

EAST AYRSHIRE COUNCIL

EDUCATION COMMITTEE – 25 MAY 2004

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE “REVIEW OF STANDARD FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP (HEADSHIP)”

Report by Executive Director of Educational and Social Services

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1** To inform the Education Committee of the Authority’s response to a consultation paper from the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) entitled “Review of Standard for School Leadership (Headship)” (Scottish Executive, February 2004).

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1** The Standard for Headship has laid out the skills and abilities that must be achieved by aspiring Head Teachers. This Standard articulates with the other professional Standards in existence within the teaching profession.
- 2.2** The consultation paper proposed that the Standard for Headship be renamed the Standard for School Leadership (Headship) and proposed a rationalisation of the documentation in order to be consistent with the other Standards in existence.

3. RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

- 3.1** The authority welcomed the proposals within the consultation paper and the full response is attached as Appendix 1. We highlighted a key issue that currently the Scottish Qualification for Headship is the only route available in order to achieve the Standard for School Leadership. We have requested that alternative routes be made available in the future.

4. LEGAL/POLICY/FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1** Nil

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1** The Education Committee is recommended to:
- (i) note the contents of this report.

John Mulgrew
Executive Director of Educational and Social Services

7 May 2004

List of Background Papers

Consultation on Review of Standard for School Leadership (Headship), Scottish Executive, February 2004.

Members wishing further information should contact John McCarney, Head of Service: Schools Support (01563 555631)

Implementation Officer: John McCarney, Head of Service: Schools Support

EAST AYRSHIRE COUNCIL

REVIEW OF STANDARD FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP (HEADSHIP)

1. STANDARD FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

We welcome the change of title to more accurately reflect developments in leadership and management in schools across the country. We question whether there is a need to include the “Headship” in the title as it should be clear that this is the category and position being targeted.

We welcome the clarity of placing school leadership within the four levels of leadership defined in “CPD for Educational Leaders”.

2. LANGUAGE OF THE DOCUMENT

We welcome the consistency in terms of language across the Standards documents and the above mentioned CPD document. There is much to be gained from a consistent approach across the system, in order that education professionals can clearly understand the articulation and progression across these documents and standards.

3. PROGRESSION

There is improved progression across the document. The illustrative examples are particularly helpful, but if these are to remain in the final document it should be made clear that these are neither prescriptive nor exhaustive.

4. ELEMENTS OF PRACTICE FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

We welcome the clarity regarding the four elements proposed. We would agree with these four elements, although may question the title of the last element “management functions”. Given the increased emphasis on Leadership as a function, both explicitly expressed in this document and recognised in a national context as a key area of development, it may be more appropriate to entitle the final element as “leadership and management functions”.

5. RELATIONSHIP TO SQH

We remain concerned that the SQH appears to be the only current route available in order to achieve the standard for school leadership. While this is not a formal part of the consultation, please note that we remain very concerned about this development and would wish alternative routes to be available as soon as possible.