Educating School Leaders to think and act both locally and globally

Tony Townsend

Chair of Public Service, Educational Leadership and Management

Faculty of Education

University of Glasgow

11 Eldon Street Glasgow, G3 6NH

United Kingdom

Phone:          +44(0)141 330 4434

Fax:            +44(0)141 330 5451

Tony Townsend is Professor and Chair of Public Service, Educational Leadership and
Management in the Faculty of Education at the University of Glasgow, Scotland. Email:
t.townsend@educ.g;la.ac.uk. His most recent books are *The Elusive What and the
Problematic How: The Essential Leadership Questions for School Leaders and Educational
Researchers*, (edited with Ira Bogotch), Rotterdam and Taiwan: Sense Publishers (2008) and
(edited) *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, New
York: Springer, (2007)

Educating School Leaders to think and act both locally and globally


Tony Townsend


**Introduction**


When educating school leaders, one simple way to open their eyes is to ask the question 'What can a 15 year old do or experience today that you could not do when you were 15?' Given a few minutes to think about this, they will come up with a series of responses such as 'I-phones', 'facebook' 'laptop computers' and so on. It is clear that school leaders recognise that there has been substantial change in the types of technology available to young people today, most of which we as adults feel less comfortable about than they do. However, when they are probed further, they come to recognise that it is not just technology that has changed, but pretty much everything else too, some of it on the back of technology, but other things not so.


So do your own test now and you will possibly think of changes in:

- the environment (e.g., global warming),

- employment (contract positions rather than life-long employment),

- relationships (try to define 'family' for instance),

- health (improved ability to replace human parts, but also the pandemic of aids),

- wealth (the rate of poverty in many parts of the world has decreased substantially over the past 30 years, but the Gini index, which analyses the spread of wealth across an individual country, shows that the rich continue to get richer and are widening the gap between themselves and everyone else),

- society (rapidly changing demography, population shifts from rural to urban communities),

- culture (the McDonaldisation and Coca-Colarisation of the world and what that means), and

- values (we seem to respect community less and individualisation more, and there seems to be a stronger link between your self-perception and the amount of money you have)

Three other questions that we should ask of school leaders are the following:

- What proportion of the students in your school right now will still be alive in the year 2100?
- What proportion of a person's lifetime will be spent in school? and
- What further change is likely to happen in that time, given what we know?

The answer to the first question is that 80% of students currently in school will still be alive in the year 2100, assuming the same level of improvement in health as we have had in the last hundred years (on average in 1900, people died at the age of 47); the answer to the second question is less than 2% (if a student spends 190 days per year in school for around 6 hours a day, that is 13% of the school year; if they stay in school for 13 years, that is around 13% of a lifetime of a 100 years); and the answer to the third question is, we have absolutely no idea, just as the people who invented the aeroplane (1903) and those that invented radio (1906) had absolutely no idea of what the world would become by 2000.

Of course all of these questions simply lead to the other bigger questions which are

- Does education today reach out to young people whose world is so different to what ours was (apart from the technology that is now available, how different is a classroom today from that of 1910)?
- What are we teaching to our students today that will help them survive and thrive for the rest of their lives (since school presumably exists to prepare young people for the future …if not, then what IS school for)?
- If, as a school leader, the answers to these questions leave you somewhat disquieted, what can we do about it?

I want to bring together two quotes to try and propose a way forward. First, Drucker (1993: 1) argued:

> *Every few hundred years in western history there occurs a sharp transformation. We cross... a divide. Within a few short decades society rearranges itself, its world view; its basic values; its social and political structure; its arts; its key institutions. Fifty years later, there appears a new world...we are currently living through such a transformation.*

Drucker talks about societal transformation, the type that I have identified in the questions above. However, Drucker uses words like 'every few hundred years' and 'fifty years later' which suggest a sort of relaxed approach to change, where something that happens when I am a child permeates its way through society so that by the time that I am fifty, we have all come to accept it. Toffler (1971: 12), on the other hand, suggests that this relaxed approach to change has collapsed.

> *I coined the term 'future shock' to describe the shattering stress and disorientation that we induce in individuals by subjecting them to too much change in too short a time.*

He called it that feeling of 'vague, continuous anxiety', something that I am sure many people in education can relate to. The interesting thing about the Toffler statement is that forty years later, things are changing even more rapidly than in Toffler's time. From email to facebook to youtube to text messaging to twitter can be measured in months, not years.

However, if we put these two statements together we gain an understanding that the world around us goes through substantial transformations, each of which makes us see the world differently, and that these transformations seem to be happening more and more frequently. In Townsend (2009), I argued that Drucker was talking about a principle similar to that first proposed by Rogers (1962)

*...to describe the diffusion of innovations, where the S-curve described the number of people accepting an innovation over a period of time. New products or innovations were first accepted by a few 'early adopters', followed by the 'early majority', the 'late majority' and then the 'laggards'. Cumulatively, when graphed, the proportions of the population that have accepted the innovation over time form an S-curve.*

(Townsend, 2009: 356)

Rogers' early work was later used by others (for instance, see Handy 1994, Phillips 2008) to describe how change progresses, and how new technologies replace others over time, but it is also a useful model for looking at how education has progressed over the course of history. Just as Drucker identified, over time, certain changes in our society have also changed the way in which we think about schooling. These changes, when documented on a global scale, can be likened to the sigmoid curve as first one community or society adopts the new way of thinking, then others follow over time. Hedley Beare (1997) also described these shifts by using what he called metaphors for education, and these are helpful in terms of identifying when the major shifts in thinking about schools came. From the dawn of time until the 1870s education might be described as the 'pre-industrial metaphor' where education was 'for the few and the privileged' (Beare, 1997: 4-5). From this time until the 1980s 'the industrial metaphor' where 'the factory-production metaphor [was] applied to schooling' Beare , (1997: 5-6) was the dominant way in which education was seen and managed by 'bureaucracies which characterised factory production'. Finally Beare (1997: 9-13).argued that in the late 1980s we entered a time of the 'post-industrial metaphor' where 'enterprise' became 'the favoured way of explaining how education operates' and 'schools are being talked of as if they are private businesses or enterprises.'

However, the changes that Beare reported on did not stand still after the turn of the millennium. Using the same way of looking at the world, Townsend (2009: 356).extended Beare's arguments into the first decade of the 21st Century.

*I would argue that we have had four S-curves in education's history and that we are now on the verge of a fifth. The first, in which the dominant drivers were individuals, lasted for more than four thousand years, the second saw the birth of local schools, and lasted for around 80 years, the third saw the intervention of national governments and lasted around 20 years, and we are in about the eighth or ninth year of the fourth S-curve, in which accountability systems and the market have become the dominant drivers of education. I will also argue that we are approaching the time when we need a new way of thinking about education, one that considers social justice issues at a global level.*

Up until the 1870s most education was aligned to individuals and Townsend (2009: 356-7) called this <u>thinking and acting individually</u>, the first S-curve in education.  Under these circumstances, very few people were educated to the level that we would demand today. Most people were not educated at all. But from as early as the 1870s in some parts of the world, and up until the 1890s in others, communities started to take responsibility for educating their people. This occurred differently in different places, as well as at different times, but could be associated with the move from an agrarian society to an industrialised one. So in some small countries a national system was instituted, in other places it was through a state system or districts, counties or provinces, with many of these systems still in existence today. Townsend (2009: 357) characterises this as <u>thinking and acting locally</u>, the second S-curve in education. Now most people were receiving some education and many people had education to a fairly high level.

However, by the 1980s the burgeoning Asian economies created great concern for the old western powers, typified by reports such as as *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983) in the United States where education was first identified as being of economic value as well as being of social importance. We started to hear new terminology in the west, 'national goals', 'national curriculum', and 'national testing' which

were designed to adopt a more standardised approach to education across diverse state or district systems. Federal governments (in the USA, the UK and Australia, for instance) started to make demands of the education system that all students be educated to the level required for 'the knowledge age'. With technological changes the opportunities to employ large numbers of people in factories diminished (the industrial age) and the need for a highly skilled workforce (the knowledge age) changed again the way in which we looked at education. Education was asked to think nationally and act locally, and the third S-curve had begun (Townsend 2009: 358).

These three S-curves align themselves fairly well to Beare's terminology, but since his chapter was more than a decade ago, we will have to forge on by ourselves. In the mid 1990s, before the national view of education had really much time to mature, the advent of TIMSS (then the *Third International Mathematics and Science Study* and now the *Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study* started to create a new level of discussion. When this was joined by PISA, the OECD's *Program for International Student Assessment* which by 2009 will be testing in countries that make up 89% of the world's economy, the international comparisons that were made in these tests led to the fourth S-curve, thinking internationally and acting locally (Townsend 2009 358-9). Although international comparisons were being used and countries were now sharing knowledge about curriculum, pedagogy and the administration of schools, individual schools were still seen as the locus of change. However, despite virtually all people now getting some education, the goal of achieving high quality education for all continues to prove elusive.

During this fourth wave, the dominant metaphor (if we use Beare's terminology) could be identified as accountability and the mechanism by which many governments have instituted this is through the use of market terminology. Just as the rest of the world has accepted the idea of a global market, the education market has been constructed using the same underlying principles, that of privatization and choice. Whether tacitly or not, governments, especially those in the west, seem to have accepted that they cannot afford to educate everyone to high

levels of skill (despite the rhetoric that this is what's needed) and have adopted the rather facile approach of supporting private enterprise practice as the means of achieving this goal. Put simply (perhaps crudely), western governments are saying 'If you don't like the school you are in, go to another one. If the government system can't provide for you, there is a private school that will.' This has allowed governments to keep education budgets within what they consider to be reasonable bounds, based on the other increasing demands for funding from a rapidly ageing and an increasingly overweight population of 'seniors' and those who will soon join them on the one hand, to the burgeoning budget for terrorism surveillance on the other, (although arguably this might be lessened just as easily by educating the world's population and giving them decent jobs as it is be by trying to contain the 1% of the world's population that might support this form of radical change).

What we can say is that there is ample evidence that student achievement is hard to shift, even after all of the reforms that have occurred in recent times. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Reading test scores have been virtually unchanged despite over forty years of educational reform efforts. There is some evidence that the gap between the socially advantaged and the socially disadvantaged has closed somewhat, but this has been confined to the elementary years of school. By the time students reach high school the level of performance is the same as it was in the 1970s. Despite all of the resources and reform efforts that have occurred since the 1980s after the *Nation at Risk* report, overall achievement is much the same as it has always been.

However an interesting study by Alexander, Entwisle and Olson (2001, 2007) suggests that the focus that is placed on schools for student achievement might not be as fair as we would hope. Their study, which tested students of 20 elementary schools in the Baltimore area at the beginning and end of each year from grade 1 to grade 5 and then again in grade 9, led them (2007: 1) to conclude:

*...cumulative achievement gains over the first nine years of children's schooling mainly reflect school-year learning, whereas the high SES–low SES achievement gap at 9th grade mainly traces to differential summer learning over the elementary years.*

The indication is that poorer students, and especially those from the middle class, do better than their higher socioeconomic counterparts during the school year, but the overall performance of schools is mitigated by the months that students spend away from school. This suggests that perhaps schools may have been more effective than politicians have given them credit for, and their ability to outweigh the social disadvantages of poor students is not as high as governments would have us think, because they are only in school for a proportion of the school year and the other 50% of the time they are awake, the community influence overwhelms what schools and teachers have done.

However, it can be argued that we, as societies from various parts of the world, have not succeeded in our aspiration to ensure quality education for all, despite all of the reforms, money and effort. The PISA Report  Executive Summary (PISA 2006: 48) makes the following statement:

*It is now possible to track change in reading performance over a six-year period. The results suggest that, across the OECD area, reading performance has generally remained flat between PISA 2000 and PISA 2006. This needs to be seen in the context of significant rises in expenditure levels. Between 1995 and 2004 expenditure per primary and secondary student increased by 39% in real terms, on average across OECD countries.*

This would suggest that our efforts at reforming schools might not be seen as being cost effective, or perhaps not effective in any sense. We have moved from a time where we had individual teachers working with one or more students, through the development of

classrooms, schools and school systems, to a time where national authorities have taken an interest in local school systems and where global comparisons have directed some of the policies promoted by those systems. We have moved through what Beare called the Pre-Industrial, the Industrial and the Post-Industrial metaphors of education and we are currently in what I call the Accountability metaphor of education, where the market and choice programs have been put in place as a means of promoting education for all. However, we are not yet there. (Townsend 1998: 248) argued:

> *We have conquered the challenge of moving from a quality education system for*
> *a few people to having a quality education system for most people. Our*
> *challenge now is to move from having a quality education system for most*
> *people to having a quality education system for all people.*

Thirty years ago Minzey (1981) argued that previous educational reform had been similar to rearranging the toys in the toy box, when what we really needed was a whole new box. We now need to move to a new S-curve, where we close in on universal quality education, where every single student has a successful school experience. Townsend (2009: 363) argued this was the next S-curve, where we think and act both locally and globally and I believe that to do this the metaphor for education has to change again, from accountability, which clearly has not worked, to social justice, where we do what is necessary to deliver a quality education to the world's population. Here, the recognition is that for true education to occur, we cannot have education for the few who are rich and privileged (pre-industrial), we cannot see schools as factories (post-industrial) or businesses (enterprise), and we cannot expect the market to solve our problems (accountability), but must see education as a global experience, where people work together for the betterment of themselves, each other, the local community and the planet as a whole. To do this the focus must become universal. All people must succeed. Townsend (2009: 364) suggests that we have to do things in a different way.

*...we have to move beyond accountability, which is simply a counting and sorting process, and seems to mostly have been designed to enable politicians to report things to communities in slick sound bites and with little or no analysis, and towards responsibility, where we need to respond to the needs and circumstances of the young people we serve and have an internal motivation to improve schools, not because it makes us look better, but because it is the right thing to do for the young people we interact with. Under these circumstances communities, and governments, accept that it is both their legal and moral responsibility to ensure that all people within their communities are given the educational provision required to enable them to achieve their full potential as global citizens.*

If the S-curves from the start of education's history are progressively described then the progress of education over time can be documented in the following way. The next S-curve starts to become clear as seen in Table 1

Table 1: Thinking and Acting Across the Ages

| Period | Focus of delivery | Those effectively educated | Dominant Paradigm of the age |
|---|---|---|---|
| Before 1890 | Individual | Few People | Thinking and acting individually |
| 1870s-1990 | Local | Some people | Thinking and acting locally |
| 1970s-2000 | National | Many People | Thinking nationally and acting locally |
| 1980s-2010 | International | Most People | Thinking globally and acting locally |
| 2010-onwards | Global | All people individually considered | Thinking and acting both locally and globally |

There are implications in moving towards thinking and acting both locally and globally at the policy level, for practice and for the training of both teachers and school leaders. These levels incorporate how we structure education at the system level, how leadership and classroom practices need to change in schools (which affects curriculum, pedagogy and assessment). This leads to new understandings of how to educate both teachers and school leaders.

Since the policy, practice and teacher education issues are briefly described in Townsend (2009), I wish to use the rest of this article to focus only on how thinking and acting both locally and globally will impact on school leaders and, in turn, create new demands for universities and other agencies that are involved in the initial training and subsequent professional development of school leaders.

**School Leadership**

If we are to be successful in our attempt to achieve universal student success, then we need to rethink the way in which school leaders do their business and work with those around them to ensure high levels of student attainment (Table 2).

Table 2: Thinking and Acting for Educational Leadership

| Thinking Globally | Acting Locally | Thinking and Acting both Locally and Globally |
|---|---|---|
| International recognition that the role of the school leader is becoming increasingly important in establishing the conditions of high levels of student learning. Leaders now have to respond to rapidly changing economic, social and environmental conditions. | Strong focus on those elements of management that promote instructional leadership, including the need to understand the law, finance, policy, data analysis and personnel development. | Recognition that an outstanding leader relies upon the people that he works with and that managing the school can only be successful if team leadership and relationship skills are also developed. Leaders think and act strategically to develop |

| | | appropriate actions that support school, student and staff development |
|---|---|---|

The research is unequivocal that leaders can have a powerful, if indirect, influence on student achievement (Leithwood and Jantzi 2000) because of the strong influence that leaders have on the quality of teaching (Fullan 2001, Sergiovanni 2001). However, there are two components for school leaders to consider when we move towards Thinking and Acting both Locally and Globally. The first of these refers to the enormity of the current task and the need to share leadership within the school and the second is the way in which leaders need to think and behave if they are to move the school forward.

In terms of the first of these issues, it is simply no longer possible for a single person to be responsible for all the activities that are contained within the concept of an effective, modern school. In Florida, Townsend and Bogotch (2008: 225) report on the changing structure of the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE), which all school leaders must pass to gain certification and thus directs the activities of leadership preparation programs.

*Of the 91 specific skills identified as part of the new statewide FELE examination, 44 of them (48%) refer to a knowledge and understanding of state or federal legislature…It is telling that all of the skills under Vision focus more on communication of the vision than actually developing one, that the two skills under Diversity involve following the law and state communications and that only two skills under Decision-Making Strategies make any mention of leadership at all.*

In Australia, the Australian Council for Educational Leaders have just released a draft Leadership Capability Framework (ACEL nd), with three major sets of imperatives for school leaders:

- Leads Self for Learning

- Leads Others for Learning

- Leads the Organisation for Learning

Within these three imperatives, there are 11 different capabilities and 34 separate indicators and school leaders are able to map their own level of performance within a rubric for each indicator that specifies a level of performance identified as:

- Influencing within and beyond classroom

- Influencing within and beyond team

- Influencing within and beyond school

- Influencing within and globally beyond school

It is interesting to note the differences between these two sets of expectations. Clearly in Florida, the state government's expectations are strongly focused on within state activity (the need to know laws and policies), whereas in Australia, the national professional association for school leaders sees the task of the leader as moving beyond the school and even beyond state and national borders.

There are many terms that have been used to describe the process whereby leadership with a school is spread from the school leader to others in the schools, including distributed leadership (Gronn 2000, 2002, Spillane, Halverson and Diamond 2001, 2004), shared leadership (Lambert, 2002), democratic leadership (Starratt 2001, Møller 2002)  and team leadership  or teacher leadership (Little 1990,  Barth 1999). The critical leadership skill in the establishment of a broader leadership base is the way in which the school leader builds capacity for leadership in other people. In this way the first focus of thinking and acting both locally and globally from a leadership perspective is the building of capacity for leadership in others and establishing relationships that will allow this to develop. Again there is a substantial body of research in the literature that focuses on this topic (see Lambert 1998, Harris and Lambert 2001, Hopkins and Jackson 2001). But it is the central focus of the school

leader, principal or headteacher, and the vision that they have that will be crucial to this exercise.

There are a number of possible views of what school leadership of the future, giving these rapidly changing conditions, might encompass, especially if we are to focus on thinking and acting both locally and globally, which will involve everything from consideration of individual students right through to ways in which school leadership might contribute to the ongoing health of the planet itself. I wish to look at three different leadership possibilities discussed in the literature, which may be able to serve this purpose, deep leadership (Hargreaves 2006), sustainable leadership (Hargreaves and Fink 2006), and regenerative leadership (Hardman 2009).

In the United Kingdom, iNet (International Networking for Educational Transformation), an initiative of the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust (SSAT), has developed into a network of around 5000 schools in over 30 countries as a mechanism for the sharing of best practice and innovation on the future of education. Part of the underlying rationale and one of the key components of the network's initiatives is what they call personalising learning (Hargreaves 2009), where the argument is made that since students all have different learning styles and learning needs, to ensure that more students reach their potential than currently is the case, we need to make sure that learning is personalised. In the early stages, iNet identified nine gateways to personalised learning (Hargreaves 2009), which were later reconfigured into four 'learning deeps'; deep learning (learning to learn, assessment for learning and student voice), deep experience (curriculum and new technologies), deep support (mentoring and coaching and advice and guidance) and deep leadership (design and organisation and workforce reform). More detail of the first three sets of gateways can be found at http://www.ssat-inet.net/whatwedo/personalisinglearning.aspx but in this article I wish to comment only on Deep Leadership.

In order for the requirements of deep learning, deep experience and deep leadership to be fulfilled, Hargreaves (2006: 2) argues that

> *Deep leadership means redesigning education so that, through a culture of personalisation and co-construction with shared leadership, the school secures deep experience, deep support and deep learning for all its students.*

Deep leadership establishes strategies for organising the staff and the school in ways that develop the capacity to achieve the transformation of full personalisation for students. It involves focusing all the efforts of the school on the task of learning and increasing the capabilities of the teachers and others involved in this effort, to do so. It could be argued that deep leadership is not a new theory of leadership or school management. It is more conceptual in nature requiring pioneering and transformational ideas to work for developing personalisation of learning for all in the school using the nine gateways in a process.

If deep leadership is seen as being conceptual, it also has implications for ongoing practice. The need to sustain such practice has also become a focus for study. Hargreaves and Fink (2007: 3) argued for the need to develop sustainable leadership in schools

> *Sustainable leadership matters, spreads and lasts. It is a shared responsibility, that does not unduly deplete human or financial resources, and that cares for and avoids exerting negative damage on the surrounding educational and community environment. Sustainable leadership has an activist engagement with the forces that affect it, and builds an educational environment of organizational diversity that promotes cross-fertilization of good ideas and successful practices in communities of shared learning and development.*

In this instance, sustainability considers the preservation of good practice once it is established. The notion of sustainability can be seen to act on two different levels, both locally and globally. Locally, we must be concerned with how leadership can be sustained

over time within a particular school and how the focus generated by that leadership can also be sustained once the leader moves on. But sustainability has also taken on a broader concept associated with sustaining the resources of the planet. Sustainability has been defined as…

> *Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*
>
> (World Commission on Environment and Development (Brundtland) Report 1987)

The original focus on environmental sustainability quickly evolved into a much broader concept. Elkington's (1994) definition of the triple bottom-line argues we must consider the economic and the social environment as well as the natural environment for true sustainability to emerge. If we consider only the natural environment and the economic environment we will have <u>viability</u> but not sustainability, if we consider only the natural environment and the social environment we will have <u>bearability</u> but not sustainability and if we consider only the social environment and the economic environment we will have <u>equity</u> but not sustainability. Only when all three are in balance can we have sustainability. If we look at the circumstances in schools at the moment, and ask ourselves these questions…

- Are schools equitable for all students?
- Are schools bearable for all students?
- Are all schools viable in the current climate?

…we might suggest that schools as they are currently constructed, managed and operated are not sustainable either. If so, then sustaining what we have now is not what we want.

Hardman (2009) suggests that sustainability is no longer enough. He considers that we are already in a position of 'overshoot'. If we look at the global environment, we could argue that the triple bottom line is not being met. It could be argued that where we are now, environmentally, economically and socially, is not sustainable. It might even be argued that

the current situation is not bearable, viable or equitable either. In other words, sustaining the position we are in now is not going to lead to the type of world that we desire.  Hardman (2009: 273) argues we can be

> *...no longer satisfied with fostering environmental, social, and economic sustainability as the ultimate objective in business, education, community, or any other form of human activity. The growing evidence of overshoot and collapse of natural and social systems indicated the need to adopt strategic approaches that went beyond sustainability.*

He (2009: 272) outlines his concept of regenerative leadership in the following way:

> *Whereas sustainability is defined colloquially…as "doing what you are doing so that you can keep on doing what you're doing," regenerative leadership can be said to be about putting back more than we took out, and doing it in entirely new ways unconditioned by prior assumptions.*

Hardman uses Wilber's (2001) Integral Theory framework, with four dimensions of human experience, the interior/subjective and the exterior/objective dimensions with regard to personal values on one hand and the interior/subjective and the exterior/objective dimensions with regard to collective values on the other. Hardman recognises that regenerative leadership is an ongoing process, represented by the infinity symbol and starts with the leader's personal value system incorporating sustainability values, developing behaviours based on these values, and then working with others to develop the sustainability mindset and establishing group behaviours based on these values. This process becomes an ongoing cycle of activity over time as both individually and collectively, the group moves towards more sustainable approaches, and eventually to the point where the overshoot issue starts to be addressed in a positive way.

If leaders truly are going to serve their school in the future, the current inequity, of services and outcomes, the current unbearability, for a substantial proportion of the school population, and the current unviability, of a system with too many expectations and too few resources, must change. To do this leaders will need to be courageous, will need to challenge authority and may need to be subversive (MacBeath 2008: 124). This can only happen by sharing the load, both locally, nationally and internationally.

One of the keys to doing this is for school leaders to adopt what Hamel and Prahalad (1989) call strategic intent, comprising three factors:

*A sense of direction: In many organisations staff do not share a sense of purpose above and beyond the short-term unit performance, because most organisations are over-managed and under-led. Strategic intent provides clarity about ends, but is unspecific about means.*

*A sense of discovery: Strategic intent offers staff an enticing spectacle of a new destination. It is broad enough to leave room for considerable experimentation in how to reach the destination. It constrains the 'where' but not the 'how', so creativity is unbridled.*

*A sense of destiny: The goal must be worthwhile to command the respect and allegiance of all the staff. Strategic intent must stimulate the passion that the staff can make a real difference. It represents an ambition that stretches beyond current resources and capabilities.*

(Hamel and Prahalad 1989, in Hargreaves 2006: 6)

The need to regenerate what is happening in schools leads to a more complex approach to school leadership than just 'managing' schools. Bogotch and Townsend (2008: 1) argue that true leadership is artistry and they characterise this as the place where the 'what' and the

'how' of school leadership come together. We have seen above that Florida seems to have spent most of its energy focusing on the what of school leadership, whereas Australia seems to have established concerns about developing the how as well, but perhaps have overshot what we can reasonably expect school leaders to be able to do.

However, the real challenge facing the providers of educational leadership programmes is how do we manage developing leaders who can be 'Influencing within and globally beyond school'(ACEL) but at the same time prepare managers who are increasingly expected to deliver on state initiated mandates and requirements (eg Florida). Perhaps Hardman's (2009) regenerative leadership model may help us here. In order to change the mindset and the behaviour of those we are working with, we first need to change the mindset and behaviour of ourselves. As a person who has worked in the two dominant civilizations (the UK and the USA) of the last two hundred years, it is clear that we need to start recognising what each might offer. With more than five years in the US, I was able to see that the research literature and the leadership practices used by faculty in the US mostly emanated from the US. After a year in the UK, the same thing is obvious, UK faculty use mostly UK research and leadership practices. Yet each has much to share with the other, and so too the rest of the world has much to share with both. Although there have been strong movements in recent years to a more international approach to research, with organisations such as the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the University's Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) on the US side of the Atlantic and the British Educational Research Association (BERA) and the British Educational Leadership and Management and Administration Society (BELMAS) on the other, now reaching out to international researchers, there is still some way to go.

In many cases, it is individual researchers, who read what those from other countries write, who choose to visit other places for joint research or other educational opportunities, and who actively seek out a wider understanding of education with all its global complexities, who will lead the way. They know the benefits of such activity and must encourage others to be

involved. However, if we accept the regenerative leadership of Hardman, then those who have adopted an international mindset and have developed international practices, must lead the way for others who still might look inwards rather than outwards for their knowledge.

The way forward is for those regenerational leaders in educational leadership departments to recognise the value of what using the world as a library might do and to show the value of this to those we work with and those we teach. As a simple first step, look at the reference list that is used in your leadership class. If more than 75% of the references are made up of people from your own country, start the process of broadening your, and your students' reading. A quick Google search will provide a plethora of websites that will document what is happening at ministerial level, department level, the research level, and in many cases school level, that could be used as a starting point for discussions about what is happening ( and how to change it) in your country. Bogotch and Maslin-Ostrowski (in press) document an educational leadership department's journey to move from a collection of individual researchers with some international interests to a department where thinking globally became the norm.

If we choose to revitalize educational leadership programmes, and through this revitalize the education of the school leaders of the future, we can't keep doing what we have always done in the past. We can hope for, but can't expect, our students to make the changes because they are so busy just trying to do what they do best, lead schools. Collectively it is the educational leadership professors that are the leaders of those that will be school leaders. It is our task to show them a world of possibilities and in doing so, we will generate much more than we take away.

**References**

ACEL (no date) *Leadership capability framework*, Sydney: Australian Council for
   Educational Leadership

Alexander, K., Entwisle,D. and Olson. L. (2001) Schools, achievement and inequality: A seasonal perspective. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* **23**, 171–91.

Alexander, K. L., Entwisle D. R., & Olson L. S. (2007). Lasting consequences of the summer learning gap. *American Sociological Review*, **72**, 167-180.

Barth, R. S. (1999). *The teacher leader* (Providence, RI: The Rhode Island Foundation).

Beare, H. (1997) Enterprise: The new metaphor for schooling in a post-industrial society, in Townsend, T. (Ed) *The primary school in changing yimes: The Australian experience*, (London and New York: Routledge).

Bogotch and Maslin-Ostrowski (in press) Internationalizing educational leadership: How a university department jumps the curve from local to international, *Educational Administration Quarterly*.

Bogotch, I. and Townsend, T (2008) What are the essential leadership questions in a rapidly changing world? in Townsend, T. and Bogotch, I. (Eds) *The Elusive What and the Problematic How: The Essential Leadership Questions for School Leaders and Educational Researchers*, (Rotterdam and Taiwan Sense Publishers),  pp 3-16.

Drucker, Peter F. (1993) *The ecological vision: reflections on the American condition* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers).

Elkington, J. (1994) Towards the sustainable corporation: Win-win-win business strategies for sustainable development. *California Management Review* **36**, (2), 90-100

Fullan, M. (2001) *Leading in a culture of change* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass).

Gronn, P. (2000) Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership, *Educational Management and Administration*, **28** (3), 317-38

Gronn, P. 2002. Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly* **13**(4): 423-51.

Hamel, G. & Prahalad, C. (1989). Strategic intent. *Harvard Business School Review,* **67**, 63-76.

Hardman, J. (2009) Regenerative leadership: An integral theory for transforming people and organizations for sustainability in business, education, and community. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Boca Raton, Florida Atlantic University

Hargreaves, D. (2006) *A new shape for schooling : Deep leadership 1*, (London: Specialist Schools and Academies Trust).

Hargreaves, D. (2009) Personalising learning: Next steps in working laterally. http://www.ssat-inet.net/pdf/Next%20steps%20in%20working%20laterally%20-%20Chapter%201.pdf, downloaded November 19, 2009.

Hargreaves, A, and Fink, D. (2006) *Sustainable leadership*, (San Francisco: Jossey Bass).

Hargreaves, A, and Fink, D. (2007) The seven principles of sustainable leadership. http://www2.bc.edu/~hargrean/docs/seven_principles.pdf downloaded 19/11/2009

Harris, A. and Lambert, L. (2001) *Building leadership capacity for school*. (Maidenhead, England: Open University Press)

Hopkins, D and Jackson, D. (2001) Building the capacity for leading and learning in Harris et al (eds) *Effective Leadership for School Improvement* (London: Routledge Falmer), pp 84-99

Lambert, L. (1998) *Building leadership capacity in schools* (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development).

Lambert, L (2002)  A Framework for Shared Leadership. *Educational Leadership* **59** (8), 37-40

Leithwood,K.  and Janzti, D. (2000) The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration, 38*, (2), 112-129

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*, (Washington, DC: The Education Schools Project).

Little, J. W. (1990). The Persistence of Privacy: Autonomy and Initiative in Teachers' Professional Relations. *Teachers College Record,* **91**, 50-536.

MacBeath, J (2008) Leadership moments: How to lead, in Townsend, T. and Bogotch, I. (Eds) *The Elusive What and the Problematic How: The Essential Leadership Questions for School Leaders and Educational Researchers*, (Rotterdam and Taiwan: Sense Publishers),  119-134

Minzey, J.D. (1981) Community Education and Community Schools. An address at the State College of Victoria, Frankston, Australia.

Møller J. (2002) Democratic leadership in an age or managerial accountability, in MacBeath, J. and Moos, L. (Eds) *Democratic Learning: The Challenge to School Effectiveness*, (London: RoutledgeFalmer), p 151-163.

National Commission on Excellence in Education, (1983) *A Nation At Risk: the Imperative for Educational Reform*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office).

Phillips, W. (2008) The "S" Curve at http://www.qm2.org/mbriefs/scurve.html: downloaded July 23rd 2008

PISA (2006) *Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World*, (Paris: OECD).

Rogers. E.M. (1962/2003) *Diffusion of Innovations*, (Cambridge, MA: The Free Press).

Sergiovanni , T. (2001) *Leadership: What's in it for schools?* (London: RoutldegeFalmer.

Spillane, J. P., R. Halverson, and J. B. Diamond. 2001. Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher* **30** (3): 23-28.

Spillane, J. P., R. Halverson, and J. B. Diamond. 2004. Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. J*ournal of Curriculum Studies* **36** (1): 3-34

Starratt, R. (2001) Democratic Leadership Theory in Late Modernity: An Oxymoron or Ironic Possibility? in P. Begley and Johansson, O. (Eds.), *The ethical dimension of school leadership,* (Boston: Kluwer Press).

Toffler, A. (1971) *Future Shock*, (London: Pan).

Townsend, T. (1998) The primary school of the future: Third world or third millennium? in Townsend, T. (Ed) *The primary school in changing times: The Australian experience*, (London and New York: Routledge), pp 235-247.

Townsend, T. (2009) Third millennium leaders: Thinking and acting both locally and globally. *Leadership and Policy in Schools,* **8** (4) 355-379

Townsend, T and Bogotch, I. (2008) 'Conclusion: 'What' plus "How" equals 'Whow'. in Townsend, T. and Bogotch, I. *The elusive what and the problematic how: The essential leadership questions for school leaders and educational researchers*, (Rotterdam and Taiwan: Sense Publishers), pp 215-230/

Wilber, K. (2001). *A theory of everything.* (Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc).

World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). Our Common Future. The Brundtland Report to the United Nations General Assembly. Retrieved December 20, 2009, from http://www.worldinbalance.net/pdf/1987-brundtland.pdf