workload from teaching responsibilities to governmental tasks is mainly achieved by longer working hours and appears to depend primarily on the system context.

In the six German federal states in the study, Brauckmann and Schwarz (2015) found that only in Hamburg did school leaders function as supervisors. In all other states, school leaders have limited decision making authority, e.g. concerning recruitment. Only in Hamburg and in Lower Saxony were school leaders relieved from teaching duties. In all other federal states in the study, leadership time primarily depends on type and size of school. In Brandenburg, for example, leadership time is seven hours per week at primary schools with an additional 0.6 hours per school class. In North Rhine-Westphalia, leadership time depends on the number of teaching posts at school; in Hesse, it depends on the size of the student body.

In the following table school leaders in 153 schools in six German states selected the three activities on which they prioritised their time and these were ranked according to the percentage of school leaders selecting them.

Table 5.4: School principals' priorities in Germany

Activity	Percentage of school leaders citing it as a top three priorities
Organisational management and development	70.59%
Personnel management and development	67.97%
Work related to students and parents	52.90%
Teaching-related management activity	49.02%
Administration and organisation tasks	35.29%
Own lessons	33.33%
Representing school to the public	26.80%

Source: Brauckmann and Schwartz, 2015

However, observations showed that leading and management tasks are not the main parts of school leaders' everyday work: on average, about one-third of weekly working hours is spent on their own lessons, 25% of the school leaders in the study spent more than 43% of their time in classes, and 25% of school leaders spent less than 5% of their time on organizational and personnel management activities.

Demski and Racherbäumer (2015) surveyed principals in one German State on their perception of, reflection on, and use of data. The researchers found a discrepancy between the perceived usefulness of information sources and the actual use of these types of data. Internal sources of information were used frequently by principals while (international) student assessment, state-wide comparative tests, and school inspections proved to be of relatively little use for informing the principals' professional practice.

Continuing Professional Development

CPD is considered a professional duty (i.e. described in regulations or contracts) in 23 countries or Regions of the EU. In 14 countries, CPD is optional for school principals. However, they might well be supported and encouraged to participate. Involvement in CPD is optional in Germany.

There is very little in the English literature on the CPD of school leaders and no available statistics on the amount of time spent on CPD.

Huber (2013) investigated the use of multiple learning approaches and different modes and types of learning in the (continuous) professional development (PD) of school leaders, particularly the use of self-assessment and feedback. Participants experienced their involvement as an enriching learning opportunity which promoted reflection and motivated them to gather more information about their own behaviour in day-to-day practice, supported other learning opportunities and promoted the participants' professional competencies in areas they identify as beneficial to improving their practice.

Chapter 6 The Netherlands

Overview

Education system

Compulsory education starts at age five in the Netherlands but most children (98%) enter primary education at age four. Primary schools cater for children aged four to 12. From around the age of 12, students are assigned an educational 'track' based on the advice of their primary school teacher and objective end-of-primary tests. The routes are VMBO (pre-vocational secondary education which lasts four years), HAVO (general secondary education which lasts five years) and VWO (pre-university education which lasts six years). Secondary schools have the freedom to delay selection through "bridge" classes in the first years of secondary school.

From 16 to 18, all young people must attend some form of education for at least two days a week. Young people up to age 18 must attend school until they obtain basic qualifications.

Schools in the Netherlands have extensive freedoms with no national curriculum, although this is balanced by a strong Inspectorate of Education. In the Netherlands, the concept of earned autonomy has been developed as part of the implementation of the Dutch Educational Supervision Act in 2003. Within the inspection framework, the intensity and frequency of school inspection is driven by student outcomes and the quality of the school self-evaluation. Student outcomes should meet the national standards, and self-evaluation results should be valid and reliable and provide information about indicators included in the inspection framework (Thoonen et al., 2012).

In 2011, at the lower secondary level, schools in the Netherlands made 86% of key decisions against an OECD average of 41%, with the remaining 14% of decisions being made by central government. Schools made 100% of decisions regarding the organisation of instruction and personnel and resource management (OECD, 2014). However, contrary to the goals of deregulation and school autonomy policies, over the last 20 years the central government has decreased the autonomy within schools with respect to educational content (and to learning and teaching objectives) by issuing more regulations (Honingh and Hooge, 2013),

School boards have a key governance role in the Netherlands but are highly diverse with responsibilities ranging from large school systems to a single primary school. The boards oversee the implementation of legislation and regulations in the school and employ teachers and other staff. The school governors who make up the boards may be voluntary or salaried professionals. Some school boards have gaps in their capacity to manage performance and finances and to develop a strategic improvement culture.

Accountability and democratic control of school boards are both relatively weak (OECD, 2016b).

Performance

The Netherlands performed well in PISA 2012. Of the 65 participating countries, the Netherlands ranked 10th in mathematics, 15th in reading and 14th in science (OECD, 2014). At the primary school level, among the 49 countries participating in the 2011 Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), the Netherlands scored 13th in reading and exceeded the international average score of 500 by 46 points. Only seven countries performed significantly better than the Netherlands in mathematics in the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMMS).

There is a weaker link between mathematics performance and socio-economic status in the Netherlands than on average in the OECD (OECD, 2013), however the performance of students from a migrant background remains a challenge.

With an expenditure of 3.8% of GDP on primary and secondary education in 2012 (similar to the OECD average) the Netherlands achieves good outcomes (OECD, 2015).

The commitment to further improve the system is strong. Decentralisation encourages innovative educational practice and is supported by a central government commitment to evidence-based policy and balanced by effective accountability mechanisms (OECD, 2016b).

Leadership Demographics

Initial training requirements and professional experience

In the Netherlands, professional teaching experience is not a requirement for becoming a school principal. In primary education, a teaching qualification is only required when a principal has teaching obligations. At large secondary schools with a central management board (senior leadership team), teaching qualifications are not required for board members who do not perform teaching activities.

Specific training programmes for principals exist, although attending one is not an official requirement in order to become school leader. None of the programmes specifically grants principal qualifications or guarantees a school leadership position.

TALIS 2013 showed that almost all lower secondary school principals participated in a school administration or principal training course either before or after taking up their post. In the Netherlands, various institutions offer principalship training – for example, the Dutch Principal's Academy is an independent, non-government body facilitating access to optional preparatory and ongoing professional development for school leaders in

primary education. Projects in the Netherlands have been instigated to recruit '*bazen van buiten'* – people without relevant teaching experience, but with management experience from a sector other than education.

OECD (2016b) notes that the decentralised system in the Netherlands makes the quality of leadership particularly critical but, despite this, the field has received little policy attention. Although most leaders have some form of training, the induction of new principals is under-developed.

The MoECS Action Plan Teacher 2020 proposes that all primary and secondary school leaders and the leadership/middle management team in upper secondary should have a required set of professional competencies (OECD, 2016b). The competencies are set out in the table below:

Table 6.1: School leader competence standards for primary and secondary education in the Netherlands

Primary education school leader competencies	Secondary education school leader competencies
Vision directed working	Creating a shared vision and direction
In relationship to the environment	Establishing a coherent organisation for the primary process
Shaping organisational characteristics from an educational orientation	Promoting co-operation, learning and research
Handling of strategies for co-operation, learning and research at all levels	Strategic dealing with the environment
Higher order thinking	Analysing and problem-solving (higher-order thinking)

Source: OECD 2016b

These standards are relatively abstract and provide school boards with a limited basis on which to select, appraise and develop the skills of their school leaders (OECD, 2016b).

Recruitment procedures

In two thirds of European countries, including the Netherlands, school principals are selected through open recruitment, which means that the responsibility for publicising posts and selecting candidates lies with the school board (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013).

Principals are typically experienced teachers who have worked at the same school for quite some time, but larger schools with a multitier leadership structure may hire external managers or financial professionals as school leaders. Developments such as increasing

sizes of school districts have increased demand for professional managers coming from outside the school sector (Taipale, 2012).

Employment status

Table 6.2: Employment status of school principals in the Netherlands

	Full time without teaching obligations	Full time with teaching obligations	Part time without teaching obligations
Netherlands	85.5%	12.6%	1.5%
OECD average	66%	33.3%	1%

Source: TALIS 2013

In the Netherlands, training institutes offer orientation courses to allow teachers interested in leadership functions to discover whether they have the required capabilities. For example, *Orientation towards Management* is offered by the Association of School Leaders for the Sectoral Board for the Education Labour Market. School boards, upper-school managers and school leaders are invited to select candidates from their own schools who participate in a two-day training course on various leadership topics. *Orientation towards Management* then offers further training for candidates who are interested and suitable (Schleicher, 2012).

Age

The average age of a lower secondary principal in the countries participating in the 2013 OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) is 52 years old. Given that principals are often recruited from the ranks of teachers, it is not surprising that the proportion of principals under 40 years old is small in most countries (OECD 2016a).

In the Netherlands, the mean age of lower secondary principals was just over 52 years, exactly in line with the OECD average. No principals in the survey were under 30 years of age and 6.4% were between 30 and 39 years-old – again in line with the OECD average (6.3%) (OECD, 2016a: 460).

Gender

In the Netherlands 41% of primary principals and 37% of principals in primary and secondary combined were female in 2010 (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013). TALIS 2013 found just over 30% of principals in lower secondary schools in the Netherlands were female, significantly below the OECD average of around 45%.

Salary

The table below sets out the minimum and maximum for ISCED[9] 1, 2 and 3 (primary, lower secondary and upper secondary respectively); school boards in the Netherlands are free to offer starting salaries at any point within the range. In addition, decisions about additional allowances (if any) are taken at the school level.

Table 6.3: Minimum and maximum annual basic gross statutory salaries for school principals in the Netherlands (in EUR)

	ISCED 1	ISCED 2	ISCED 3
Minimum (EUR)	43,185	47,678	47,678
Maximum (EUR)	79,308	106,253	106,253

Source: European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice 2016

The salary difference between teachers and leaders is small; for example, a principal of a small primary school (fewer than 200 students) only earns a maximum of 7% above a teacher on the highest salary scale (OECD, 2016b).

Styles of Leadership

In Dutch secondary education, school leaders are highly autonomous and are expected to develop their own system of quality assurance through reliable and valid self-evaluation. This requires a type of leadership that places great emphasis on school leaders' reflective, investigative, and collaborative skills in their daily work (van Veelen et al., 2012). However, OECD (2016b) stated that:

> "Secondary school leaders [in the Netherlands] are knowledgeable of regulations and their application, but less able to reflect on their own actions, to create a professional learning culture and to use data" (p. 126).

Because of its complexity, the work of the school and especially the work of the principal are increasingly recognised as responsibilities that are or should be more broadly shared. Distributed leadership reflects the fact that leadership in schools is not exerted only by principals, but others within the organisation also act as leaders (OECD, 2016a).

The table below shows the extent to which principals report that the responsibility for a task is shared which could be with other members of the school management team,

[9] International Standard Classification of Education

teachers who are not part of the school management team, a school's governing board, or a local or national authority.

Table 6.4: Shared responsibility for leadership activities in lower secondary education in the Netherlands

	Netherlands	OECD Average
Appointing or hiring teachers	77.9%	41.5%
Dismissing or suspending teachers from employment	63%	31%
Establishing teachers' starting salaries, including setting pay scales	34.2%	15.6%
Determining teachers' salary increases	46.1%	20.1%
Deciding on budget allocations within the school	69.3%	49%
Establishing student disciplinary policies and procedures	67.9%	63%
Approving students for admission to the school	82.2%	37.3%
Choosing which learning materials are used	34.4%	47.5%
Deciding which courses are offered	92.3%	59.3%

Source: TALIS 2013

In all of the tasks, principals in the Netherlands report a greater degree of shared responsibility than for the OECD average with the differences most significant for tasks that involving the hiring and remuneration of teachers and deciding on the course offer to students.

The relationship between school autonomy and performance in mathematics in the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) varies according to the degree to which principals collaborate with teachers throughout the system (OECD, 2013). In systems where teachers and principals collaborate more frequently in managing schools, autonomy is positively related to performance in mathematics. PISA 2012 asked school principals to report how frequently various actions and behaviours related to managing their school occurred in the previous academic year. Principals' responded to three questions about their engagement with teachers in school management: providing staff with opportunities to make decisions concerning the school; engaging teachers to help build a culture of continuous improvement in the school; and asking teachers to participate in reviewing management practices. Responses to these three questions are combined to develop a composite index, the index of teacher

participation in school management. Ranking the 42 countries in terms of descending order of teachers' participation in school management, the Netherlands is at number 31, suggesting a comparatively low level of participation.

The table below shows the percentage of principals who report having engaged "often" or "very often" in the following leadership activities during the 12 months prior to the survey.

Table 6.5: Collaboration between teachers and principals in lower secondary education in the Netherlands (TALIS 2013)

	Observe instruction in the classroom	Take action to support co-operation among teachers to develop new teaching practices	Take action to ensure that teachers take responsibility for improving their teaching skills
Netherlands	43.1%	42.8%	69.1%
OECD average	40.5%	60.1%	63.7%

Source: OECD. Table D6.3 (OECD 2016a)

In addition to the help principals may provide to teachers in solving disciplinary problems, principals can observe instruction and provide teachers with feedback based on their observations. Improving instructional effectiveness and improving teaching should, in turn, help to improve student learning outcomes (OECD 2016a). On average in OECD countries, the proportion of principals who say they frequently observe instruction in the classroom is around 40%, with the proportion for the Netherland marginally higher than this.

Principals who exert greater instructional leadership work in schools in which teachers are more engaged in collaboration. By encouraging teachers to learn from one another, principals help teachers remain current in their practice and may also help to develop more collaborative practices between teachers in their schools (OECD 2016a). In these schools, teachers are more likely to share teaching materials with colleagues, engage in discussions about student progress and work together to ensure common standards in evaluations for assessing student progress, and attend team conferences (OECD, 2016). Around 60% of principals report encouraging this frequently in OECD countries, but the figure was much lower in the Netherlands at just over 40%. However, around two-thirds reported frequently taking action to ensure teachers take responsibility themselves for improving their practice, slightly higher than the OECD average. Honingh and Hooge (2013) note that:

> "Educational policy documents, theoretical insights and educational research repeatedly indicate that teacher collaboration is a promising concept, as it has the

potential to promote school reform, school improvement and professional development.” (page 24)

They contend that school leaders play a central role in directly supporting, challenging and encouraging teachers to collaborate, in addition to their indirect efforts to cultivate the internal conditions necessary for teacher collaboration. Making use of existing data on the voice of teachers in Dutch schools Honingh and Hooge (2013) found that there are significant differences between primary and secondary schools:

- There is more teacher collaboration in primary schools than in secondary schools
- Teachers in primary schools perceive more school leader support for collaboration than their colleagues in secondary schools
- Secondary teachers reported more participation than primary teachers in curricular and instructional decision making and are more satisfied with the extent to which they participate in such decisions than primary teachers
- Individual and organisational characteristics have different effects on teacher collaboration in primary schools than they do in secondary schools. In secondary schools, only the ‘perceived support from the school leader’ directly affects ‘teacher collaboration’. The situation in primary schools appears to be less simple: both ‘satisfaction concerning participation in curricular and instructional decisions’ and ‘teacher orientation towards student performance’ have a direct effect on teacher collaboration, in addition to ‘perceived school-leader support’

Overall, teachers who report receiving support from their school leaders are more likely to engage in collaboration. Honingh and Hooge (2013) also note a positive relationship between participation in decision making by teachers and organisational commitment.

Research studies suggest that teacher learning is crucial for improving practice and that conditions such as participative decision-making, teacher collaboration, an open and trustful climate, cultures which value shared responsibilities and values, and transformational leadership practices can foster teachers’ professional learning in schools (Thoonen et al. 2012). In a longitudinal study over five years to examine the extent to which school improvement capacity develops over time in Dutch elementary schools, Thoonen et al., (2012) found that school leaders demonstrated more transformational leadership behaviour at the end of the study than they did at the beginning. The authors speculate that the Dutch Educational Supervision Act in 2003, which came into effect at the beginning of the study and links inspection to student outcomes and the quality of self-evaluation, might be a driver for this change. Thoonen et al. (2012) conclude that improved leadership practices seem to enhance teachers’

motivation, promote professional learning, and facilitate the improvement of school organisational conditions.

Leadership Activities

In the TIMSS 2011 survey, school principals were asked how much time they had spent, approximately, on specific activities. While principals in the Netherlands were broadly similar to other EU countries in two of the measured activities in terms of spending at least some time on them, the Netherlands stands out on 'initiating educational projects or improvements' with all school principals answering that they either spent 'some' or 'a lot' of time on this activity.

Table 6.6: School principals in the Netherlands with Grade 4 students: time spent monitoring certain activities (EU average in brackets)

Activity	Not at all/a little	Some	A lot
Monitoring students' learning progress to ensure that the school's educational goals are reached	5.2% (5.1%)	50.5% (46.8%)	44.3% (48.1%)
Initiating educational projects or improvements	0% (3.7%)	56.8% (54.8%)	43.2% (41.5%)
Participating in professional development activities specifically for school principals	7% (10.4%)	70% (58.5%)	23% (31.1%)

Source: IEA, TIMSS 2011 international database

Eurydice 2013 (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013) also reports on the proportion of school principals in schools with 15-year-olds enrolled reporting a high frequency of certain management activities:

Table 6.7: Proportion of 15-year old students in schools in the Netherlands where school principals reported a high frequency of certain management activities during the last school year, 2009

	I make sure that the professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals in the school	I give teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching	I ensure that there is clarity concerning the responsibility for coordinating the curriculum	I take over lessons from teachers who are unexpectedly absent
Netherlands	94.5%	72.6%	79.9%	16.3%
EU Average	90.8%	71.2%	86.4%	33.3%

Source: OECD, PISA 2009

This shows that, in the Netherlands, the proportion of principals covering for absent teachers was half the rate of the EU as a whole. While other management activities were broadly in line with EU averages, principals in the Netherlands reported spending more time on clarifying the curriculum than most principals – perhaps reflecting that the curriculum in the Netherlands is devolved to the school level.

Principals are increasingly responsible for the development of the school's educational goals and programmes and for the use of student performance and student evaluation results to develop those goals and programmes (OECD 2016a). Only 16% of principals in the Netherlands reported not using student data to develop their school's goals and programmes but significantly fewer said that they had worked on a professional development plan for the school than the OECD average.

Table 6.8: Percentage of school principals in the Netherlands who report having engaged in the following activities related to a school development plan in the 12 months prior to the survey

	Used student performance and student evaluation results (including national/international assessments) to develop the school's educational goals and programmes	Worked on a professional development plan for the school
Netherlands	84.1%	57.8%
OECD average	89.3%	77.4%

Source: OECD 2016a, Table D6.4.

Continuing Professional Development

CPD is considered a professional duty (i.e. described in regulations, contracts or legislation) in 23 countries or Regions of the EU. In 14 countries, CPD is optional for school principals including in the Netherlands. However, they might well be supported and encouraged to participate (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013).

The following table sets out the percentage of principals in the Netherlands who participated in various types of professional development in the 12 months prior to the survey and the average number of days spent on the activity by those who participated.

Table 6.9: School principals' recent professional development in lower secondary education in the Netherlands

	Netherlands		OECD average	
Percentage of principals who did not participate in any professional development	0.4%		8.9%	
	Percentage participating	**Average number of days**	**Percentage participating**	**Average number of days**
Participated in a professional network, mentoring or research activity	87.5%	10.8	52.6%	15.3
Participated in courses, conferences or observation visits	97.4%	7.3	85.2%	11.1
Participated in other types of professional development activities	22.9%	5.1	32.5%	10.2

Source: TALIS 2013

It is clear from the data that principals in the Netherlands almost universally took part in some form of professional development, with considerably more than the OECD average participating in networking, mentoring and/or research activities and with almost the entire sample attending courses, conferences or making observation visits.

Hulsbos et al. (2016) contend that little is known about school leaders' incidental and non-formal learning in the workplace in the Netherlands. In a qualitative study involving 20 large Dutch secondary schools, the researchers found that school leaders mostly value workplace learning through working on improvement and innovation and through reflection. Asking leaders to identify their top three workplace learning activities in terms of value enabled Hulsbos et al. (2016) to devise the following rank order (most valuable first):

1. Working on improvements or innovations in the school
2. Reflecting with colleagues
3. Participating in a learning network
4. Cooperation with colleagues
5. Visiting another school
6. Self-reflection
7. Asking / receiving feedback
8. Role model / mentor
9. Reflecting in general
10. Working on a practical problem in the school

Hulsbos et al. (2016) found that, when school leaders work on school improvements or innovations, this often involves teachers in long-term projects which leads to learning outcomes for both teachers and leaders. The authors differentiate, however, between a 'planned' approach and an 'emergent' approach:

> "Our data show fundamental differences between learning outcomes from a planned approach and an emergent approach to improvement and innovation. The first difference lies in the individual learning outcomes. Those using a planned approach often report improved skills to apply the planned approach and motivate teachers to adopt the approach as well. Those using the emergent approach learn skills to facilitate and support teachers. Moreover, the emergent approach leads to unexpected school outcomes and learning outcomes of teachers, such as unforeseen innovations and initiatives of teachers. The planned approach on the other hand leads to more expected outcomes, such as teachers who - following

> the example of the school leader - adopt the planned approach themselves. Hence, it seems that in the planned approach teachers will follow the school leader's example and school outcomes will be realised in line with the school leader's wishes. Yet, if a school leader learns to facilitate and support teachers to try out new things, teachers learn in unexpected areas and unforeseen school outcomes are realised" (Hulsbos et al., 2016: 38).

In a study in 46 elementary schools from a single school district in the south of the Netherlands, Moolenaar and Sleegers (2015) assessed principals' social network position within their own schools through asking to whom they went for work-related advice. The study aimed to test the theory that transformational school leaders[10] occupy a more central position in their school's social network than non-transformational leaders:

> "Transformational leaders may reach out to others more to ask for advice (in network terms: higher out-degree centrality), encourage relationships among their staff and colleague principals so that they can quickly reach others (creating shorter network paths, thus increasing closeness centrality), and try to exert influence by connecting educators that are themselves unconnected (higher betweenness centrality). In addition, as transformational leaders involve teachers in building a shared vision and setting clear goals for their school, show individualized attention to the needs and aspirations of teachers, and stimulate and challenge teachers to try new approaches, they may also be sought more for advice and collaboration (higher in-degree centrality) in schools and districts than less transformational leaders" (Moolenaar and Sleegers, 2015: 14).

Their findings suggest that those principals who are more closely involved in the district's collaboration network occupied a more central position in their school's network. These principals are more often sought out for advice by their teachers, and other principals like to collaborate with them. Moolenaar and Sleegers (2015) speculate that this may be because such principals have better access to district resources to support their teachers and, as such, teachers may ask them for advice more often than principals with limited access to district resources. It also raises the question whether there are personal characteristics that explain why some principals occupy central positions in both settings. Findings also suggest that transformational leaders, who actively involve others in building a shared vision and intellectually challenge their colleagues are more sought out for support by others and so have less need to actively 'broker' change.

[10] Transformational leadership is defined as a leadership approach that causes change in individuals and social systems. In its ideal form, it creates valuable and positive change in the followers with the end goal of developing followers into leaders.

Chapter 7 Canada

Overview

Education system

Education is compulsory up to the age of 16 in every province in Canada, except for Manitoba, Ontario and New Brunswick, where the compulsory age is 18, or as soon as a high school diploma has been achieved. All provinces and territories provide pre-primary education for 5-year-olds.

Canada is a federation composed of 10 provinces and three territories. Education is decentralised in Canada with only an indirect role for the federal government. In each of the 13 jurisdictions, one or two ministries or departments determine the framework for providing educational services and are responsible for the organisation, delivery and assessment of the education system. Local authorities (through school boards) are responsible for school administration, employing teachers, and in some cases, raising educational funds. However, Canada's ministers of education collaborate on pan-Canadian educational priorities through the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) with evaluation and assessment arrangements a key area for collaboration.

Much decision-making is entrusted to school boards or school districts although the level of authority delegated is at the discretion of the provincial/territorial government. The local boards/districts may have responsibility for the operation and administration (including financial) of their schools, curriculum development and implementation, personnel management and the enrolment of students (although in 2004, approximately 80% of the curriculum content was centrally determined at ministry level (OECD 2004)). Schools may have responsibility for the organisation of instruction (e.g. student careers, instruction time, choice of textbooks, grouping of students, teaching methods and day-to-day student assessment) although school leaders continue to report less autonomy than the OECD average for curriculum and assessment (e.g. establishing student assessment policies, choosing which textbooks are used, determining course content, and deciding which courses are offered), as these are often school board responsibilities (OECD 2015). School leaders also report that their schools have less autonomy than the OECD average for allocating resources (e.g. appointing and dismissing teachers, establishing teachers' starting salaries and salary raises, formulating school budgets and allocating them within the school).

Education is mostly delivered by publicly funded institutions maintained by the jurisdictions. Investment in educational institutions is slightly above the OECD average (OECD 2015).

Performance

Attainment in upper-secondary education is above the OECD average.

In Canada, approximately 20,000 15-year-olds from about 900 schools participated across the ten provinces in the PISA assessments for 2015 which was administered in English or French according to the school system. In PISA 2015, 89% of Canadian students and 79% of students in OECD countries performed at or above Level 2 in science, which is the baseline level of science proficiency. Across provinces, the percentage of Canadian students at or above the baseline level of performance ranges from 83% in Saskatchewan and Manitoba to over 90% in Quebec, Alberta, and British Columbia.

Since reading and mathematics were minor domains in PISA 2015, there were fewer assessment items in these two areas compared to the major domain of science. As a result, PISA 2015 allows for only an update on overall performance in reading and mathematics, and not on their sub-domains. On average, Canadian 15-year-olds performed well in reading and mathematics. Canadian students had an average score of 527 in reading and 516 in mathematics, well above the OECD average of 493 and 490, respectively. In reading, the performance of students in all provinces, was at or above the OECD average. In mathematics, students in Saskatchewan performed below the OECD average while students in all other provinces performed at or above the OECD average.

However, while performance in reading and science in Canada has been stable since 2006, remaining higher than the average for OECD countries, performance in mathematics has declined relatively while remaining higher than the OECD average.

On measures of equity Canada performs well, with better than average OECD performance in all three measurements: boys versus girls; social background; and immigrant students.

Scott and Webber (2013) argue that:

> “The strength of the education system over Canada’s history comes from the entrepreneurship demonstrated consistently by school and district leaders and policy makers. Educational entrepreneurship is evident at local, national, and international levels. School councils and elected school boards contribute by implementing provincial standardized curricula within local communities. This assists with the creation and sustenance of a common Canadian identity and builds cohesion across a highly diverse society. A standardized curricula enables children and youth to be able to move towns, cities, and provinces and still have their educational level understood aiding a seamless transition. At the provincial level, cross-role stakeholder participation in policy making is a strong feature of the governance processes.”

Leadership Demographics

Overview

The Canadian Statistical Information Service (Statistics Canada) does not collect data on school principals through their survey of elementary and secondary schools, although some data is available for educators which includes teachers and support staff as well as administrators, principals and vice principals. Available information on leadership is generally only available at province/territory level, if at all.

TALIS collected some data for Alberta in 2013, which is a province where more data is available than in other Canadian jurisdictions. The table below summarises key demographics for principals in Alberta, comparing these with the TALIS average:

Table 7.1: School principal demographics in Alberta, Canada

Typical principal in TALIS countries	Typical principal in Alberta (Canada)
51% are men	57% are men
96% completed university or other equivalent higher education	100% completed university or other equivalent higher education
90% completed a teacher education or training programme	98% completed a teacher education or training programme
85% a school administration/principal training programme	83% a school administration/principal training programme
78% instructional leadership training	92% instructional leadership training
Has an average of 9 years of experience as a principal and 21 years of teaching experience	Has an average of 8 years of experience as a principal and 21 years of teaching experience
62% are employed full time without teaching obligations and 35% are employed full time with teaching obligations	39% are employed full time without teaching obligations and 50% are employed full time with teaching obligations
Works in a school with 546 students and 45 teachers on average	Works in a school with 335 students and 18 teachers on average

Source: Key Findings from the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) 2013

Initial training requirements and professional experience

Qualifications and experience requirements for becoming a principal vary between provinces with some explicitly defining the role and responsibilities of a school principal in provincial/territorial legislation, along with any qualification requirements, and others delegating the responsibility to school boards/districts. In all provinces and territories, as a pre-condition to attaining a principalship, an individual must secure a teaching certificate: a valid and current license to serve as a teacher. In some provinces and territories, an additional condition for becoming, and practicing as, a principal is the requirement to attain further certification (Kun, 2013). Examples of the different approaches are given below. However, regardless of their status as mandatory or otherwise, qualifications/preparation courses for principals are available through universities and other training providers in all provinces.

Principals in publicly funded schools in Ontario are required to have an undergraduate degree, five years of teaching experience, certification in three divisions (primary, junior, intermediate, senior), two Specialist or Honour Specialist additional qualifications or a master's degree, and are required to complete the Principal's Qualification Program. The Principal's Qualification Program is offered by Ontario universities, teachers' federations and principals' associations. The program is designed to provide educators with the knowledge and skills necessary to become effective school administrators.

In New Brunswick, a certificate is a requirement for holding a Principal’s or Vice Principal’s position in schools. In order to be eligible for a Principal’s certificate, candidates must hold at least a certificate 5 (higher level teaching certificate) and have a minimum of 5 years of teaching experience. New Brunswick operates a two-tiered system, with an Interim Principal’s Certificate given to an individual who has completed the required course work and training, but not the practicum component, and a Principal’s Certificate given to the holder of an interim certificate who has completed the practicum and has been duly recommended by the local superintendent of education. Participants are required to belong to their District Leadership Development Program and to complete 6 modules as part of this program. Three of the Modules are compulsory: Legal Aspects 1; Legal Aspects 2; and School Improvement Planning /School Performance Review. The other 3 modules are selected from the offerings of the aspiring principal’s district. In addition, three Graduate Level University courses must be completed, one each in: Current Administrative Theory; Supervision of Instruction; and Assessment and Evaluation in Education. The Office of Teacher Certification must approve each course selection. Upon completion of the training outlined above, the candidate may apply to the Office of Teacher Certification for an Interim Principal's Certificate. Upon receiving an Interim Principal's Certificate, the candidate is eligible for the one-year practicum phase of training. The practicum component will be completed in conjunction with the candidate having an administrative position.

In Manitoba, there is no mandatory requirement to complete the Certificate in School Leadership that is the recognised qualification although this may be a requirement of the employing school district authority. The Certificate may be issued where the person:

- holds a valid Manitoba Permanent Professional Teaching Certificate
- has three years or more of approved teaching experience while holding a valid Manitoba Permanent Professional Teaching Certificate or an approved teaching certificate issued by a jurisdiction outside Manitoba and satisfies one of the following requirements:
    - completes an approved 30 credit hour post-baccalaureate program with a focus in educational administration offered by a faculty of education that includes:
        - 15 core credit hours linked to all of the five Domains of Knowledge and Skill;
        - 6 credit hours of Field-led courses linked to one or more of the five Domains of Knowledge and Skill; and
        - 9 credit hours of elective courses; or
    - completes an approved Master of Education degree with a specialisation in educational administration that is a minimum of 30 credit hours.

Note that this programme replaces the previous two-tier certification process described in the table below from September 2017.

The table below sets out the requirements for certification in each province/territory:

Table 7.2: School principal certification requirements and responsibilities in Canada

Province or Territory	Principal Certification	Required
Alberta	Government responsibility; Newly proposed Two-tiered structure: Interim Professional Certificate Permanent Professional Certificate (lifetime)	No – only a valid teaching certificate
British Columbia	Not a Government responsibility; Certification is through the BC College of Teachers, a self-governing professional body established by legislation; a One-	No – only a valid teaching certificate

Province or Territory	Principal Certification	Required
	tiered structure: 1) Teacher's Certificate of Qualification (para. 2)	
Manitoba	Government responsibility; Until September 2017 (replaced with a single certificate, see above): Two-levelled structure: Level 1: School Administrator's Certificate – valid teaching certificate with three-years teaching experience plus120 contact hours Level 2: Principal's Certificate – valid teaching certificate and two-full years as vice-principal or principal plus 180 contact hours (p. 3) Master's or Doctoral degree required for certification	Yes – in addition to a valid Permanent Professional Teaching Certificate plus a minimum of 3years of teaching experience
New Brunswick	Government responsibility; Two-levelled structure: 1) Interim Principal's Certificate 2) Principal's Certificate – issued to an interim principal's certificate holder who has completed a practicum approved by the Minister	Yes – in addition to a valid Teacher's Certificate 5 or 6 or Interim Teacher's Certificate 5 or 6 with at least 5 years of teaching experience, or equivalent approved training and experience; Certificate 5 requires completion of an approved graduate degree
Newfoundland & Labrador	Government responsibility;	No – only certification as a teacher
Northwest Territories	Government responsibility;	Yes – Certificate of Eligibility as a Principal in addition to teaching certificate which must be renewed every 5 years

Province or Territory	Principal Certification	Required
Nova Scotia	Government responsibility;	No – only certification as a teacher
Nunavut Territory	Government responsibility;	Yes- Certificate of Eligibility as a Principal in addition to teaching certificate
Ontario	Not a Government responsibility; Certification is through the Ontario College, a Self-governing professional body established by legislation	Yes-in addition to a teaching certificate
Prince Edward	Government responsibility;	Yes – Instructional Administrative License, in addition to teaching certificate
Quebec	Government responsibility;	Yes – Leadership Certificate, in addition to teaching certificate
Saskatchewan	Government responsibility; Four types of certificates: 1) Professional 'A' Teacher's Certificate For kindergarten to grade 12 2) Professional 'B' Teacher's Certificate (endorsed) for kindergarten to grade 12- limited to endorsed subject area 3) Vocational Teacher's Certificate (endorsed) for kindergarten to grade 12- limited to endorsed subject area 4) Technical Teacher's Certificate (endorsed) for kindergarten to grade 12- limited to endorsed subject area	No – only certification as a teacher
Yukon Territory	Government responsibility;	No – only certification as a teacher

Source: Kun (2013)

As can be seen above, for the majority of the provinces and territories, some form of proscribed certification is a requirement for principals and, even where it is not an absolute perquisite for being hired, local governments often specify a recognised form of certification. For example, the Nova Scotia Instructional Leadership Academy Program

(NSILA, 2010) is a standards-based programme that provides public school principals and other leaders with postgraduate-level training. It aims to improve the capacity for school-based instructional leadership in order to increase student learning and achievement in Nova Scotia public schools. Achieving the Diploma in Instructional Leadership demonstrates a high level of commitment to the field of practice, increases and validates skills and knowledge, and recognises professionals who have met this high standard of achievement (OECD 2015).

Government websites seldom publish information on the course content which may be because content varies depending on local and current priorities and circumstances. However, a number of provinces and territories have developed frameworks of standards or sets of competencies for school leaders.

In the Province of Alberta, the Alberta Commission on Learning (2003) argued that the role of principal "has gone beyond organizing and managing a school to leading a diverse and challenging education enterprise" (p. 122). It further argued that the then existing programmes of preparation for the role were not sufficiently targeted at "the knowledge, skills, and attributes principals need to be effective. They tend to be research-based and focused on educational theory and knowledge" (p. 123). This was developed further in The Principal Quality Practice Guideline (Alberta Education, 2009) which argued that, previously:

> "Policymakers assumed that significant, positive teaching experience generally provided individuals with sufficient preparation to assume the office of school principal. Therefore, Alberta, like most other Canadian provinces, required only that an individual designated as a school principal be a certificated teacher. However, some Alberta school authorities increasingly recognized that teaching qualifications and successful teaching experience alone were insufficient to prepare individuals to serve as school principals. Over time, school boards have increasingly required that individuals interested in being considered for the principalship hold post-graduate diplomas or degrees in education administration or leadership" (Alberta Education, 2009: 3).

The intention appeared to be that a ministerial order for a framework similar to that posited in the Quality Practice document would be forthcoming but as yet, this does not appear to be the case. Alberta Education (2009) describes seven dimensions which would form the basis of a framework:

- fostering effective relationships
- embodying visionary leadership
- leading a learning community
- providing instructional leadership

- developing and facilitating leadership
- managing school operations and resources
- understanding and responding to the larger societal context

It argues that the knowledge, skills and attributes within each dimension should form the basis for recruiting principals, preparing school principals and assessing each principal's performance.

Mombourquette (2013) found that only 14 of the 46 school districts reviewed had policies or procedures in place that were consistent with the Alberta Guideline although a further third had policies and procedures in keeping with the intent of the Guideline. Some districts had used the leadership competencies to develop role descriptions and to build on a requirement for principals to develop and report on their professional growth. Mombourquette (2013) questions why some jurisdictions have not incorporated the Guideline and was unable to provide a definitive answer, wondering if legislation was a requirement to force change.

In a review of principal preparation courses in Alberta, Webber and Scott (2010) make three suggestions and observations:

1. A caution against what they refer to as "credential creep." That is, more certificates, diplomas, and degrees do not necessarily mean better leadership without adequate attention to the social, political, and economic environments in which leaders practice.
2. Second, the potential benefits of inter-institutional collaboration among organisations and across cultures should be explored in future studies. The expansion of globalisation makes it reasonable that educational leaders need to develop cross-cultural literacies to a far greater degree than in the past.
3. Finally, findings do not suggest a one-size-fits-all model for leadership development but, rather, they offer a set of insights intended to inform other professional developers.

Ontario's Leadership Framework for Principals and Vice-Principals (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2012) stems from commitments in Leading Education: New Supports for Principals and Vice-principals in Ontario Publicly Funded Schools (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2005) to develop, support and sustain high quality leadership in schools across the province. It is made up of two parts:

1. Leader competencies and practices that have been shown to be effective in improving student achievement. These come under the headings of: Setting directions; Building relationships and developing people; Developing the organization; Leading the instructional program; and Securing accountability.

2. System practices and procedures that boards should have in place to support school and system leaders to be effective. These include a commitment to school and board improvement; fostering professionalism; leadership development; administrative structures to support and streamline processes; providing parent and community support; and succession planning, recruitment and capacity building.

Lyons (2016) identifies as a weakness that opportunities to develop knowledge and expertise related to inclusive education are lacking within educational leadership programs across Canada. However, she also cautions against a fragmented approach which looks at issues of inclusion and disability in isolation rather than as a germane topic within courses or modules focusing on, among other things, human resources, legislation and policy, ethics and instructional leadership.

Recruitment procedures

Recruitment of principals and vice principals in Canada is the responsibility of the local school board. As noted above, principals are also certified/licensed teachers and so becoming a school principal is often viewed as a form of promotion.

While there is little research available on the effectiveness of recruitment processes, the following excerpt from an official review of the Toronto District School Board (which is the largest in Canada serving 588 schools) describes the process there:

> "The promotion process for vice-principals and principals is staff-intensive. The candidates submit a notice of intent to apply, which must be signed by the supervisory officer (SO, also referred to as the superintendent) responsible for the candidate's school. Reference checks are completed by the immediate supervisor and the SO. Applicants who are deemed ready to proceed are interviewed by a panel. For principal appointments, the panel is composed of two SOs and one principal. For vice-principals, the panel is one SO, two principals and a parent representative. The interview team decides whether or not to place the candidate on the promotion list. Candidates remain on the list for a minimum of two full school years. When a vacancy is identified in a school, the School Council and the SO complete their respective sections of the School Statement of Needs (SSON) form. The SO discusses the SSON with the parent representative and the ward trustee. The SO then works with the Executive Supervisory Officer of Employee Services to recommend a candidate from the promotion list whose experience is consistent with the needs and priorities expressed in the SSON. The SO then meets separately with the candidate, the parent representative and the trustee. Following these discussions, the SO might consider another candidate. Finally, the SO, the recommended candidate, the parent representative and the trustee meet to discuss the needs and priorities identified in the SSON. The recommended candidate is then placed on the slate, which is presented to the Board for approval."

The review comments that this process allows trustees and Parent Council chairs to veto candidates. Interviews undertaken as part of the review found that many had exercised this veto and that successful candidates had sometimes been identified prior to the formal interview and selection process taking place. The review makes a number of recommendations that include streamlining the process and reducing the ability of individuals to make subjective decisions on candidates' suitability.

While other school boards may adopt different policies and procedures in making senior appointments to their schools, it is clear that there is no uniform practice for how this is done.

There are no published statistics for vacancy rates for school leaders in Canada but, in an article in the Globe and Mail newspaper in 2014, Paul Newton, an associate professor at the University of Alberta, who has researched the role of the school leader, claimed that:

> "The research for the last 20 years is quite clear, teachers are not attracted to the principalship. Principals were always responsible for ensuring efficient management of the school, but, increasingly, the principal has become responsible for the academic achievement of students. This is not an insignificant shift."

The same article also states that the number of educators receiving their principal qualifications in Ontario dropped from 1,056 in 2003 to 590 in 2013, according to data from the Ontario College of Teachers. A spokesman for Alberta Education is reported as saying that school superintendents have indicated a greater challenge than in the past in recruiting teachers to become principals.

Employment status

While there are no pan-Canadian statistics, TALIS (2013) found that more principals in Alberta (50%) had teaching responsibilities compared with the average for TALIS countries (35%). Additionally, 11% of Alberta's principals were not employed full time against an average across TALIS countries of only 3%.

Age

The last pan-Canadian survey of school principals by Statistics Canada took place in 2005. At that time 57% of principals were aged over 50 compared with 32% of managers of similar levels of responsibility across the labour force. Similarly, only 12% of principals were aged 39 or below, compared with 33% of managers overall.

Gender

Statistics Canada, in 2005, reported that women accounted for 47% of all school principals but with marked differences at school level with 53% of principals being female at elementary level, compared with only 32% at secondary level.

TALIS (2013) found 57% of school principals in Alberta were men, compared with an average of 51% across TALIS countries.

Salary

There are no nationally prescribed salary ranges for school principals.

The Alberta Wage and Salary survey of 2015 reported an average salary of C$107,891(EURO 73,366)[1] for school principals (secondary and elementary combined).

A job site gives the median annual School Principal salary in Ontario as $108,255 (EURO 73,613), as of September 06, 2017, with a range usually between $95,616 - $121,777, not including bonus and benefit information and other factors that impact base pay. [11]

A compensation analysis organization provides a range of C$60,000 (EURO 37,746) to C$120,000 (EURO 75,491) for school principals across Canada, with a median of C$97,018 (EURO 61,033).[12]

Styles of Leadership

In PISA 2012, school leaders in Canada reported a higher level of instructional leadership than the OECD average (OECD 2015).

As noted above, in school systems where teachers and principals collaborate more frequently in managing schools, autonomy is positively related to performance in mathematics. PISA 2012 asked school principals to report how frequently various actions and behaviours related to managing their school occurred in the previous academic year. Principals' responded to three questions about their engagement with teachers in school management: providing staff with opportunities to make decisions concerning the school; engaging teachers to help build a culture of continuous improvement in the school; and asking teachers to participate in reviewing management practices. Responses to these three questions are combined to develop a composite index, the index of teacher participation in school management. Ranking the 42 countries in terms of descending

[11] http://www1.salary.com/CA/Ontario/School-Principal-salary.html

[12] https://www.payscale.com/research/CA/Job=High_School_Principal/Salary

order of teachers' participation in school management, Canada (Alberta) is at number 11, suggesting a higher than average level of participation.

TALIS (2013) (based on data from Alberta), recommended an increased use of distributed leadership models and strategies for principals, along with increased training in and applications of instructional leadership. Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA) (2014) note the philosophical tension in the TALIS call for principals to simultaneously embrace instructional leadership and distributed leadership—leadership models that locate power and expertise very differently within the school. ATA's own findings suggest that principals value instructional leadership as the most rewarding aspect of their role, while acknowledging that they struggle to find sufficient time to focus on it.

New leaders report tensions between managerial demands and the desire to be instructional leaders in their school; Scott and Webber (2013) advocate a reconceptualisation of leadership so that tasks seen as managerial are understood in terms of their impact on teachers. Thus mundane tasks such as timetabling, school maintenance and staffing can be viewed in terms of their potentially powerful impact on teachers' instructional practices and professional development, as well as in building a school culture and improving student achievement. "Therefore, sophisticated leadership development focuses concurrently on instructional, entrepreneurial, and inclusive approaches."

Webber and Scott (2008) developed a conceptual framework for educational entrepreneurship containing six dimensions. The dimensions are: innovative behaviour, networking, time-space communication framework, local-global perspective, educational organisations as knowledge centres, and integrated face-to-face and Internet-based learning. Major considerations suggested for entrepreneurial initiatives include access, equity, quality, and sustainability. Educational entrepreneurship is defined as "the strategic focus on creating short and long-term opportunities for learning that will make a significant difference for individuals and their societies. Elements of educational entrepreneurship highlighted are strategic planning, the capacity to make responsible but timely decisions, business acumen, faculty development, and strategic alliances."

Beauchamp and Parsons (2012), in case studies of five elementary schools where instructional leadership was practiced successfully, concluded that principals who practiced successful leadership in the schools they researched were able to create spaces where teachers and students 'did it themselves.' Successful school leaders used their skills to build strong relationships, inspire a shared vision and enable others to act. They described the leaders they studied as 'constructivists' defined as developing a reciprocal learning process that helps community participants construct meaning towards shared purposes.

Hauserman and Stick (2013), in a study conducted in Alberta, found that teachers strongly preferred those principals who displayed 'transformational' leadership, summarised *as:*

- **Idealised influence**- behaviours highlighted included maintaining and creating visibility, developing rapport, holding students and teachers accountable, having high expectations, having a best-practices emphasis, leading by example, mentoring, showing consistent fairness, making ethical decisions, and building leadership capacity.
- **Individual consideration -** behaviours included collaborating on decisions, listening and caring, consulting involved parties, being consistent, and making decisions that were best for children.
- **Inspirational motivation** - behaviours were demonstrated by showing encouragement and support, promoting teamwork, celebrating successes, and using humour effectively.
- **Intellectual stimulation** - illustrated by asking questions and challenging the status quo, explaining decisions, using current research, trusting staff to take risks, focusing on a collaborative vision, being a proactive problem solver, and providing creative solutions.

Kutsyuruba et al. (2016) emphasise the importance of trust in implementing school reforms arguing that it is that it is “crucial that school principals have a certain threshold of trust to lead effectively.” Trust relates not only to positive character traits such as kindness, honesty and reliability, but also to trust in the principal’s level of competence expressed through others’ trust in their capacity to accomplish tasks and make the right decisions. Reciprocal trust – with superiors, peers, subordinates and external stakeholders such as parents and the wider community – was a strong theme in successful leaders. This was particularly important with teachers who felt empowered by the trust placed in them by the principal and reciprocated by trusting the principal. Principals recognised that trust has the ability to create a safe school environment where best teaching practices and professional learning, as well as student learning and achievement, were a priority. School leaders who create bonds of trust help create the conditions that inspire teachers to move to higher levels of effort and achievement (Tschannen-Moran and Gareis, 2015).

Lambersky (2014), in a qualitative research study in Ontario, also linked the behaviours of the principal to the ability to improve student achievement through their impact on teaching staff. Key principal behaviours affecting teacher performance included showing professional respect for teachers; encouraging and acknowledging teacher effort and results; providing appropriate protection; being seen; allowing teacher voice; and communicating principal vision.

Leadership Activities

In a paper on the future of principals in Canada (2014), the Alberta Teachers’ Association (ATA) outlined the wide array of functions expected to be performed by Canadian principals in the context of widespread societal and educational changes. This included:

- managing budgets
- inspiring teachers
- building relationships with parents
- negotiating change.

Respondents in a pan-Canadian survey of principals reported that schools are overloaded with responsibilities stemming largely from increasingly stringent accountability measures. “Administrative and reporting requirements diminish the school leader’s capacity to support teachers and build a school community” (Alberta Teachers’ Association, 2014, p11).

Principals’ workload has increased and is becoming increasingly complex (Pollock, 2016). Principals are, on occasion, demoralised by their inability to spend time on relationships and learning, which they perceived to be the most meaningful and effective use of their time (ATA, 2014). The roles of pedagogical leader and educator of the students are less frequently considered important in the work of principals; nevertheless, the vast majority of administrators (over 85%) still consider these roles important or very important (Cattonar et al., 2007).

Pollock (2016) cites relatively new forms of communication, such as email and other internet applications as adding an additional layer of complexity to principals’ work by increasing the demand for communicating policy, information sharing and decision making, and blurring the boundaries between home and work.

ATA (2014) argues that changes that have influenced the changing roles of school leaders in Canada can be grouped under the following headings:

1. School regulation changes
2. Pedagogical changes
3. Budgetary cuts
4. Changes in parents’ perception regarding their role in education
5. Social changes
6. Demographic changes
7. Marketisation of education
8. Technological advancement

These influences, the most dominant of which is changes to school regulations (which includes curriculum changes and accountability) have led to changes to the work that principals in Canada do in the following areas:

1. Increased workload
2. Increased complexity of the job
3. Increased focus on instructional leadership
4. Increased focus on transformational leadership
5. Development of new skills
6. Increased focus on external relationships
7. Changes in leadership approach
8. Changes in autonomy
9. Increased levels of stress
10. Decreased family/personal time

In a survey in 2004 -2005, Statistics Canada asked principals about the tasks they undertook and whether they wanted more or less responsibility for them:

Table 7.3: School principals' perceptions of the match between the actual and the ideal level of responsibility for selected tasks in Canada

	Percentage of principals reporting having full responsibility	Percentage of principals who:		
		Want more responsibility	Have the ideal level of responsibility	Want less responsibility
Recruitment and selection of professional staff	29.1	56.5	40.7	2.8
Recruitment and selection of technical staff	35.7	48.3	47.6	4.1
Recruitment and selection of teachers	66.6	41.8	55.0	3.2
Recruitment and selection of students	27.0	24.6	69.3	6.0
Supervision of professional staff	63.8	22.9	67.4	9.8
Educational development of teachers	62.7	21.8	69.7	8.4
Evaluation of educational materials	37.3	19.9	74.0	6.0
Supervision of technical staff	59.2	17.7	71.4	10.9
Developing the school budget	78.7	16.3	73.7	10.1
Selection of educational materials	55.7	15.3	79.2	5.5
Evaluation of educational	76.7	15.1	76.7	8.2

	Percentage of principals reporting having full responsibility	Percentage of principals who:		
		Want more responsibility	Have the ideal level of responsibility	Want less responsibility
programs and teaching methods				
Definition of the objectives and profiles of the educational programs at the schools	76.9	13.5	80.5	5.9
Assignment of teaching tasks	90.4	13.4	82.9	3.7
Participation in management or school board committees	56.0	12.0	74.9	13.0
Partnerships with community organizations	73.8	8.9	74.5	16.6
Educational and administrative training of parent members of the school's governing body	55.2	8.8	70.0	21.2
Acquisition of private funds	49.3	8.8	59.0	32.2
Decisions for allocation of the budget	91.5	8.1	83.2	8.7

	Percentage of principals reporting having full responsibility	Percentage of principals who:		
		Want more responsibility	Have the ideal level of responsibility	Want less responsibility
within the school				
Ensuring parental involvement in the life of the school	83.3	6.1	77.8	16.1
Collection, processing and analysis of school data and statistics	77.7	6.0	67.9	26.1
Raising the community's awareness of the school's objectives and achievements	90.1	5.9	76.7	17.3
Management of funds generated by school activities and services	85.1	5.9	77.4	16.7
Supervision of teachers	93.8	5.7	83.4	10.9
Management of the school's material resources	84.4	5.4	71.7	22.9
Assignment of students to classes or to the educational	85.1	5.3	89.7	5.0

	Percentage of principals reporting having full responsibility	Percentage of principals who:		
		Want more responsibility	Have the ideal level of responsibility	Want less responsibility
programs in school				
Development of the school's mission, direction, development or success plan	96.3	3.4	88.5	8.1
Resolution of conflicts between school/families over values	85.9	3.0	75.3	21.7
Supervision of students outside of class, in the school	79.2	2.4	79.5	18.1
Development of the school's rules	97.1	2.2	92.3	5.5
Reporting to appropriate authorities for accountability	94.8	1.7*	76.1	22.2
Disciplining of students	91.9	1.3*	81.4	17.3

Note: * Numbers marked with this symbol have a coefficient of variation between 16.5% and 25% and are less reliable than unmarked numbers

Source: Statistics Canada, Survey of Principals, 2004-2005.

Cattonar et al. (2007) categorised the typical activities of principals in the following way:

1. General manager and administrator: budgetary appropriation, emergency management, general administration of the school, etc.

2. Educational administrator: development of regulations and the school's mission, assignment of teaching tasks, teacher supervision and evaluation, etc.

3. Manager of external relations: parent-teacher mediation, liaising with the authorities, promoting the school in the community

Where there is debate in the literature, it concerns the relative importance of each of these domains, how well principals are equipped to meet all of their demands and the extent to which these activities can and should be distributed within the school.

Continuing Professional Development

Engaging in professional development is not a requirement of principals in Canada, although the two-tier leadership qualifications in some provinces/territories do have a practicum component to be completed typically within one or two years of being appointed.

Another common practice is the use of mentors for newly appointed principals and vice principals which is the case in Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Ontario, and Saskatchewan; however, there is no evidence of formal induction processes in Canada (Kun, 2013). A mentoring/coaching program operated by the Ontario Ministry of Education was based on a theoretical framework consistent with cognitive theory and adaptive expertise. Nanavati and Robinson (2009) concluded that new principals improved their skills and their sense of confidence as new administrators by having the opportunity to network and meet other administrators in training sessions and group meetings to overcome the culture of isolation that often accompanies the first year of administration.

Given the importance of school leadership and the projected retirement of a number of current principals, the Alberta Teachers' Association initiated a 16-month pilot of the L2L Leadership Program to support newly appointed principals. The purpose of the L2L Leadership Program was "to develop a network of reflective, self-reliant school leaders whose high-quality leadership optimizes student learning and supports improvement initiatives that take into account the unique context of each school" (Alberta Teachers' Association, 2012, p. 1). In a case study review of the Cognitive Coaching element which paired new principals with a coach from outside their school district, Rogers et al. (2016) concluded that "the knowledge, practice, level of thinking, self-reflection, self-efficacy, and confidence of the new principals improved during the time of the pilot program."

Riveros et al. (2013) in a study of teacher leadership in Alberta argued that the emphasis on teacher leadership as a vehicle for school improvement can cloud the importance of teacher leadership roles in career advancement with the consequence that the research evidence on the benefits of leadership professional development is strikingly absent.

Much of the limited amount of literature relates to collaborative learning through formal and informal networks (Nixon, 2016) although Leithwood et al. (2010) contend that the focus in Canada and the U.S. on professional learning communities and on principal participation in learning teams is inconsistent with evidence showing they contribute minimally to student achievement. Nixon (2016) suggests that action research takes place in schools when a group identifies a concern or deficit. “Development of school leadership occurs as problems emerge and leaders acquire the ability to transfer knowledge from known solutions to new situations” (Rogers et al. 2016). In case studies in Alberta, principals explored innovative teaching practices and documentation methods along with teachers and so were both learners and leaders. An implication of the case studies was the need for time for principals to reflect on what constitutes good teaching and learning in their particular context and opportunities to stay abreast of research on good teaching and assessment practices.

Reid (2013), in a study in Ontario, highlighted the importance of principals promoting environments and cultures of reflection and sharing in which knowledge is collaboratively created and mobilised throughout the organisation. Principals supported and modelled the difficult task of challenging the status quo and advancing different ways of thinking and acting and created safe places in which risks could be taken. Reid (2013) also emphasised the importance of ensuring leaders and educators had the time and space to analyse data and reflect on instructional and leadership practices.

Cooper and Levin (2013) analysed survey data from school principals across Canada and found a growing awareness of the importance of using research but that this had translated into only modest behavioural changes in principals’ actual instigation and use of research. Generally, processes for finding, sharing and using relevant research were weak across school districts despite wide support for the idea that policy and practice should be grounded in empirical evidence. However, Beauchamp and Parsons (2012) paint a different picture in Alberta where the Alberta Initiative for School Improvement (AISI) movement, begun in 2000, has led to the province-wide organisation of school site-based research projects with the result that Alberta has been able to build strong collegial relationships among educational partners and within the educational community.

Principals in a pan-Canadian survey (Alberta Teachers’ Association, 2014) offered surprisingly few specifics about the kind of support they needed for their professional development:

> “Many of the needs that they did indicate were content focused, such as help with technology, mediation training for work with parents and timetabling strategies. Yet, principals clearly expressed that they value time in an instructional leadership role and want to spend more time occupying that role.” (Alberta Teachers’ Association, 2014. P 53)

Chapter 8: Singapore

Overview

Education system

There are opportunities for every child in Singapore to complete at least ten years of general education, with drop-out rates before the completion of ten years of education at less than 1%. The school system features a national examination at the end of the primary (6 years), secondary (4 to 5 years) and junior college (2 to 3 years) stages. Upon completion of their primary education, students can choose from a wider range of schools and programmes that cater to different strengths and interests. There are lateral bridges, with bridging programmes that allow students to transfer across parallel courses of studies. Bilingualism is a key feature of the education system. While most subjects are taught in English, all students also learn an official Mother Tongue Language. (Ministry of Education, Singapore, 2016).

Pupil-teacher ratio in primary schools in 2013 had improved to 17.6, down from 25.9 in 2000. In secondary schools, it had improved to 14.2 in 2013, down from 19.2 in 2000 (Ministry of Education, Singapore, 2013).

There is a national curriculum at every level and in every subject, which is reviewed once every six years, with a mid-term review in the third year of implementation. The Ministry of Education has processes to ensure that textbooks and learning materials used in schools are aligned with the national curriculum. In Singapore, curriculum and pedagogy for each subject area are reviewed in tandem, with curriculum planners tasked to develop learning and teaching strategies appropriate to the respective syllabuses.

Performance

International comparative studies such as the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) indicate that student outcomes generated by the education system in Singapore is of high quality. The same studies also indicate that the results of the low-performing students have been improving over the years.

Leadership Demographics

Initial training requirements and professional experience

Singapore, use a planning model, continuously assessing teachers for different leadership positions and providing them with the opportunity for training (Schleicher ed., 2012). Only those who successfully complete a six-month, full-time Leaders in Education Programme (LEP) can be appointed as principals. LEP is therefore mandatory for aspiring principals (Ng, 2009; Retna, 2015; State Government of Victoria, 2012: Walker, Bryant, and Lee 2013).

Table 8.1: Teaching experience and training required before appointment as a school principal in Singapore

Teaching experience	Initial training requirements
Future school leaders are chosen from successful teachers already in the education system. Future school leaders are chosen from successful teachers already in the education system. Moreover, all education leadership positions are part of the teaching-career structure. All education leadership positions are part of the teaching-career structure.	Potential school leaders are selected to attend the Leaders in Education Programme (LEP) at Singapore's National Institute for Education. Completion of this six-month, full-time programme is a mandatory for aspiring principals.

Source: Retna, 2015

The Singapore Ministry of Education provides oversight in the selection of LEP participants. The selection process for LEP is stringent (Retna, 2015: 531) and only 35 people per year are selected for the programme (Schleicher, ed., 2012). It has been suggested by academic researchers that the drawback of this for the Singapore system is that there is less diversity in the class

Recruitment procedures

Singapore's approach to recruitment differs from countries in which a teacher can apply to train as a principal or school head, and then apply for a position in a school. In Singapore teachers who demonstrate leadership potential are identified early and move into middle management teams for development. They participate in training that prepares them for school leadership and innovation and, as noted above, complete a six-month, full-time Management and Leadership in Schools program, with their salaries paid. Those that do well are matched to a school and receive continuous mentoring, peer group learning and professional development (Retna, 2015: 531; Schleicher, ed., 2012).

Employment status

Virtually all school principals in Singapore are employed full-time, without teaching obligations.

Table 8.2: The employment status of school principals in lower secondary education in Singapore (TALIS 2013)

Employment status	Singapore	OECD Average
Full time without teaching obligations	99.3%	66%
Full time with teaching obligations	0.7%	33.3%
Part time without teaching obligations	0.0%	1.0%
Part time with teaching obligations	0%	2.5%

Source: OECD, 2016a: 461

Age

Singapore's Ministry of Education (2016) reports that just under half (49.4%) of school principals in primary education are over 50, with 48% aged between 40 and 49 and 3.7% aged 39 or under.

Table 8.3: Age of school principals in primary education in Singapore (2015)

Age (in years)	Female	Male	Total
29 & Below	0	0	0
30-34	0	0	0
35-39	7 (3.7%)	0	7 (3.7%)
40-44	26 (13.7%)	12 (6.3%)	38 (20.0%)
45-49	39 (21.5%)	12 (6.3%)	51 26.8%)
50-54	31 (16.3%)	9 (4.7%) (21%)	40 (21%)
55 & above	41 (21.6%)	13 (6.8%)	54 (28.4%)
Total	144 (75.8%)	46 (24.2%)	190 (100%)

Source: Ministry of Education, Singapore, 2016b

The age profile in secondary education is slightly younger with 40.2% of school principals in secondary education aged over 50, 54.9% aged between 40 and 49 and 2.9% aged 39 or under. This compares with an OECD average in TALIS (2013) of 65.2% of school principals in lower secondary education being aged 50 or over (OECD, 2016b).

Table 8.4: Age of school principals in secondary education in Singapore (2015)

Age (in years)	Female	Male	Total
29 & Below	0	0	0
30-34	0	0	0
35-39	4 (2.4%)	4 (2.4%)	8 (2.9%)
40-44	26 (15.9%)	26 (15.9%)	52 (31.7%)
45-49	19 (11.6%)	19 (11.6%)	38 (23.2%)
50-54	15 (9.1%)	11 (6.7%)	26 (15.8%)
55 & above	24 (14.6%)	16 (9.8%)	40 (24.4%)
Total	88 (53.7%)	76 (46.3%)	164 (100%)

Source: Ministry of Education, Singapore (2016)

The combined figures (shown in Table 8.5) are: 45.2% of school principals in secondary education aged over 50 years; 50.5% aged between 40 years and 49 years; and 4.2% aged 39 years or under.

Table 8.5: Age of school principals in primary and secondary education combined in Singapore (2015)

Age (in years)	Female	Male	Total
29 & Below	0	0	0
30-34	0	0	0
35-39	11 (3.1%)	4 (1.1%)	15 (4.2%)
40-44	52 (14.7%)	38 (10.7%)	90 (25.4%)
45-49	58 (16.4%)	31 (8.7%)	89 (25.1%)
50-54	46 (13%)	20 (5.6%)	66 (18.6%)
55 & above	65 (18.4%)	29 (8.2%)	94 (26.6%)
	232 (65.5%)	122 (34.5%%)	354

Source: Ministry of Education, Singapore (2016)

Table 8.6: The percentage of school principals in lower secondary education in Singapore in different age groups (TALIS 2013)

Age group	Singapore	OECD Average
Under 30	0.0%	0.1%
30-39 years	10.7%	6.3%
40-49 years	39.4%	28.4%
50-59 years	47.9%	47.8%
60 years or more	2%	17.4%

Source: OECD, 2016a: 460

Gender

Singapore's Ministry of Education (2016) reports that the proportion of female principals in basic education is 66%. The percentages of female principals are noticeably higher in primary education (76%) and lower in secondary education (54%). The tables below set out the gender split of principals and vice principals, both overall and by phase:

Table 8.7: Gender of school principals in Singapore (2015)

	Female	Male	Total
Primary	76% (144)	24% (46)	100% (190)
Secondary	54% (88)	46% (76)	100% (164)
Combined	66% (232)	34% (122)	100% (354)

Source: Ministry of Education, Singapore (2016)

Table 8.8: Gender of vice principals in Singapore

	Female	Male	Total
Primary	68% (206)	32% (97)	100% (303)
Secondary	49% (155)	51% (160)	100% (315)
Combined	58% (361)	42% (257)	100% (618)

Source: Ministry of Education, Singapore (2016)

Salary

A compensation analysis organization indicates that the average school principal salary in Singapore is SGD 82,486 (EURO 51,884.42). In addition, school principals earn an average bonus of SGD 4,561 (EURO 2,868.91).The entry level salary is 58,291 (SGD) (EURO 36,666); the senior level salary is SGD 102,683 (EURO 64,584).[13]

Styles of Leadership

According to Zongyi Deng & S. Gopinathan (2016), in Singapore school leaders are expected to be instructional leaders, practising distributed leadership and being able to provide teachers with guidance and support in curriculum and instruction.

In a national survey of 1,232 Singapore principals, vice-principals and heads of department, Hairon et al (2015) explored the idea of distributed leadership in Singapore schools. The sense of control from those in higher level positions was evident in that whilst leadership was distributed, it was done so within relatively tight boundaries of empowerment, and cautiously in terms of developing leadership. Nevertheless, there was evidence of genuine shared decision making, and collective engagement. So, whilst there is control and caution in terms of leadership distribution, there is a sense of wanting to involve many in a collective endeavour to improve schools. Hairon et al (2015) argued that societal cultural values may play a large part in shaping distributed leadership practices in Singapore schools, with school leaders drawing upon Asian cultural values of collectivism and hierarchy, and economic pragmatism in the enactment of distributed leadership actions.

The table below shows the extent to which principals report that the responsibility for a task is shared with other members of the school management team, teachers who are not part of the school management team, a school's governing board, or a local or national authority. This indicates that the percentage of principals that report a degree of shared responsibility exceeds the OECD average for tasks in some areas, especially those relating to teaching and learning (deciding on budget allocations within the school, establishing student disciplinary policies and procedures, approving students for admission to the school, deciding which courses are offered), but does not do so in others (e.g. in relation to disciplinary procedures for teachers and salaries).

[13] Currency conversion based on XE rates 21/11/2017 of 0.63 Singapore dollars to the euro.

Table 8.9: percentage of school principals of lower secondary schools in Singapore who report a shared responsibility for the following leadership activities/tasks (TALIS 2013)

	Singapore	OECD Average
Appointing or hiring teachers	36.8%	41.5%
Dismissing or suspending teachers from employment	31.5**% %**	31.0%.
Establishing teachers' starting salaries, including setting pay scales	6.0**%**	15.6%
Determining teachers' salary increases	14.7**%**	20.1%
Deciding on budget allocations within the school	69.7**%**	49%
Establishing student disciplinary policies and procedures	83.9**%**	63%
Approving students for admission to the school	66.3**%**	37.3%
Choosing which learning materials are used	40.2**%**	47.5%
Deciding which courses are offered	75.8**%**	59.3

Source: OECD, 2016a: 464

With regards to instructional leadership, in a systematic literature review of literature on this form of leadership in Singapore, Ng et al. (2015) found that Singapore principals worked with others within the school community and experts from external institutions to perform instructional leadership. Principals focused attention on developing the school vision, creating a good learning climate and developing and improving the school-wide curriculum. The review highlighted a lack of direct involvement of Singapore principals in instruction evaluation and supervision. Instead, such roles are delegated to the middle-levels leaders. Singapore principals' practice of instructional leadership was also found to be tightly aligned to contextual factors, and particularly to implementing system policies and initiatives. In TALIS (2013) the percentage of principals in lower secondary schools in Singapore that reported they engaged in instructional leadership activities was above the OECD averages (see Table 8.10).

Table 8.10: School principals instructional leadership activities in lower secondary education in Singapore (TALIS 2013)

	Estonia	OECD Average
Collaborate with teachers to solve classroom discipline problems	63.8%	62.1%
Observe instruction in the classroom	58.5%	40.5%
Take action to support co-operation among teachers to develop new teaching practices	65.4%	60.1%
Take action to ensure that teachers take responsibility for improving their teaching skills	84.4%	63.7%
Take action to ensure that teachers feel responsible for their students' learning outcomes	91.1%	71.4%

Source: OECD, 2016a: 462

Leadership Activities

Ng (2013) explored the perceptions of 36 Singapore vice principals in regards to school accountability. Accountability for the quality of the school in terms of the site, funding and staff management was an important element and not unexpected. What Ng (2013) found more interesting was the emphasis on the holistic development of students, and the importance of schools not only to the development and survival of Singapore as a nation, but to humanity and future generations. These two studies by Ng suggest a rich and evolving conception of what school success means. This is somewhat explained in a conceptual paper by Dimmock and Tan (2013) that explored factors that contributed to Singapore' s educational success. The smallness and tight central control of the system, human resource policies that reinforce system alignment, and a unique "leader-teacher compact" reflecting the predominant Chinese culture, were seen to explain the high level of tight coupling and alignment of leadership across the school system. It was argued that these unique features bring synergies of sustainability, scalability, succession and high performance across the entire Singapore school system. The features of tight alignment and leader-teacher compact are seen in how leadership is distributed in Singapore schools.

Table 8.11: Percentage of principals of lower secondary schools in Singapore who report having engaged in the following activities related to a school development plan in the 12 months prior to the survey (TALIS 2013)

	Singapore	OECD Average
Used student performance and student evaluation results (including national/ international assessments) to develop the school's educational goals and programmes	99.3%	89.3%
Observe instruction in the classroom	98.6%	77.4%

Source: OECD, 2016a: 463

Continuing Professional Development

Over many years, the Singapore government advocated the importance of school leadership as a key driver for improvement and transformation (Retna, 2015). The country applies a systematic and compulsory approach to the leadership development of principals. As noted, young teachers are continuously assessed for their leadership potential and are given the opportunity to develop their leadership capacity. Future school leaders are chosen from successful teachers already in the education system. Moreover, all education leadership positions are part of the teaching-career structure. Potential school leaders can serve on committees, be promoted to middle-level leadership positions (e.g. head of department), and be transferred to the ministry for a period. There are also a range of leadership programmes for serving principals.

The key provider of leadership programmes in Singapore is the National Institute of Education (NIE), which develops its offer through collaborative efforts involving multiple Academic Groups in NIE and the Ministry of Education. Table 8.12 provides details of Principal of some of the Institute's school leadership programmes:

Table 8.12: Professional development for school principals in Singapore

Phase	Training programme
Preparatory training for aspiring principals	Leaders in Education Programme (LEP) As noted above, the LEP is a six-month full-time programme for specially selected vice-principals and ministry officers in Singapore to prepare them for school leadership. These officers have a track record of good potential and performance appraisal and have successfully passed a series of situational tests and selection interviews conducted by the Ministry of Education. The selected participants leave the schools where they have been working to engage in the LEP full-time All participants are fully funded by Ministry of Education during the period of the six-month course at the National Institute of Education. In the LEP, participants are required to take eleven compulsory courses. These courses are compulsory and are highly interactive classroom-based sessions. They aim to engage participants in innovative, critical and professional dialogues which are facilitated by NIE and visiting professors and are seen as providing theoretical knowledge of different leadership models, school effectiveness and curriculum leadership as well as understanding the key and diverse roles of principals. In addition, the contents of the courses are designed to reflect the values and educational philosophy of the Singapore national educational system. LEP Courses are as follows: • Overview of the 5-Roles-5-Minds framework • School Leadership, Vision and Culture • Educational Leadership through Complexity Lenses • Contemporary Strategic Management • Human Capital Development • Design Thinking: Innovation and Values • Valuing and Developing People • Values and Ethics for School Leaders • Leading Curriculum and Instructional Change • Evaluation and Assessment • Use of ICT in Enhancing Teaching and Learning Other programmes, include the Management and Leadership in Schools (MLS) programme, a full-time 17-week in-service programme for selected middle leaders of schools in Singapore. The programme aims to develop middle level leaders to expand their roles beyond

Phase	Training programme
	departments and take on direct leadership for teaching and learning for the innovative school.
In-service training for serving principals	Building Education Bridges: Innovation for School Leaders (BEB) This is a full-time programme of two weeks' duration. The programme focuses on innovation and high performing educational systems and offers experienced and successful school leaders the opportunity to explore key leadership It is jointly conducted at both NIE and various international institutions which include the National College for Teaching & Leadership, UK and Danish School of Education, Aarhus University. School leaders are selected from each country to engage in issues relating to the countries' unique educational systems. This programme aims to: • Improve understanding of each other's educational systems and the context for leadership and its challenges • Generate ideas on innovation and change for high performance educational system • Define routes for sustaining school leadership and innovation Other programmes include a full-time programme of four weeks' duration for middle school leaders. The course is designed to prepare senior teachers to achieve the vision of innovating in the classroom and school, in their roles as instructional leaders and coaches to younger colleagues. The course focuses on creating a variety of learning experiences that are intended to result in new ways of teaching and learning, and that are built upon the firm foundation of holistic education and sound values. The course aims to enable senior teachers to: • Be kept up to date with current issues, trends and developments in learning and teaching • Be inspired by innovative individuals and practices in and outside of their specialist fields • Be challenged to innovate in all aspects of their job • Be encouraged to share with others their own experiences and ideas

Sources: Santiago et al., 2016; The National Institute of Education website

While the LEP has gained worldwide admiration for heightening participant's awareness of the interactive nature of the "roles" and "minds" of school leadership, as has already been noted, this model has been found to be "especially selective," attracting just 5% of the intended population and it has been argued that the system should be modified in order for a larger pool of school leaders to benefit (Jayapragas, 2016).

Table 8.13 shows the participation rates, types and average number of days of professional development reported to be undertaken by principals of lower secondary schools in Singapore in the 12 months prior to TALIS (2013). It reveals that all of the principals reported that they had participated in professional development, and that the percentages of principals that reported participating in a range of activities were above the OECD averages. Moreover, the average numbers of days devoted to professional development activities were also above the OECD averages.

Table 8.13: Participation rates, types and average number of days of professional development reported to be undertaken by principals of lower secondary school Singapore in the 12 months prior to TALIS (2013)

	Singapore	OECD Average	Average number of days among those who participated	OECD Average
Principals did not participate in any professional development	0%	8.9%	N/A	N/A
Principals participated in a professional network, mentoring or research activity	92.5%	52.6%	15.5 days	15.3 days
Principals participated in courses, conferences or observation visits c	99.3%	85.2%	13.4 days	11.1 days
Principals participated in other types of professional development activities	44%	32.5%.	14.1 days	10.2 days

Source: OECD, 2016a: 465

School principals are transferred between schools periodically as part of Singapore's continuous improvement strategy (Schleicher, ed., 2012).

Chapter 9 Comparisons between the countries

This chapter synthesises the key findings that emerged from the review under the key themes.

Initial training requirements and professional experience

In Estonia, Finland, Singapore and some provinces of Canada, aspiring school principals are required to have a recognised leadership qualification before they can be appointed as the head of a school. This is not the case in Germany, the Netherlands and the remaining Canadian provinces, although the literature suggests that most aspiring principals do nonetheless complete a relevant leadership training course in these countries.

Aspiring principals must have teaching experience in Estonia (between 3 and 5 years), Singapore (where principals are always experienced teachers), Germany and some Canadian provinces. Teaching experience is not required in the remaining Canadian provinces, the Netherlands (unless positions have teaching obligations, which is more common in small primary schools), and Finland - although those selected for a permanent post in Finland are usually recruited from among experienced teachers (and are required to have prior experience of supervisory duties).

Table 9.1: Professional experience and initial training requirements

	Recognised leadership qualification formally required	Period of teaching experience formally stipulated
Estonia	✓ 240 hours of compulsory training	✓ 3-5 years
Finland	✓ A Certificate in Educational Administration (or equivalent)	✕
Germany	✕	✓ Duration not stipulated

	Recognised leadership qualification formally required	Period of teaching experience formally stipulated
The Netherlands	✕	✕
Canada	✓ 6 states ✕ 7 states	✓ 6 states Minimum of 5 years ✕ 7 states
Singapore	✓ Potential school leaders are selected to complete Management and Leadership in Schools program (LEP	✕

Recruitment procedures

In Canada, Estonia, Finland, Germany and the Netherlands aspiring school leaders can self-nominate to train as a school principal - without a guarantee of a job - and then apply for a position in a school. This is known as the ‘aspiration’ approach to selecting school leaders (Jensen et al. 2017). Singapore, however, uses a markedly different approach which involves the Ministry of Education identifying young school teachers who demonstrate leadership potential and moving them into middle management teams for development. The teachers participate in training that prepares them for school leadership and those that do well are matched to a school and receive continuous mentoring, peer group learning and professional development.

While Canada, Estonia, Finland, Germany and the Netherlands all broadly use the ‘aspiration’ approach, their recruitment methods vary in several other respects. In Estonia, the Netherlands and Canada, school heads are selected through open recruitment, which means that the responsibility for publicising posts and selecting candidates lies with the school board. In Finland school principals are selected through either open calls or nominations by Municipal School Boards. Germany is one of four countries in Europe (the others are Greece, Cyprus and Luxembourg) that use the candidate list - a system in which applicants for employment as a school principal put themselves forward for a candidate list, which is compiled by local school authorities each of which develop a process for selecting candidates for the principal role and submit the list to the top-level authority (the Ministry of Education in each country).

With the exception of Estonia, all of the countries have a career structure for school leaders. As of 2013, Estonia was one of only four systems in Europe without a distinct career structure for school leaders (the other countries were Denmark, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia) (OECD, 2013).

Table 9.2: Recruitment procedures

	Open recruitment	candidate list	Career structure for school leaders
Estonia	✓	✕	✕
Finland	✓	✓	✓
Germany	✕	✓	✓
The Netherlands	✓	✕	✓
Canada	✓	✕	✓
Singapore	✓	✕	✓

Age

The age profile of school leaders in Singapore is significantly younger than in Estonia, Finland and the Netherlands, where the school leader workforces are aging and there are concerns about attracting and retaining school principals. As Table 9.3 shows, as of 2013, just under half (49.9%) of school principals in (lower) secondary education in Singapore were aged over 50[14] - compared with, 67.2% in the Netherlands, 65.5% in Estonia and 58.4% in Finland. Moreover, only 2% of secondary school principals in Singapore were aged over 60, compared to 22.3% in Estonia, 18% in the Netherlands and 12.8% in Finland. Comparable data are not available for Canada, Germany and Holland.

Statistics published by the Ministry of Education in Singapore reveal an almost identical age profile in primary education to that in secondary education, with just under half (49.4%) of school principals in primary education aged over 50. Comparable figures are not available for primary school principals in the other countries, although a recent survey conducted by the Finish National Agency for Education (2017) found that 60% of principals in all general education schools in Finland were aged over fifty.

[14] The latest figures indicate this has fallen further. According to the latest Ministry of Education statistics, in secondary education, 45.2% of school principals in Singapore are aged over 50.

Table 9.3: Age profile of school principals (TALIS 2013)

Status	Est.	Fin.	Neth.	Sing.	OECD Average
Under 30	0%	0.6%	0%	0%	0.1%
30-39 years	5.1%	8.0%	6.4%	10.7%	6.3%
40-49 years	29.4%	33.0%	26.4%	39.4%	28.4%
50-59 years	43.2%	45.6%	49.2%	47.9%	47.8%
60 years or more	22.3%	12.8%	18.0%	2.0%	17.4%

Gender

As Table 9.4 shows, Singapore and, to a lesser extent Estonia, have substantially higher percentages of female school heads than Finland and the Netherlands. Comparable figures are not available for Canada and Germany.

Table 9.4: Gender of school leaders

Status	Est.	Fin.	Ger.	Neth.	Can.	Sing.
Female	92%	42%	Not available	37%	Not available	66%
Male	8%	58%	Not available	63%	Not available	34%

Research has shown that the percentage of school principal positions occupied by women in Europe is generally relative to the level of education, with women often occupying over half of school leader positions in primary schools but below half in secondary schools (Eurydice, 2013). As Tables 9.5 and 9.6 show, this is not the case in either the Netherlands or Singapore: In the Netherlands male school heads are in a majority at both levels, while in Singapore females are in a majority at both levels.

Table 9.5: Gender of school leaders in primary schools

Status	Est.	Fin.	Ger.	Neth.	Can.	Sing.
Female	Not available	Not available	Not available	41%	Not available	76%
Male	Not available	Not available	Not available	59%	Not available	24%

able 9.6: Gender of school leaders in Lower secondary schools

Status	Est.	Fin.	Ger.	Neth.	Can.	Sing.	OECD Average
Female	60%	40.6%	N/A	30.8%	43%	54%	49%
Male	40%	59.4%	N/A	69.2%	57%	46%	51%

As can be seen in Table 9.6, the proportions of female principles at lower secondary level is higher than the OECD average of 49% in Estonia (60%) and Singapore, (54%), and lower than the OECD average in Finland (40.6%), the Netherlands (30.8%) and Canada (Alberta) (43%). Comparable figures are not available for Germany.

Employment status

While most heads of lower secondary schools are employed on full-time contracts, there are notable differences between the countries in terms of the likelihood of them having teaching obligations. More principals in Singapore (99.3%), the Netherlands (85.5%) and Estonia (69.5%) are employed full time without teaching obligations in lower secondary education compared with the OCED average (66%). In contrast, only just over a quarter (25.2%) of full-time principals in Finland and research suggests that around half of full-time principals in Alberta (Canada) are employed on this basis. Although authoritative statistics are not available, historically principals in Germany continue to have teaching responsibilities when they assume leadership responsibilities.

Table 9.7: Employment status of school principals

Status	Est.	Fin.	Ger.	Neth.	Sing.	OEDC Average
F/T without teaching	69.5%	25.2%	N/A	85.5%	99.3%	66%
F/T with teaching	25.4%	71%	N/A	12.6%	0.7%	33.3%
P/T without teaching	2.0%	1.6%	N/A	1.5%	0.0%	1.0%
P/T with teaching	3.0%	2.1%	N/A	-	0.0%	2.5%

Salary

Across Europe the basic statutory salary for school heads in primary education is generally lower than in secondary education, especially in upper secondary schools (Eurydice, 2013). As can be seen in Table 9.8, while this is the case in the Netherlands, in Finland the top and bottom of the salary range for school heads in primary education

are higher than that for the heads of lower secondary schools, although less than for the heads of upper secondary schools. The higher ends of the salary scales are substantially higher in the Netherlands than in Finland. Comparable figures are not available for the other countries. However, average salaries for school principals are available for Estonia, Canada and Singapore.

The annual average actual salary for an Estonian school leader was EUR 14,833 in 2013-14, that is, EUR 1,236 per month (this average is for primary, lower secondary and upper secondary education school principals combined). According to a salary comparison website, the salary scale in Singapore is considerably higher; it ranges from EURO 36,666 to EURO 64,584, with an average salary of EURO 51,884.42, plus an average bonus of EURO 2,868.91.[15] While there are no nationally prescribed salary ranges for school principals in Canada, the Alberta Wage and Salary survey of 2015 indicates the average annual salary in Alberta is EURO 73,366 and a job site gives the median annual school principal salary in Ontario in 2017 as EURO 73,613. These figures are higher than annial average salary in Singapore and higher than the top of the salary scales in Finland and Singapore, but lower than those in the Netherlands. The figures suggest that school principals are on average paid substantially more in the Netherlands and Canada than in Estonia, Finland and Singapore.

[15] https://www.salaryexpert.com/salary/job/school-principal/singapore/singapore

Table 9.8: Basic annual statutory salary of school principals

	Annual statutory salary
Estonia	EUR 14,833
Finland	EURO 48,372-58,663 for primary school principals EURO 46,526-56,425 for lower secondary school principals EURO 53,224-64,548 for upper secondary school principals
Germany	Figures not available
The Netherlands	EURO 43,185-79,308 for primary school principals EURO 47,678-106,253 for lower secondary school principals EURO 47,678-106,253 for upper secondary school principals
Canada	No nationally prescribed salary ranges for school principals. The Alberta Wage and Salary survey of 2015 reported an average salary of C$107,891(EURO 73,366)[16] for school principals (secondary and elementary combined). A job site gives the median annual School Principal salary in Ontario as $108,255 (EURO 73,613), as of September 06, 2017, with a range usually between $95,616 - $121,777, not including bonus and benefit information and other factors that impact base pay.[17] A compensation analysis organization provides a range of C$60,000 (EURO 37,746) to C$120,000 (EURO 75,491) for school principals across Canada, with a median of C$97,018 (EURO 61,033).
Singapore	A compensation analysis organization indicates that the average school principal salary in Singapore is SGD 82,486 (EURO 51,884.42). In addition, school principals earn an average bonus of SGD 4,561 (EURO 2,868.91).The entry level salary is 58,291 (SGD) (EURO 36,666). The senior level salary is SGD 102,683 (EURO 64,584).

[16] Currency conversion based on XE rates 7/11/2017 of 0.68 Canadian dollars to the euro

[17] http://www1.salary.com/CA/Ontario/School-Principal-salary.html

Leadership Styles and Activities

In recent years there has been a growing emphasis on the importance of distributed leadership (the ability of principals to incorporate different stakeholders in their decision-making processes) and instructional leadership (the involvement of principals in improving of teaching and learning).

The evidence suggests that distributed leadership features above international averages in Estonia, Finland, the Netherlands, Canada and Singapore, but is more limited in Germany due to the Principal/Vice Principal structure operated in German schools. In Finland and the Netherlands, schools exercise high levels of degrees of autonomy in leadership distribution, whereas in Singapore distributed leadership operates within relatively tight boundaries of empowerment. It is unclear how much discretion school heads have in terms of distributing leadership in Estonia, the Netherlands and Canada.

School heads in all the countries generally have limited direct involvement in instructional or pedagogical leadership. The reasons for this, which vary across the countries, are as follows:

- Appointment of head teachers to oversee teaching and learning (Estonia)
- Respect for the pedagogical independence of teachers (Finland)
- The time school heads devote to their own teaching, coupled with respect for the pedagogical independence of teachers (Germany)
- Insufficient time to engage in instructional leadership, even though principals value instructional leadership as the most rewarding aspect of their role (Alberta, Canada)
- Confining instructional leadership to implementing system policies and initiatives and delegating direct involvement in instruction evaluation and supervision to middle managers (Singapore)

It appears that Germany is moving slowly towards instructional forms of leadership as a result of increased decentralisation and accountability measures.

Internationally, there is evidence to suggest that on average, women appear to be stronger advocates of instructional leadership than men (OECD, 2016). In contrast, male principals in Finland and the Netherlands give more attention to instructional leadership than females.

Continuing Professional Development

In Estonia, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands and Canada professional development for school heads from pre-primary to upper secondary education is optional and is not necessary for promotion. In contrast, Singapore applies a systematic and compulsory approach to the leadership development of school principals.

As Table 9.9 shows, the percentages of principals participating in professional network, mentoring or research activity and courses, conferences or observation visits were above OECD averages in Estonia, Finland, the Netherlands and Singapore. In Estonia, Finland and Singapore the percentages of Principals that participated in other types of professional development activities were also above the OECD average.

In Estonia, Finland, and the Netherlands the average number of days among those who participated in these groups of activities were below OECD averages. In Singapore, principals were above OECD averages in terms of the average number of days devoted to both courses, conferences or observation visits and other types of professional development activities, but below OECD average in relation to professional network, mentoring or research activity. Comparable figures are not available for Germany. However, the literature indicates that fewer principals in Germany spend time on professional development activities than is common across OECD countries. Pan-Canadian figures are not available.

Table 9.9: participation rates, types and average number of days of professional development reported to be undertaken by principals of lower secondary schools 12 months prior to TALIS (2013)

	Est.	Fin.	Ger.	Neth.	Sing.	OEDC Average
Percentage of principals who did not participate in any professional development	10.7	8.3	N/A	0.4	0.0	9.5
Percentage of principals who participated in a professional network, mentoring or research activity	54.1	48.1	N/A	87.5	92.5	51.5
Average number of days among those who participated	7.7	4.4	N/A	10.8	10.0	20.2
Percentage of principals who participated in courses, conferences or observation visits	93.9	87.7	N/A	97.4	99.3	83.4

	Est.	Fin.	Ger.	Neth.	Sing.	OEDC Average
Average number of days among those who participated	10.2	5.8	N/A	7.3	13.4	12.6
Percentage of principals who participated in courses, conferences or observation visits	48.0	36.2	N/A	22.9	44.0	33.5
Average number of days among those who participated	6.9	3.7	N/A	5.1	14.1	10.4

Despite having high performing education systems, CPD for school leaders in Singapore and Finland has attracted critical attention for:

- Being too selective and leading to a lack of diversity in the pool of school leaders, in the case of Singapore

- Lacking consistency/harmony across different training programmes (content, duration, fees, entry requirements etc.) and failing to make sufficient use of interactive teaching methods and curriculum that are required prepare principals to tackle present and future school leadership challenges, in the case of Finland

In Estonia, concerns about the quality of school leadership training led to the development of a competence framework for school leaders in 2014 and CPD modules based on it are now being targeted at school principals. This model provides a framework for the identifying the personal development requirements of school principals, training school principals and evaluating the work of school principals.

Chapter 10 Conclusion

There is considerable variation across the countries in terms of the demographics of school leadership. However, the literature provides little in the way of explanation for these differences, in part because there is limited existing research on equality and diversity written in the English language.

With the exception of Singapore, the countries have an ageing workforce and are experiencing difficulties attracting and retaining school principals. This is consistent with the situation in many countries with established education systems, which are facing shortages of school leaders as the 'baby boomer' generation of leaders reaches retirement. In the case of Singapore, the Ministry of Education's selection and development of aspiring leaders establishes a 'pipeline' that provides a steady flow of school leaders.

It has been noted in the literature that across many countries, shortages of school leaders may be exacerbated by gender imbalance, with women making up the majority of teachers but the minority of school leaders (OECD 2014). This could possibly be the case in Finland, the Netherlands and Canada (Alberta) where the proportions of female principals are lower than the OECD average. It should be noted, however, that Estonia is facing a shortage of school leaders despite having substantially more female than male principals at both primary and secondary levels.

Recent years have witnessed a growth in the importance of the practice of distributed leadership, which is said to produce better student learning outcomes (Breakspear et al. 2017; OECD, 2016). There appears to be an emphasis on distributed leadership across all the countries considered in this review, apart from Germany. What this means in practice, however, varies considerably. Consequently, it is difficult to draw lessons on the potential impact of the use of distributed leadership because the term is used to refer to diverse arrangements, which involve varying degrees of involvement of stakeholders in decision-making processes.

Instructional leadership is also a dominant theme of school leadership research and development programs, and there is some evidence to suggest that school principals who adopt this approach have considerably more impact (Breakspear et al. 2016). Although instructional leadership is generally valued amongst school principals in the six high performing countries considered in this report, it is not widely practiced due to a range of factors, including lack of time available to principals and, in some countries, the pedagogical independence of teachers. Once again, however, there is very little research into precisely what instructional leadership involves and what impact this type of leadership has on the establishment of positive learning environments.

Currently there is a diverse array of CPD programmes for school leaders on offer across and within the countries. Singapore, Estonia and the Netherlands have put systems in place that are designed to ensure that CPD programmes are linked to key leadership

competencies and, as noted above, Singapore maintains a 'pipeline' of emerging leaders through early identification and training programmes. There is less consistency in the approaches adopted in the other countries, although there have been calls for this issue to be addressed in Finland. What is lacking in the literature is systematic evaluations of the effectiveness of leadership programmes in terms of actually impacting the daily practice of school leaders and connecting to positive student outcomes (Breakspear et al. 2017:8).

There is also a lack of research on the suitability of borrowing and adapting elements of CPD models in countries with high performing education systems as a basis for reform in other countries (including England). This is important because CPD systems are not necessarily readily transferable from one country context to another due to the fact that they are tailored to suit the needs, characteristics and reforms of a country's specific education system. Consequently, for example, Singapore's approach could well be less effective in other countries where system objectives and roles and responsibilities of teachers, teacher leaders and school principals are different (Jensen et al. 2017: 29).

Chapter 11 Evidence gaps

1. Much of the data was for 2013 or earlier due to a time lag in the publication of relevant data.

2. It was not always possible to obtain directly comparable figures for each country, nor, in some cases, figures for the same year.

3. There is limited demographic information available on school leaders in primary schools.

4. There is little research on (whether and how) how the use of distributive leadership and instructional leadership is shaped by different education systems and the implications of this.

5. There is very little pan-Canadian research on leadership styles and activities and what research there is tends to focus on a limited number or provinces (notably Alberta and Ontario) or on small case studies.

6. With regard to Germany, there are few documented findings of school leadership styles in the past 15 years, and most of those that there are originat from small-scale school improvement studies or re-analyses of large-scale assessments, such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) or the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS).

7. There is a lack of research concerned with systematically examining the potential links between the performance of countries that perform well in large-scale international student assessments and aspects of school leadership, such as styles of leadership and the types and content of CPD programmes.

8. There is an absence of research into equality and diversity in the context of school leadership and CPD.

9. There is very little in the anglophone literature on the CPD of school leaders in Germany and no available statistics on the amount of time spent on CPD.

10. There are very few systematic evaluations of CPD programmes for school leaders in countries with high performing education systems.

11. Further research is needed on the possibility of borrowing and adapting elements of CPD models in countries with high performing education systems as a basis for reform in England.

Appendix A: Summary of findings for selected countries

Estonia

Education system

In Estonia, the state sets national standards and establishes principles of education funding, supervision and quality assessment. However, local authorities and schools have a high level of autonomy to make decisions on resource allocation and the curriculum

The main challenges are to adapt to demographic trends; increasing the attractiveness of the teaching profession in order to attract more high-quality candidates; further reducing early school leaving; and narrowing the performance gap between Estonian-speaking and Russian-speaking students.

Professional experience and initial training requirements

240 hours of compulsory training is required before appointment as a school head. Professional teaching experience is also a basic condition for appointment. At least three years of teaching experience is required when a person has undertaken pedagogical higher education; a person who has undertaken other types of higher education is required to have at least five years' teaching experience.

Recruitment procedures

School principals are selected through open recruitment, which means that schools are responsible for publicising posts and selecting candidates. In a recent OECD review of evaluation and assessment frameworks, Estonia was one of only four systems without a distinct career structure for school leaders

Employment status

Just under 70% of principals in lower secondary schools are employed full time with teaching obligations, compared with the OECD average of 66%. In addition to school principals and their deputies, Estonian schools employ 'head teachers' who have responsibility for teaching and learning within the school.

Age

The majority of school principals in general education schools are in the age group 50-59 years-old. 22% of lower secondary school leaders are aged 60 years or over and this

proportion more than doubled between 2008 and 2013. The average age of a lower secondary school leader is around 51 years.

Gender

The Estonian Ministry of Education and Research (2015) reports that the 92% of principals of general education in schools are women.

Salary

There is no specific framework for school leader salaries in Estonia. The school owner (the state, municipalities or private entities) determines the school leader's salary. The annual average actual salary for an Estonian school leader was EUR 14,833 in 2013-14, that is EUR 1,236 per month.

Leadership styles and activities

While a substantial percentage of principals of schools in Estonia share responsibility for leadership activities/tasks with other members of staff, they are less inclined to engage in instructional or pedagogical leadership. In lower secondary education, the percentages of principals reporting engaging with teachers on pedagogical issues is substantially below the OECD average

Estonian school principals are in charge of administrative and pedagogical leadership activities but head teachers are appointed to oversee teaching and learning, although school principals retain overall responsibility for this.

CPD

Preparatory training for aspiring principals comprises a 24-month development programme for future school leaders, open to school staff, plus individuals from other sectors. Participants are selected via competition. An induction programme designed to help new school leaders with implementing their responsibilities and to shorten their introduction period is also available.

A competence framework for school leaders has been developed and CPD modules based on it are targeted at principals already serving in their positions. In-service training for serving principals includes a 12-month school team development programme with the school leader and two other staff members, covering different school management topics.

Professional development for school principals from pre-primary to upper secondary education is optional rather than regarded as a professional duty and is not necessary for promotion.

There is a systematic allocation of central funding to support school leaders' (and teachers') professional development activities. Since 2015, funds for professional

development are determined on the basis of a per student model. This amount is allocated to the local level (in the case of municipal schools) for distribution to the respective schools.

Finland

Education system

All schools in Finland operate under the same basic guidelines created by the National Board of Education, which is a part of the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture. In addition to developing and implementing general guidelines of education policy, the National Board of Education approves a national curriculum that municipalities and their schools need to follow.

However, municipalities and schools are obliged to prepare local curricula based on the National Core Curriculum, and pedagogical development strategies are constructed in both the municipalities and schools by the chief education officers, principals, and teachers. A New National Core Curriculum was introduced in 2016.

Professional experience and initial training requirements

Principals are required to have a Certificate in Educational Administration or to have completed a university programme in educational leadership, which includes the Certificate in Educational Administration. Principals are always required to have at least a masters degree and teaching qualifications.

There is no specific criterion for work experience, but those selected for a permanent post are, in practice, required to have prior experience from supervisory duties. As a general rule, principals are recruited from among quite experienced teachers. There is not a clearly defined career ladder.

Recruitment

In Finland, school principals are selected through either open recruitment or nominated by Municipal School Boards. There are no common regulations for a consultation procedure, but teaching staff and representatives of parents are often consulted when defining a new principal's competencies or when comparing applicants for the post. In addition to interviews, the use of psychological tests to compare candidates is also becoming more common. Principals are initially appointed to their posts for a six-month trial period on a fixed-term basis (Finnish National Board of Education, 2012).

Employment status

In Finland, principals at comprehensive schools and general upper secondary schools have teaching responsibilities determined at the public sector collective agreement level, which are tied to the school size. In some cases, teaching responsibilities may be

nullified for reasons such as working in several units or in a unit covering different school levels. However, school maintaining organisations may define teaching responsibilities and these may also include other duties besides teaching, which means that discharging them is not tied to school timetables.

71% of full-time principals of lower secondary schools have teaching obligations, compared with an OCED average of 33.3%.

Age

The teaching workforce in Finland is ageing; in 2016 the majority (60%) of principals were over fifty (60%), compared with 39% of teachers.

Gender

In 2013, the European Commission/ EACEA/ Eurydice, reported that 42% of school principals in primary and secondary education were female. In contrast to many other countries (where there are significantly more female principals in primary schools) the percentages of female school principals in primary, lower secondary and upper secondary schools in Finland was is almost identical – 43%, 41% and 41% respectively. According to the Finnish National Agency for Education, in 2016 the proportion of female principals in school education was 49%, compared with 77% of teachers

Salary

The minimum and maximum annual gross statutory salaries for school principals (in EUR) were as follows in 2013/14: EUR 48,372- EUR 58,663 in primary education and EUR 46, 526- EUR 56,425 in lower secondary education.

Leadership styles and activities

The principal in Finnish schools has a key role in distributing leadership responsibilities. The principal may establish a leadership group and teams of teachers within the school, which can be set up and disbanded in a flexible way according to current themes or other school needs. The principal leads the school together with the leadership group, which can also plan school development. Members of the leadership team are often the leaders of teaching teams, where the actual implementation of decisions takes place.

Principals in Finland appear to adopt a “hands off” approach when it comes to instructional leadership, registering well below the international norms in this regard. Finland’s principals are known to defer to teachers on instructional decisions. Internationally, there is evidence to suggest that on average, women principals appear to be stronger advocates of instructional leadership than men. In contrast, male principals in Finland give more attention to instructional leadership than females.

National legislation describes principals' tasks broadly, including administrative matters, financial management, pedagogical matters (student assessment, formative evaluation of

staff), personnel administration and teaching. According to OECD (2013), school leaders in Finland have wide-ranging responsibilities and tasks, within a framework of considerable autonomy.

CPD

As noted above, aspiring principals are required to obtain the Certificate in Educational Administration. This covers the following subject areas: basics of public law; general and municipal administration; educational administration; human resources administration; financial administration; government-funded training for school leadership.

Induction training plays an essential and long-term role in Finnish principal training and attracts government funding**.** The core content of the government-funded induction training programme is as follows: school organisation, administration and finances; school curriculum and learning results: human resources management and leadership; strategic planning.

In Finland legislation or collective agreements do not determine any training obligations for principals, but training courses assigned by municipal HR departments are compulsory in practical terms. The number of training days varies between 5 and 10 days per year, depending on the principal's position and municipality, and themes are related to development of the municipal governance system, financial and HR management and new technological solutions, but there is minimal focus on strengthening principals' competencies as leaders of educational and teaching work.

Professional development for school principals is viewed as optional and is not necessary for promotion or regarded as a professional duty.

It has been suggested that most training programmes need to re-design their structure and content to incorporate more interactive teaching methods and curricula which would better prepare principals to tackle present and future school leadership challenges.

Germany

Education system

Germany has a decentralised system in which responsibilities are shared between the Federation, the Länder and local authorities. The literature is conflicted on whether schools are becoming more or less autonomous in their decision making.

Professional experience and initial training requirements

In Germany, teaching experience is required but the duration is not stipulated. Formal leadership training is not a requirement in Germany and is generally only provided after appointment as a principal.

Recruitment

Becoming a principal has historically been regarded as a promotion given to the most able teachers rather than seen as a role with its own distinct functions and skill set. Principals in Germany generally continue to teach.

Germany is one of four countries (Germany, Greece, Cyprus and Luxembourg) that uses the candidate list (a system in which applications for employment as a school principal are made through submitting candidates' names and qualifications to a top level or intermediate level authority as the only recruitment channel). In Germany, the local school authority prepares a proposal for selection in a multiphase process that involves consulting school representatives and also requires candidates to give teaching demonstrations. The selection decision is confirmed by the relevant State Ministry of Education.

Employment status

Although authoritative statistics are not available, historically principals in Germany are teachers and continue to have teaching responsibilities when they assume leadership responsibilities.

While there are no official English language sources, teachers in Germany can either be civil servants or employees, depending on which state they are in. The ratio of civil service to employed teachers varies from state to state. In Bavaria, almost all the teachers have civil servant status, in North Rhine Westphalia it's 80 percent, whereas in Berlin it's about half. Civil service status gives greater job security to teachers but less flexibility for employers.

Age

There is no published information on the average age of principals in Germany available in English.

Gender

Eurydice (2013) does not provide data for the gender split for school principals in Germany but Brauckmann and Schwarz (2015) comment that about 85% of primary schools are led by women (source not stated).

Salary

The minimum and maximum salary for principals is EUR 44,860 - 59,734 for primary schools, EUR 50,448 - 66,510 for lower secondary schools and EUR 50,764-73,709 for upper secondary schools.

Leadership styles and activities

Distributed forms of leadership are limited because of the Principal/Vice Principal structure operated in schools with other teachers not generally being given leadership responsibilities. The time school principals devote to their own teaching, coupled with respect for the pedagogical independence of teachers, has limited the extent to which principals exercise instructional leadership. The literature suggests that Germany is moving slowly towards instructional forms of leadership as a result of increased decentralisation and accountability measures; however, the extent to which this is happening varies according to the policies and procedures operating in the different Länder.

CPD

Formal leadership training is not a requirement in Germany although courses and degrees in leadership are becoming more common. These often cater for both aspirant and serving school leaders. Fewer principals spend time on professional development activities than is common across OECD countries and this is reflected in the lack of evidence regarding CPD in the literature. The literature is similarly silent on the reasons for the lack of CPD, although this may reflect a lack of time because of principals' teaching responsibilities.

School leadership training organised and funded by the government is only accessible to those who have been approved as principal candidates.

The Netherlands

Education system

Schools in the Netherlands have extensive freedoms with no national curriculum, although this is balanced by a strong Inspectorate of Education. In the Netherlands, the concept of earned autonomy has been developed as part of the implementation of the Dutch Educational Supervision Act in 2003. Within the inspection framework, the intensity and frequency of school inspection is driven by student outcomes and the quality of the school self-evaluation.

School boards have a key governance role in the Netherlands but are highly diverse with responsibilities ranging from large school systems to a single primary school. The boards oversee the implementation of legislation and regulations in the school and employ teachers and other staff. The school governors who make up the boards may be voluntary or salaried professionals. The literature suggests a mixed picture in the skills and capabilities of boards.

Professional experience and initial training requirements

Teaching experience/qualifications are not a requirement for school principals in the Netherlands unless they have teaching obligations (more common in small primary schools). Initiatives exist to recruit people with management experience outside of education to take up leadership posts.

Achieving a specific qualification is not a requirement for principals, although the literature suggests that most do complete a relevant training course.

Recruitment procedures

In the Netherlands school principals are selected through open recruitment.

Principals are typically experienced teachers who have worked at the same school for quite some time, but larger schools with a multitier leadership structure may hire external managers or financial professionals as school leaders. Developments such as increasing sizes of school districts have increased demand for professional managers coming from outside the school sector.

In the Netherlands, training institutes offer orientation courses to allow teachers interested in leadership functions to discover whether they have the required capabilities.

Employment status

In the Netherlands 85.5% of principals in lower secondary education are employed full time without teaching obligations compared with the OECD average of 66%.

Age

In the Netherlands, the mean age of lower secondary principals was just over 52 years, exactly in line with the OECD average. No principals in the survey were under 30 years of age and 6.4% were between 30 and 39 years-old – again in line with the OECD average (6.3%).

Gender

In the Netherlands 41% of primary principals and 37% of principals in primary and secondary combined were female in 2010. TALIS (2013) found just over 30% of principals in lower secondary schools in the Netherlands were female, significantly below the OECD average of around 45%.

Salary

In general, basic statutory salaries for school principals in pre-primary and primary education are lower than in secondary education, especially in upper secondary schools. School boards in the Netherlands are free to offer starting salaries at any point within the

range. In addition, decisions about additional allowances (if any) are taken at the school level.

The minimum and maximum for is EUR 34,806 - 54.604 for primary schools, EUR 36,891 - 75,375 for lower secondary schools and EUR 36,891 - 75,375 for upper secondary schools. The salary difference between teachers and leaders is small; for example, a principal of a small primary school (fewer than 200 students) earns only a maximum of 7% above a teacher on the highest salary scale

Leadership styles and activities

In TALIS (2013) the level of principals carrying out activities associated with an instructional leadership style was much lower in the Netherlands than the OECD average, with just over 40% saying that they encouraged teachers to share teaching materials with colleagues, engage in discussions about student progress and work together to ensure common standards in evaluations for assessing student progress, and attend team conferences, compared with an OECD average of over 60%.

CPD

CPD is optional for school principals in the Netherlands. Principals in the Netherlands are far more engaged in their own professional development than the OECD average, with only 0.4% saying that they had not engaged in development activities in the previous 12 months compared with an OECD average of 8.9%.

It is clear from the data that principals in the Netherlands almost universally took part in some form of professional development, with considerably more than the OECD average participating in networking, mentoring and/or research activities and with almost the entire sample attending courses, conferences or making observation visits.

Canada

Education system

Responsibility for education is almost entirely devolved to the 13 provinces and territories with only an indirect role for central government. Responsibilities for the operation and administration (including financial) of their schools, curriculum development and implementation, personnel management and the enrolment of students are further devolved to school boards or districts which vary in size from having responsibility for a single school to a large urban area. Schools themselves report having less autonomy than the OECD average.

Initial training/experience requirements

Qualifications and experience requirements for becoming a principal vary between provinces with some explicitly defining the role and responsibilities of a school principal in

provincial/territorial legislation, along with any qualification requirements, and others delegating the responsibility to school boards/districts.

Recruitment procedures

Recruitment of principals and vice principals in Canada is the responsibility of local schools. Principals are drawn from the pool of certified/licensed teachers and so becoming a school principal is often viewed as a form of promotion

Employment status

While there are no pan-Canadian statistics, TALIS (2013) found that more principals in Alberta (50%) had teaching responsibilities compared with the average for TALIS countries (35%). Additionally, 11% of Alberta's principals were not employed full time against an average across TALIS countries of only 3%.

Age

The last pan-Canadian survey of school principals by Statistics Canada took place in 2005. At that time 57% of principals were aged over 50 compared with 32% of managers of similar levels of responsibility across the labour force. Similarly, only 12% of principals were aged 39 or below, compared with 33% of managers overall.

Gender

Statistics Canada, in 2005, reported that women accounted for 47% of all school principals but with marked differences at school level with 53% of principals being female at elementary level, compared with only 32% at secondary level. TALIS (2013) found 57% of school principals in Alberta were men, compared with an average of 51% across TALIS countries.

Salary

There are no nationally prescribed salary ranges for school principals. The Alberta Wage and Salary survey of 2015 reported an average salary of C$107,891(EURO 73,366) for school principals (secondary and elementary combined).

A job site gives the median annual School Principal salary in Ontario as $108,255 (EURO 73,613), as of September 06, 2017, with a range usually between $95,616 - $121,777, not including bonus and benefit information and other factors that impact base pay.

A compensation analysis organization provides a range of C$60,000 (EURO 37,746) to C$120,000 (EURO 75,491) for school principals across Canada, with a median of C$97,018 (EURO 61,033).

Leadership styles and activities

There is very little pan-Canadian research on leadership styles and activities and what research there is tends to focus on a limited number or provinces (notably Alberta and Ontario) or on small case studies.

TALIS (2013) (based on data from Alberta), recommended an increased use of distributed leadership models and strategies for principals, along with increased training in and applications of instructional leadership. Other research suggests that principals value instructional leadership as the most rewarding aspect of their role, while acknowledging that they struggle to find sufficient time to focus on it and points out the philosophical tension in the TALIS call for principals to simultaneously embrace instructional leadership and distributed leadership—leadership models that locate power and expertise very differently within the school.

Respondents in a pan-Canadian survey of principals reported that schools are overloaded with responsibilities stemming largely from increasingly stringent accountability measures which diminish the school leader's capacity to support teachers and build a school community.

CPD

Engaging in professional development is not a requirement of principals in Canada, although the two-tier leadership qualifications in some provinces/territories do have a practicum component to be completed typically within one or two years of being appointed.

A common practice is the use of mentors for newly appointed principals and vice principals which is the case in Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Ontario, and Saskatchewan; however, there is no evidence of formal induction processes for new principals.

Singapore

Education system

The national curriculum, at every level and in every subject, is reviewed once every six years, with a mid-term review in the third year of implementation. The Ministry of Education has processes to ensure that textbooks and learning materials used in schools are aligned with the national curriculum. In Singapore, curriculum and pedagogy for each subject area are reviewed in tandem, with curriculum planners tasked to develop learning and teaching strategies appropriate to the respective syllabuses.

Professional experience and initial training requirements

Future school leaders are chosen from successful teachers already in the education system. Moreover, all education leadership positions are part of a teaching-career structure. Potential school leaders are selected to attend the Management and Leadership in Schools program (LEP) at Singapore's National Institute for Education. Completion of this six-month, full-time programme is a mandatory for aspiring principals. The LEP is fully funded by the Singapore Ministry of Education.

The Singapore Ministry of Education provides oversight in the selection of LEP participants. The selection process for LEP is stringent and it has been argued that this resulted in their being less diversity in the class, which may reduce the extent of learning in the programme.

Recruitment procedures

Singapore's approach to recruitment differs from countries in which a teacher can apply to train as a principal or school head, and then apply for a position in a school. Singapore uses the 'select then train' rather than the 'train then select' model. Teachers who demonstrate leadership potential are identified early and move into middle management teams for development. They participate in training that prepares them for school leadership (LEP) and those that do well are matched to a school and receive continuous mentoring, peer group learning and professional development.

Employment status

Virtually all school principals in Singapore are employed full-time, without teaching obligations.

Age

Singapore's Ministry of Education (2016) reports that just under half (49.4%) of school principals in primary education are aged over 50, with 48% aged between 40 and 49 and 3.7% aged 39 or under. In secondary education 45.2% of school principals aged over 50, with 50.5% aged between 40 and 49 and 4.2% aged 39 or under

Gender

Singapore's Ministry of Education (2016) reports that the proportion of female principals in primary and secondary education was 66%. The percentages of female principals are noticeably higher in primary education (76%) than in lower in secondary education (54%).

Salary

A compensation analysis organization indicates that the average school principal salary in Singapore is SGD 82,486 (EURO 51,884.42). In addition, school principals earn an

average bonus of SGD 4,561 (EURO 2,868.91).The entry level salary is 58,291 (SGD) (EURO 36,666); the senior level salary is SGD 102,683 (EURO 64,584).

Leadership styles and activities

Singapore school leaders are expected to be instructional leaders, practising distributed leadership and being able to provide teachers with guidance and support in curriculum and instruction.

In a national survey of 1,232 Singapore principals, vice-principals and heads of department, concluded that whilst leadership was distributed, it was done so within relatively tight boundaries of empowerment, and cautiously in terms of developing leadership. Nevertheless, there was evidence of genuine shared decision making, and collective engagement.

Research on instructional leadership in the Singapore found that principals worked with others within the school community and experts from external institutions to perform instructional leadership. Principals focused attention on developing the school vision, creating a good learning climate and developing and improving the school-wide curriculum. The review highlighted a lack of direct involvement of Singapore principals in instruction evaluation and supervision. Instead, such roles are delegated to the middle-levels leaders. Singapore principals' practice of instructional leadership was also found to be tightly aligned to contextual factors, and particularly to implementing system policies and initiatives

The smallness and tight central control of the system, human resource policies that reinforce system alignment, and a unique 'leader-teacher compact' reflecting the predominant Chinese culture, were seen to explain the high level of tight coupling and alignment of leadership across the school system. It was argued that these unique features bring synergies of sustainability, scalability, succession and high performance across the entire Singapore school system. The features of tight alignment and leader-teacher compact are seen in how leadership is distributed in Singapore schools.

CPD

Singapore applies a systematic and compulsory approach to the leadership development of principals. Being able to identify talent has been a cornerstone of how Singapore develops its leaders across all public service sectors. Young teachers are continuously assessed for their leadership potential and are given the opportunity to develop their leadership capacity.

Future school leaders are chosen from successful teachers already in the education system. Moreover, all education leadership positions are part of the teaching-career structure. Potential school leaders can serve on committees, be promoted to middle-level leadership positions (e.g. head of department), and be transferred to the ministry for a period. There are also a range of leadership programmes for serving principals.

Bibliography

Estonia

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2013). Key Data on Teachers and School Leaders in Europe. 2013 Edition. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission (2016a) Education and Training Monitor 2016: Estonia. https://ec.europa.eu/education/sites/education/files/monitor2016-ee_en.pdf

Eurydice (2013). Key data on teachers and school Leaders in Europe. http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/key_data_series/151EN.pdf

Eurydice (2015). Teachers' and School Principals' Salaries and Allowances in Europe, 2013/14, Eurydice Facts and Figures. http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/facts_and_figures/salaries.pdf

Golubeva, M. (2014). Teaching policies in the NEPC region: A comparative study of teacher policies in 10 countries. Network of Education Policy Centers. http://edupolicy.net/new/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/01-nepc-Taecher-policies-in-the-nepc-region.pdf

Ministry of Education and Research of the Republic of Estonia, the Estonian Co-operation Assembly and the Education Forum (2014), The Estonian Lifelong Learning Strategy 2020 www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/estonian_lifelong_strategy.pdf

Ministry of Education and Research of the Republic of Estonia (2015). OECD Review of Policies to Improve the Effectiveness of Resource Use in Schools: Country Background Report for Estonia. www.oecd.org/education/schoolresourcesreview.htm.

OECD (2016/15 (September)). School leadership for developing professional learning communities. *Teaching in Focus*.

OECD (2016a). Education at a Glance 2016: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing, Paris. (Cut-off date for the data: 20 July 2016. Any updates on data can be found on line at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-data-en) http://dx.doi.org/10.187/eag-2016-en

OECD (2016b), School Leadership for Learning: Insights from TALIS 2013, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/ 9789264258341-en
Unable to Download pdf but can read online:
http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/education/school-leadership-for-learning_9789264258341-en#.WbwLtyMrL1w

OECD (April 2016c). Education Policy Outlook: Estonia.
http://www.oecd.org/edu/Education-Policy-Outlook-Country-Profile-Estonia.pdf

OECD (2016d). Country Note: PISA 2015 High Performers.
https://www.oecd.org/pisa/PISA-2015-estonia.pdf

OECD (2017). Education at a Glance 2017: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing, Paris.

Santiago, P., Levitas, A., Radó, P. and Shewbridge, C. (2016). OECD Reviews of School Resources: Estonia 2016, OECD Reviews of School Resources, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264251731-en or
http://www.oecd.org/publications/oecd-reviews-of-school-resources-estonia-2016-9789264251731-en.htm

Finland

Brown Centre on Education Policy at Brookings (2016). The 2016 Brown Center Report on American Education: How well are American Students Learning? The Brown Center on Education Policy, The Brookings Institution.
https://www.brookings.edu/research/2016-brown-center-report-on-american-education-how-well-are-american-students-learning/

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2013). Key Data on Teachers and School Leaders in Europe. 2013 Edition. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/key_data_series/151EN.pdf

Eurydice (2015). Teachers' and School Principals' Salaries and Allowances in Europe, 2013/14, Eurydice Facts and Figures.
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/facts_and_figures/salaries.pdf

Finnish National Board of Education. (2012/13). International Survey on Educational leadership: A survey on school leader's work and continuing education. Finnish National Board of Education

Finish National Agency for Education (2017). Teachers and Principals in Finland.
OECD (2013, November). Education Policy Outlook: Finland.
http://www.oecd.org/edu/EDUCATION%20POLICY%20OUTLOOK%20FINLAND_EN.pdf

OECD (2015), Education Policy Outlook 2015: Making Reforms Happen, OECD Publishing.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264225442-en

OECD (2016a). Education at a Glance 2016: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing, Paris.
http://dx.doi.org/10.187/eag-2016-en

OECD (2016), School Leadership for Learning: Insights from TALIS 2013, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris
http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/ 9789264258341-en

OECD (2017). Education at a Glance 2017: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing, Paris.

Saarivirta, T. and Kumpulainen, K., (2016). School autonomy, leadership and student achievement: reflections from Finland. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(7): 1268-1278.

Schleicher, A. (ed.) (2012). Preparing Teachers and Developing School Leaders for the 21st Century: Lessons from around the World. OECD Publishing.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264174559-en

Shantal, K.M.A., Halttunen, L. and Pekka, K. (Spring 2014). Sources of principals' leadership practices and areas training should emphasize: Case Finland. Journal of Leadership Education.

Germany

Brauckmann, S., Feldhoff, T. and Pashiardis, P. (2016) Instructional Leadership in Germany: An Evolutionary Perspective. International Studies in Educational Administration Volume 44, No. 2, 2016

Brauckmann, S. and Schwarz, A. (2015). No time to manage? The trade-off between relevant tasks and actual priorities of school leaders in Germany. International Journal of Educational Management Vol. 29 No. 6, 2015 pp. 749-765

Demmer, M. & von Saldern, M. (2010). *Helden des Alltags. Erste Ergebnisse aus der Schulleitungs- undLehrkräftebefragung (TALIS) in Deutschland*. Münster, Germany: Waxmann.

Demski, D. and Racherbäumer, K. Principals' evidence-based practice – findings from German schools. International Journal of Educational Management Vol. 29 No. 6, 2015 pp. 735-748

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2013). Key Data on Teachers and School Leaders in Europe. 2013 Edition. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2016. Teachers' and School Principals' Salaries and Allowances in Europe – 2015/16. Eurydice Facts and Figures. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/images/2/22/Teacher_salaries.pdf

Gessler, M. and Ashmawy, I. K. (2014), The effect of political decentralization on school leadership in German vocational schools. Educational Management Administration & Leadership 2016, Vol. 44(2) 184–204

Huber, S. G. (2013). Multiple Learning Approaches in the Professional Development of School Leaders – Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Findings on Self-assessment and Feedback. Educational Management Administration & Leadership 41(4) 527–540, Paris
http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264201156-en.

OECD (2004) Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers Country Note: Germany.
https://www.oecd.org/germany/33732207.pdf

OECD (2013), *PISA 2012 Results: What Makes Schools Successful (Volume IV): Resources, Policies and Practices*, PISA, OECD Publishing,

OECD (2014a), *PISA 2012 Technical Report,* PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/pisa2012technicalreport.htm.

OECD (2014b) Education Policy Outlook Germany.
http://www.oecd.org/edu/EDUCATION%20POLICY%20OUTLOOK%20GERMANY_EN.pdf

OECD (2016). Education at a Glance 2016: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing, Paris.
http://dx.doi.org/10.187/eag-2016-en

Pietsch, M. (2014). Blickpunkt Schulleitung: Instruktionale Führung an Schulen in Hamburg. *Hamburg macht Schule*, 2, 24–27.

Taipale, A. 2012. International Survey on Educational Leadership. A survey on school leader's work and continuing education

Tulowitzki, P. (2015). The Development of Educational Leadership and Teaching Professions in Germany. ECPS Journal – 11/2015

The Netherlands

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2013). Key Data on Teachers and School Leaders in Europe. 2013 Edition. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/key_data_series/151EN.pdf

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2016. Teachers' and School Principals' Salaries and Allowances in Europe – 2015/16. Eurydice Facts and Figures. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/images/2/22/Teacher_salaries.pdf

Honingh M. and Hooge E. (2013). The effect of school-leader support and participation in decision making on teacher collaboration in Dutch primary and secondary schools Educational Management Administration & Leadership 2014, Vol 42(1) 75–98

Hulsbos, F. A.; Evers, A. T. and Kessels, J. W. M. Learn to Lead: Mapping Workplace Learning of School Leaders. Vocations and Learning (2016) 9:21–42

Ministry of Education. Teaching 2020
https://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/centres/lfl/about/events/pastlflsupperseminars/PDFs/Teaching_2020_The_Netherlands_Ministry.pdf

Moolenaar, N. M. and Sleegers, P. (2015) The networked principal. Examining principals' social relationships and transformational leadership in school and district networks. Journal of Educational Administration Vol. 53 No. 1, 2015 pp. 8-39.

OECD (2013), *PISA 2012 Results: What Makes Schools Successful (Volume IV): Resources, Policies and Practices*, PISA, OECD Publishing,
Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264201156-en.

OECD (2014a), *TALIS 2013 Results: An International Perspective on Teaching and Learning*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris,
http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264196261-en.

OECD (2014b), *PISA 2012 Technical Report,* PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris,
www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/pisa2012technicalreport.htm.

OECD (2016), School Leadership for Learning: Insights from TALIS 2013, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris,
http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/ 9789264258341-en

OECD (2016a). Education at a Glance 2016: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing, Paris.
http://dx.doi.org/10.187/eag-2016-en

OECD (2016b) Netherlands 2016 Foundations for the Future

http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/education/netherlands-2016_9789264257658-en#page1

OECD (2017). Education at a Glance 2017: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing, Paris.

Schleicher, A. (ed.) (2012), *Preparing Teachers and Developing School Leaders for the 21st Century: Lessons from around the World,* OECD Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264174559-en

Taipale, A. 2012. International Survey on Educational Leadership. A survey on school leader's work and continuing education

Thoonen, E.E.J.; Sleegers, P.J.C.; Oorta, F.J. and. Peetsma, T.T.D. (2012). Building school-wide capacity for improvement: the role of leadership, school organizational conditions, and teacher factors. School Effectiveness and School Improvement Vol. 23, No. 4, December 2012, 441–460

van Veelen, R.; Sleegers, P. J. C. and Endedijk, M. D. Professional Learning Among School Leaders in Secondary Education: The Impact of Personal and Work Context Factors. Educational Administration Quarterly 2017, Vol. 53(3) 365– 408

Canada

Alberta's Commission on Learning. (2003). *Every child learns. Every child succeeds* https://education.alberta.ca/media/1626474/commissionreport.pdf

Alberta Education (2009). Principal quality practice guideline: promoting successful school leadership in Alberta. http://education.alberta.ca/admin/resources.aspx

Alberta Teachers' Association (2014). The Future of the Principalship in Canada.

The Alberta Wage and Salary survey 2015 https://open.alberta.ca/publications/alberta-wage-and-salary-survey-survey-overview

Beauchamp, L and Parsons, J. *I*nstructional Leadership in Alberta: Research Insights from Five Highly Effective Schools. Journal of Scholarship and Practice. Winter 2014. Vol. 8 No. 4.

Brown S., Hales A., Kuehn L., and Steffensen, K. 2017. The State of Educators' Professional Learning in British Columbia. https://learningforward.org/docs/default-source/pdf/BCCaseFull2017.pdf

Cattonar, B., Lessard, C., Blais, J.G., Larose, F., Riopel, M.-C., Tardif, M., Bourque, J. and Wright, A. (2007). *School principals in Canada: context, profile and work. Pan*

Canadian surveys of principals and teachers in elementary and secondary schools (2005-2006).

Cooper, A., & Levin, B. (2013). Research Use by Leaders in Canadian School Districts. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership 8*(7). Retrieved from www.ijepl.org

The Globe and Mail February 2014. What makes a great principal – and why few want the job
https://beta.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/education/matters-of-principal-what-makes-a-great-one-and-why-few-want-the-job/article17105742/?ref=http://www.theglobeandmail.com&

Hauserman, C.P. and Stick, S. L. (2013) The Leadership Teachers Want from Principals: Transformational. Canadian Journal of Education / Revue Canadienne de l'éducation 36:3

Kun, D. E. 2013. Current International Trends in Formal Socialization to the Principalship: An Exploratory Multiple Case Study

Kutsyuruba, B., Walker, K & Noonan, B (2016): The Trust Imperative in the School Principalship: The Canadian Perspective, Leadership and Policy in Schools, DOI: 10.1080/15700763.2016.1164866

Lambersky, J.J. (2014). Understanding the Human Side of School Leadership: Improving Teacher Morale, Efficacy, Motivation, And Commitment

Leithwood, K., Patten, S., & Jantzi, D. (2010). Testing a conception of how leadership influences learning. Educational Administration Quarterly, 46, 671–706

Lyons, W. Principal Preservice Education for Leadership in Inclusive Schools. Canadian Journal of Action Research Volume 17, Issue 1, 2016, pages 36-50

Manitoba Government. Certification for school principals.
http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/profcert/certificates/othercertificates/leadership.html

Mombourquette, C. Principal Leadership: Blending the Historical Perspective with the Current Focus on Competencies in The Alberta Context. Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, Issue #147, October 28, 2013.

Nanavati, M., & Robinson, J. (2009). Implementing the plan: Mentoring and coaching school leaders in Ontario. OPC Register, 11(4), 19–22.

The New Brunswick Teachers' Association: Requirements for Principal's Certificate
https://www.nbta.ca/services/teacher_certification/cert_principal.html

Nixon, R. (2016) Principals and teachers as partners in critical, participatory action research, Educational Action Research, 24:3, 404-423, DOI:10.1080/09650792.2016.1182041

Nova Scotia Instructional Leadership Academy Program (NSILA, 2010) http://www.nselc.ca/nsila/nsila-home

OECD (2004). *Report and recommendations*. What Makes School Systems Perform? Seeing School Systems Through the Prism of Pisa. OECD Publishing, Paris

OECD (2013) Country Note Alberta (Canada) Results from TALIS 2013 https://www.oecd.org/canada/TALIS-2013-country-note-Alberta-Canada.pdf

OECD (2015). Education Policy Outlook Canada. OECD Publishing, Paris http://www.oecd.org/edu/EDUCATION%20POLICY%20OUTLOOK%20CANADA.pdf

OECD (2016a). Education at a Glance 2016: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2016), School Leadership for Learning: Insights from TALIS 2013, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris,

http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/ 9789264258341-en

http://dx.doi.org/10.187/eag-2016-en

OECD (2017). Education at a Glance 2017: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing, Paris.

Ontario Ministry of Education – becoming a school principal http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/teacher/directobe.html

Ontario Ministry of Education (2012) Framework for Principals and Vice-Principals

Ontario Ministry of Education (2005) Leading Education: New Supports for Principals and Vice-principals in Ontario Publicly Funded Schools http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/general/elemsec/partnership/leadingEducation.html

Ontario Ministry of Education. Review of the Toronto District School Board Jan. 2015 http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/new/2015/TDSBReview2015.pdf

PISA 2015 results for Canada http://www.compareyourcountry.org/pisa/country/CAN

Pollock, K. Principals' Work in Ontario, Canada: Changing Demographics, Advancements in Information Communication Technology and Health and Wellbeing. International Studies in Educational Administration Volume 44, No. 3, 2016

Reid, S. (2013). The leader's role in strategic knowledge creation and mobilization. International Journal for Leadership in Learning, 1(1), 1-53.

Riveros, A.; Newton, P. and da Costa, J. From Teachers to Teacher-Leaders: A Case Study. International Journal of Teacher Leadership. Volume 4, Number 1, Fall 2013

Rogers, W.T.; Hauserman, C. P. and Skytt, J. Using Cognitive Coaching to Build School Leadership Capacity: A Case Study in Alberta. Canadian Journal of Education / Revue Canadienne de l'éducation 39:3 (2016)

Scott S. and Webber C. 2013. Entrepreneurialism for Canadian Principals: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. Journal of Research on Leadership Education 8(1) 113–136

Statistics Canada. A profile of elementary and secondary school principals in Canada: First results from the 2004-2005 Survey of Principals
http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/81-004-x/2006002/9249-eng.htm#a

Tschannen-Moran, M. and Gareis, C. R. (2015) Principals, Trust, and Cultivating Vibrant Schools Educational Policy, Planning, and Leadership, College of William & Mary, P.O. Box 8795, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795**,**

Webber, C. F.; Scott, S. (2008) Entrepreneurship and Educational Leadership Development: Canadian and Australian Perspectives, 12(14). IEJLL: International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning, [S.l.], jan. 2008. ISSN 1206-9620

Webber, C. F.; Scott, S. (2010) Mapping Principal Preparation in Alberta, Canada. Cilt (Vol): 1 Sayı (No): Yaz (Summer) 2010, 75-96

Singapore

Dimmock, C. and Tan, C.Y. (2013), "Educational leadership in Singapore: tight coupling, sustainability, scalability, and succession", Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. 51 No. 3, pp. 320-340.

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2013). Key Data on Teachers and School Leaders in Europe. 2013 Edition. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/key_data_series/151EN.pdf

Hairon, S., Goh, J.W.P. and Saravanan, P. (2015). Predictors of instructional leadership in the Singapore school system. THF Working Paper: Working Papers Series No.4/2015. The Head Foundation.

Ministry of Education, Singapore. 2013. Education Statistics Digest 2013.
http://www.moe.gov.sg/education/education-statistics-digest/files/esd-2013.pdf

Ministry of Education, Singapore (2016a). Education Statistics Digest 2016

Ministry of Education, Singapore (2016b). Education for All 2015 National Review: **2015**

Ng, F.S.D., Nguyen, T.D., Wong, K.S.B. and Choy, K.W.W. (2015a), "A review of Singapore principals' leadership qualities, styles, and roles", Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. 53 No. 4, pp. 512-533.

OECD (2016a). Education at a Glance 2016: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing, Paris. http://dx.doi.org/10.187/eag-2016-en

OECD (2016b). School Leadership for Learning: Insights from TALIS 2013, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/ 9789264258341-en

Retna, K.S. (2015). Different approaches to the professional development of principals: a comparative study of New Zealand and Singapore, School Leadership & Management, 35:5, 524-543, DOI: 10.1080/13632434.2015.1107038

Schleicher, A. (ed.) (2012). Preparing Teachers and Developing School Leaders for the 21st Century: Lessons from around the World. OECD Publishing.

State Government of Victoria (June 2012). New directions for school leadership and the teaching profession. Melbourne: Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.

Wang, L.H., Gurr, D. and Drysdale, L. (2016). Successful school leadership: case studies of four Singapore primary schools. Journal of Educational Administration 54(3): 270-287

Zongyi Deng & S. Gopinathan (2016) PISA and high-performing education systems: explaining Singapore's education success, Comparative Education, 52:4, 449-472, DOI: 10.1080/03050068.2016.1219535

Comparisons and conclusions

Breakspear, S., Peterson, A., Alfadala, A. and Khair, M.S.B.M. (2017). Developing Agile leaders of Learning: School Leadership policy for dynamic times. Learn Labs.

Eurydice (2013). Key data on teachers and school Leaders in Europe. http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/key_data_series/151EN.pdf

Finnish National Agency for Education (2017). Teachers and Principals in Finland.

Harris, A. and Jones, M. (2015) Leading Futures: Global Perspectives on educational leadership. SAGR Publications.

Harris, A., Jones, M. and Adams, D. (2016). Qualified to lead? A comparative, contextual and cultural view of educational policy borrowing. *Educational Research*, 58(2): 166-178.

Jensen, B., Downing, P. and Clark, A. (2017). Preparing to Lead: Lessons in Principal Development from High-Performing Education System. Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy.

OECD (2013, November). Education Policy Outlook: Finland. http://www.oecd.org/edu/EDUCATION%20POLICY%20OUTLOOK%20FINLAND_EN.pdf

OECD (2014), *TALIS 2013 Results: An International Perspective on Teaching and Learning*, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264196261-en.

OECD (2016). Education at a Glance 2016: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing, Paris. http://dx.doi.org/10.187/eag-2016-en

Reference: DFE-RR823

ISBN: 978-1-78105-903-6

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:
Michele.weatherburn@education.gsi.gov.uk or www.education.gov.uk/contactus

This document is available for download at www.gov.uk/government/publications