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This paper is a condensed version of a survey from twelve European countries of educational leadership programmes. The programmes described and compared are of one hundred hours’ duration or more. The content of the courses is analysed using a fourfold framework: organisation and administration of the school; curriculum and student results; the staff; strategic policy of the school. This is done country-by-country and then across countries. Providing institutions, entry requirements, student characteristics and other characteristics of the courses are then considered along with the instructional methods and the effects. Overall conclusions are formulated and the prospect of European masters degree considered to encourage more cross-European consistency in programmes for educational management.
INTRODUCTION

Goal of the Project

ENIRDENM, the European Network for Improving Research and Development in Educational Management, celebrated the 10th anniversary in 2001. To mark this occasion, the board of ENIRDENM initiated a project to discover how school leaders are developed in a sample of European countries – a cross-European perspective. The examples of good practice revealed can contribute to improvement by being made available to those running development programmes. In the first phase of the project, the members of ENIRDENM were asked to describe a training programme by completing a questionnaire. Questions were posed about characteristics of the programmes, about the content and the working methods, and about the effects of the programmes and the measurements of these effects. This report summarises the first phase by presenting the results of the questionnaires filled in by 15 participants. A more extensive report is obtainable by the leading author.

Approach

About two hundred people – the members of ENIRDENM – were asked to select what they judged to be a good example of a training programme for school leaders, and to describe that training programme by filling in a questionnaire. The programme selected had to be at least 100 hours’ duration. Fourteen questionnaires were sent in (see table 1), one of which describes a programme of 90 hours and was also included. The questionnaire was semi-structured including both closed and open questions in order to deepen the explanation. After a first elaboration of the data, most of the participants came together to discuss the results. In this discussion some data were clarified further, additional information was given and conclusions were formulated.

In this summary, the data are presented in two ways. First of all, the different programmes are briefly described, one by one. This horizontal analysis is done in order to give some information about the programmes and some background for the next analysis; therefore not all characteristics of the programmes are described in this horizontal analysis. In the vertical analysis a comparative description of the different programmes is made, different characteristics of the programmes are identified and the overall patterns identified.
**Horizontal Analysis**

Table 1 gives an overview of the countries (with abbreviation), the name of the programme, and the institute(s) providing the programme. Some countries are represented twice: Czech Republic, Poland and Sweden.

A short description of each programme now follows, including: the pre-service or in-service character of the programme, the duration, the general content of the programme, the most important domain or field and the most important working methods.

A distinction is made between four domains:

- the organisation and administration of the school,
- the curriculum and the results of the students in the school,
- the staff,
- the strategic policy of the school.

**Belgium**

This programme, provided by the Centre for Andragogy of the University of Antwerp, is the oldest programme in the sample. Since 1971, about 1500 school leaders have graduated from this programme. It provides in-service training spread over two years for new principals and vice-principals in secondary education. The programme lasts 215 hours. General ideas about the content of the programme are:

- Providing a survival kit.
- Functional opportunity.
- Professionalisation of management skills.
- Creating a network of professional colleagues.

Of the four domains of the programme, the domain ‘staff’ is seen as the most important.

As to the working methods, the most important methods are lectures and skills training.

**Bulgaria**

The Department of In-service Training of Teachers, Sofia University provides this programme. Since 1996 more then 340 school managers have graduated. This in-service training for principals in secondary
Table 1: Participating countries, name of the programme, institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Country and Abbreviation</th>
<th>Name of the programme</th>
<th>Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Belgium B</td>
<td>Basisopleiding Schoolbeheer (School management)</td>
<td>Centre for Andragogy, University of Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bulgaria BUL</td>
<td>School management Basis</td>
<td>Department of In-service Training of Teachers, Sofia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Czech Republic CZ1</td>
<td>School management</td>
<td>Dept. of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Brno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Czech Republic CZ2</td>
<td>Further education of principals of primary and secondary schools</td>
<td>Dept. of Further Education (professional association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Finland FIN</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Centre for Continuing Education and In-service training, Unit of Ostrobothia, Åbo Academi University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Iceland IS</td>
<td>Administration of schools</td>
<td>Iceland University of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ireland IRL</td>
<td>Diploma in Management in Education</td>
<td>Drumcondra Education Centre + Trinity College, Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Latvia LV</td>
<td>Effective School Management</td>
<td>Riga Teacher In-Service Training Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Norway N</td>
<td>School leadership – first unit</td>
<td>Dep. of Teacher Education and School Development, University of Oslo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Netherlands NL</td>
<td>Magistrum – Training for School Leader, Primary Education</td>
<td>Fontys Teacher Training Institutions in co-operation with 11 other Teacher Training Institutions and a Pedagogical Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Poland PL1</td>
<td>School Principal Education management course</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, to be used by Teacher-in-service training centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Poland PL2</td>
<td>Educational management</td>
<td>Dept. of Educational Management, Jagiellonian University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sweden S1</td>
<td>National Head teacher training programme</td>
<td>Centre for School management training, Uppsala University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sweden S2</td>
<td>The school leader programme</td>
<td>Dalarna University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Slovenia SLO</td>
<td>Headship licence programme</td>
<td>National Leadership School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

education last 90 hours, spread over 11 days. Leading ideas about the content of the programme are:
The school is a place for children.

The school is an effective educational organisation.

The teacher and the students are partners in the educational process.

The domains ‘curriculum/results’ and ‘staff’ are the most important. The most important working methods are: lectures, discussion in small groups skills training and tests.

**Czech Republic 1**

There are two programmes in the sample from the Czech Republic. This first programme, from the Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Arts of Masaryk University, Brno is an in-service programme for headteachers, deputy heads, middle school managers in basic and/or secondary education and occasionally leaders of higher vocational colleges. Started in 1997, 23 school managers have graduated. The programme lasts 224 hours spread over 24 months. Important ideas about the content of the programme are:

- The school as a learning organisation.
- Management of quality.
- The school as a community.

The most important domain is ‘strategic policy’.

The most important methods in this programme are self-assessment, study of literature and discussions in plenary.

**Czech Republic 2**

The second programme from the Czech Republic is the only programme provided by a professional association. It started in 1996. Since then, 300 students have graduated. It is an in-service programme for principals and vice-principals of primary and secondary education. The programme lasts 370 hours spread over 6 months. The most important ideas about the content of the programme are:

- School management in conditions of change related to reform of public administration.
- The Framework of the National Programme of Education in the Czech Republic.
As in the case of CZ1, the most important domain is ‘policy’.
The most important working method in this programme is discussions in small groups.

**Finland**
The Unit of Ostrobothnia from the Åbo Academi University has organised this pre-service programme since 2000. Up till now, 20 persons have graduated. The programme is for every type of school and educational institute. The duration of the programme is about 12 months. The programme itself lasts 600 hours and consists of 15 academic credits. General ideas in the programme are:

- The leadership challenge.
- Investigating school culture.
- Professional development as leader and counsellor.
- Leading school development projects.

The most important domain is ‘organisation and administration of the school’.
As to the working methods, the most important methods are self-assessment, discussion in small groups, study of literature, coaching by a supervisor, shadowing and practice (10 days).

**Iceland**
The programme, organised by the Iceland University of Education, is a combination of short seminars and distance learning. This programme started in 1988 as a 15-credit programme. In 1996, it was expanded up to a 30-credit programme. 69 students have graduated (46 with 15 credits, 23 with 30 credits). The courses although organised in a meaningful whole can also be seen as part one in a MED. or MA programme. The programme is for principals, vice-principals and middle managers in pre-schools, basic schools and secondary schools. This programme is the largest programme (1200 hours) and takes a year on a full time basis or two years part-time. The generic idea behind the programme is to combine into a meaningful whole:

- The leadership role.
- The school as a learning organisation.
- Educational improvement.
School-based evaluation.

As in the case of Finland, the most important domain is ‘organisation and administration of the school’.

The most important working-method is the study of literature.

Ireland

This programme aims to prepare qualified teachers for positions in management and to provide self-develop opportunities. Since 1988, the year of starting, 540 students have graduated. The programme is organised jointly by the Drumcondra Education Centre (a centre for continuing education) and Trinity College in Dublin. The programme is open for all qualified teachers in primary and secondary education. The duration of the programme is 240 hours. General ideas about the content of the programme are that teachers need:

- to understand general theories of management;
- to learn skills in research;
- to require skills and competencies in professional development;
- to know how to manage change.

‘Staff’ is the most important domain.

The most important working-methods are: the study of literature and skills training.

Latvia

This programme is designed for new school principals and vice-principals and for teachers who want in the future to apply for these positions in primary and secondary education. The programme started in 1996 since when 59 students have graduated. The programme takes 240 hours spread over 12 months. The programme is organised by the Riga Teacher-In-Service Training Centre. General ideas about the content of the programme are:

- Democracy in school management.
- Development of the curriculum/schoolplan.
- Education policy of the national and local government.
- Strategic policy and school vision.
- Implementing new ideas and innovations.
The most important domain in this programme is ‘the strategic policy of the school’.

The most important working-methods are lectures and discussion in small groups.

Norway

Started in 1992, this programme is for leadership at all levels in the educational system. It aims to give understanding about how leadership, school development and organisational learning interplay in a social and political context. The main focus is on managing change in education, developing professional and creative leadership based on the values stated in the national curriculum. The programme includes 3 one-year units (part time) which build on each other. The first unit, which is the one described in the following, builds on the national programme for leadership development in schools (Luis), and may be seen as a basic course for school leaders. The programme, organised by the Department of Teacher Education and School Development, University of Oslo, is open for principals, vice-principals and teachers in primary and secondary education and also for leaders and counsellors at municipal level. So it is in-service for the principals and vice-principals, pre-service for the teachers who want to become principals. The programme lasts 340 hours over 12 months. Since the start of the programme, 288 (unit 1); 224 (unit 2) and 45 (unit 3) students completed the programme.

General ideas about the content of the programme are:

- Concepts relating to organisation and leadership.
- The national curriculum as basis for school development.
- Understanding the school’s culture and strategies for change.
- Evaluation as the basis for leadership and development.

The most important domains in this programme are ‘staff’ and ‘the strategic policy of the school’.

The most important working-methods are: self-assessment, lectures, discussion in small groups, skills training, problem-based approach to learning based on real problems from student’s work, portfolio assessment, ICT-based counselling, communication and information.
The Netherlands

This programme is an in-service programme for principals of schools for primary education started in 1994 by the Training Centre for School Management of the Fontys University of Professional Education, in co-operation with all Catholic teacher-training institutions for primary education, and a Pedagogical Centre. The programme of two years lasts 680 hours and gives attention to all important aspects of leadership and management. About 900 students have completed the programme. A special feature is that the school boards of the participating principals receive so-called ‘replacement-money’ from the government, which can be used to pay a part of the costs for a substitute for the absent principal although this is not mandatory. General ideas about the content of the programme are:

· Integral leadership (aiming at the integration of the different aspects of leadership and management from an integral vision).
· Transformational leadership.
· The school leader as a reflective practitioner.

‘Staff’ is the most important domain in the programme.

The most important working-methods are discussion in small groups, skills training, application of training in a work setting, intervisi- 

Poland

This response does not describe a concrete, specific programme. In the year 1999, the Polish Ministry of Education passed the law in which training was made compulsory for principals and vice-principals of all types of schools including kindergartens. The deadline to complete the training for those already appointed for the principal and vice-principal position was 1 January 2002. Together with that decision, Ministry of Education issued precise training guidelines. That programme was compulsory for public and non-public teacher in-service training centres traditionally involved in principal training but not to universities

1. In intervisiion peers learn from questions and situations from the daily practice. In small groups, participants bring in cases, in order to analyse how a participant is handling these situations, what are his/her habits, blind spots and so on. By way of feedback, questions, suggestions, the peers help each other to learn from the situation.
and higher education institutions, which have greater autonomy. Teachers who want to apply for the principal position after 1 January 2002 have to have completed that training. At present, the programmes are usually in-service, but from 2002, they will be pre-service. The programmes last 220 hours spread over 8 to 14 months. General ideas about the content of the programme are:

\[\begin{align*}
\cdot \text{ Quality.} \\
\cdot \text{ The school leader as a reflective practitioner.}
\end{align*}\]

Most of the topics, mentioned in the questionnaire have a place in the programmes. The same is true for the working-methods, particularly lectures and discussion in small groups, skills training, study of literature, active methods and written assignments.

**Poland 2**

The second case from Poland describes an educational management course for heads, deputies, and teachers from primary, secondary and pre-school who are interested in school development for pupil-centred education and participation of parents in school life. The programme has been organised since 1997 by the Educational Management Department of the Jagiellonian University. Since then, 56 students completed the programme. The programme is not compulsory but may be chosen to acquire qualifications required by the Ministry for principals and vice-principals.

In this programme, the general ideas about the content of the programme are:

\[\begin{align*}
\cdot \text{ School as a learning organisation.} \\
\cdot \text{ Participation of pupils, teachers and parents in school process.}
\end{align*}\]

‘Staff’ and ‘Curriculum and the results of the students’ are the most important domains in the programme.

The most important working-methods are: discussion in small groups, application in a work setting, coaching by supervisor and coaching by peers.

**Sweden 1**

This programme is organised by the Centre for School Management Training of the Uppsala University. The responsibility for the programme lies with the National Agency for Education. It is financed by
A Cross-European Survey on Training School Leaders

state grants and is run by departments within six Universities. The Centre for School Management Training at Uppsala University is responsible for the training in six counties in central Sweden. Since starting in 1992 and 650 students have completed. The programme is based on a holistic view of the school and the role of the headteacher in which the organisation of the school, its relationship with local community and knowledge of school conditions constitute important elements. The purpose of the training is to deepen headteachers’ knowledge and increase their understanding of the national goals of the school and the role of school in society. The training promotes a working climate inspired by democratic values, learning and communication. The role of leadership in a school system managed by objectives and results is considered, as well as participants’ ability to plan, implement, evaluate and develop educational activities. The emphasis on management by objectives helps the head to build and clarify his/her own ideological platform as well as to be aware and confident in his/her own interpretation of national values and goals. The present training goals are grouped into four main areas: school goals, school management, development of educational activities and follow-up and evaluation.

In this programme, the general ideas about the content of the programme are:

- Reflection, critically processing information a problem solving, related to own experiences and concepts and theoretical models from research and theory.
- School as a learning organisation.
- Balance between theory and practice.
- The educator/trainer as a model for leadership.

In this programme, “staff” is the most important domain

The most important working-methods are: self-assessment, skills training, application in a work setting and coaching by supervisor.

Sweden 2

Started in 1989, this programme organised by Dalarna University is designed for all leadership functions in educational organisations. About 200 students have completed the programme. For the students who are already school leaders the programme is in-service, for others, pre-service. The four-semester programme lasting 24 months is organised
as distance learning. For students attending lectures and seminars at the university, it lasts 130 hours using Friday afternoons and Saturday-mornings. Between the meetings, contact via ICT with the teacher supports individual study and compulsory individual projects based in the work place. Students can create their individual study plan. This individual character of the programme affects the degree of importance of the different topics.

General ideas about the content of the programme are:

· School as a learning organisation.
· The school leader as an official (political).
· The school leader as a leader (personal leadership).

The most important domain is ‘strategic policy’.
The most important working method is the use of individual written exercises.

Slovenia

Slovenian legislation requires all school directors to attend management training in order to obtain a Headship Licence. The National Leadership School offers the programme that leads to a Headship Licence. It qualifies school leaders for every type of schools (from kindergarten to higher education). About 1500 students have graduated since 1994. The programme consists of six modules (Introductory module; organisational theory and leadership; planning and decision making; headteachers’ skills; human resource management; and legislation). Modules are organised as residential workshops based on the participants’ experiences and school situations. Pedagogical formats of the programme vary from case-studies to debates, from simulations and role-playing to team action projects, from reflective reading and synthesis papers to creative brainstorming, from visits to a variety of creative institutional settings to presentations for colleague audiences. The programme takes 8 months and 204 hours of study.

General ideas about the content are:

· leadership for learning;
· the effective school.

The most important domain is ‘staff’.
The most important working methods are self-assessment, discussions in small groups, skills training, and tests.
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COMPARATIVE DESCRIPTION: GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

This section compares the different programmes. Attention is paid to

· the type of institutions who organise the programme,
· the main reasons for designing the programmes,
· the programme itself: the main focus, pre-service or in-service,
· the scope of the programmes (total time of the different programmes, contact time, study time, other time, contact time as a percentage of the total time, duration of the programme), the costs compulsory or not, certification,
· the students (entry-qualifications, male/female proportion, age, number of students in a draft, the target group).

Organising institutions

Teacher-training institutions (universities, and universities for professional education) provide most of the programmes. In some cases, there is some co-operation between teacher training institutions and other institutions. In one case, the programme is provided by an institution established (by the government) for the training of school leaders (slo). In another case, a professional association (cz2) provides the programme. In many cases, not only university teachers of the involved institutions perform teaching and training but also experienced school leaders or domain-experts in some topics.

Reasons for designing the programme

Most of the programmes started recently. Only four of the fourteen programmes started before 1990 (b, Is, Irl, s2). Seven programmes started not longer then five years ago (bul, cz1, cz2, fin, lv, pl1, pl2). This can be seen as a sign that the last decade the need for professionalisation of leadership is becoming more urgent. This is related to changes in the social and political context of schools and the consequent increasing demands on schools and school leaders (Chapman 1996; Murphy and Hallinger 1992; Verbiest 1998; Mahieu 1998). This is confirmed by the reasons given for designing the programmes.

Some of the reasons refer explicitly to the changing context: ‘Understanding of changes in public administration and school management.’(cz2); ‘Rationalisation of the school organisations and the education’ (b); A stronger focus on the importance of school leadership
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in national educational policies in the 90’s; The National Curriculum from 1987 put emphasis on local school development, as a consequence many principals felt a need for further education’ (N).

Other reasons relate to the changing professional needs felt by (future) school leaders: ‘A need for the school leaders to know principles of management and to possess management skills. School leaders have no basic training in the field of school management. The school leaders themselves realise the need of management knowledge and skills and wish to have the relevant training’ (BUL); ‘The lack of educational management training and education offered in the system’ (CZ1); ‘Lack of knowledge of theoretical and practical skills how to run the school’ (LV); ‘A strong need for education for school leaders. Beside university programmes, the only education offered to school leaders is the state ‘principals’ programme’ which is given at six places in Sweden but does not automatically give academic credits’ (S2).

Some reasons refer to the national regulations applying to principalship: ‘Achieving education that is nationally equivalent is a responsibility for the head-teacher. (...) For this reason, although the school system is a municipal responsibility, the state offers this national training programme for head-teachers’ (S1); ‘The Finnish regulation system for getting the competence to apply for a principal’s job was redesigned from 1 January 1999. This academic programme in educational management and leadership was one alternative for a leadership specialisation’ (FIN) ‘As part of a major school reform in Poland, teachers and principals have to upgrade their qualification in the various ways. Principal training is one example’ (PL1); Slovenian legislation from 1996 requires all school directors to have a headship licence.’ (SLO).

In one case, there is a reference to consequences for school leaders in terms of salary: ‘Increasing of salaries’ (CZ2). In another case, there is an explicit relation with the financial need at the organising institute itself: ‘Financial reasons – the department has to earn money for its functioning (state budget is too low to cover the whole year needs)” (CZ1). And one institute mentions the importance of good relations between the institute and the schools: ‘To develop association of schools and the university department of educational management’ (PL2).

The programme: functions, pre-service or in-service, size, costs

The programmes are designed for different functions. Some programmes are designed only for a rather narrow group of school managers, for
example, principals in primary education (NL). Most of the described programmes have a broader scope, at least principals and vice-principals from primary and secondary education (CZ2, S1). But in most cases the programme is designed also for other functions:

- principals, vice-principals and middle managers in pre-school, basic school and secondary school (IS),
- principals and vice-principals from all kind of schools (PL1, PL2),
- principals and candidates for principalship for kindergarten, primary, secondary and higher education (SLO),
- counsellors at municipal level (N),
- middle school managers in basic and or secondary education, and leaders of higher vocational colleges (CZ1)
- all leading functions in organisations with educational tasks (S2).

Most of the programmes are in-service programmes. In some cases however, the programme can be pre-service for those who are not yet school managers. (IRL, IS, LV, N, S2, SLO). One programme is mentioned, as in-service but became a pre-service programme in 2001 (PL1). In one case the programme is entirely pre-service (FIN).

The programmes differ also in the total time the student must spend at the programme, and accordingly in the duration of the programme. In table 2, the total time of each programme is divided between contact time, study time and other time. This last category indicates time to spend on compulsory group activity (N); intervision groups (NL) or ‘practice’ in school (PL1). Also, one can find the percent of the total time devoted to contact time.

The total study load varies between 90 hours and 1200 hours. The largest programme (IS) takes more then 13 times the smallest programme (BUL). Most of the programmes count no more then 300 hours. Four of the programmes count 600 hours or more (FIN, IS, NL, PL2). On the average, the contact time is 53% of the total time but there is much variation, from 100% (CZ1) to 20% (IS). There is no significant relationship between the total time of the programme and the contact time. Most large programmes (FIN, IS, NL) have a relative low contact time ratio. But in the case of another large programme, PL2, that ratio is 80%. For some average programmes (B, CZ1, CZ2, IRL, LV) the contact time ratio from 22% to 100%. As table 2 indicates, the duration of the programmes differs a lot. Large programmes (IS, NL) take
Table 2: Country – total time, contact time, study time, other time, proportion of contact time, duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Time (hours)</th>
<th>Contact time</th>
<th>Study time</th>
<th>Other time</th>
<th>Contact time¹</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUL</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ1</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ2</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>960</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12 m / 24 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. As % of total time. 2. Full-time/part-time. 3. Individual. m = months d = days

two years but that is also the case for some smaller programmes (B, CZ1, S2).

There are large differences in costs per student between the different programmes. The most expensive programme costs $13,000 (S2); the cheapest programme costs $85 (CZ2). But there is great variation. There is no significant correlation between cost and the total study load or contact time. These data must be interpreted carefully. Sometimes the costs for the programme are included in the budget of the providing organisation (BUL, S2). Sometimes students can have tax concessions (IRL, NL); in many cases in the Netherlands, schools pay back the fee the students have to pay; in other cases, there are regulations to help students.

**Compulsory requirements and certification**

Although there is a general recognition of the changing demands on schools and new and increasingly difficult tasks for school leaders, only a few of the programmes are compulsory. In most of the participating
countries, there are no specific regulations for teachers who apply to be a principal, apart from specified years of practice or a minimum age (B, BUL, IRL, LV, N, NL, S). But in some cases, maybe due to the success of the programmes, they are becoming an expected requirement for school managers and it becomes difficult to obtain a principal position without following this kind of programme (IRL, NL). Only in two cases is the described programme compulsory (PL1; SLO). In some countries, the described programme is one of the alternatives for teachers to get the formal competence to apply for principal or vice-principal (FIN, PL2) or the programme contributes to being assigned to a post of director (CZ2).

In all cases, except one, there is a kind of certification. The kind of certification differs considerably. Sometimes it is an unofficial certificate as proof of participation (B, BUL, S1); sometimes it is an informal certificate of the university (CZ1); in another case, a certificate of extended qualification in part requirement for an application as principal or vice-principal (CZ2, PL2). There are also examples of certification based on exams, portfolios and written assignments (N, NL, PL1). Some programmes lead to academic credit (FIN, IS, S2). One programme leads to 15 academic credits and participants get an academic certificate as a proof of their formal competence for principals job (FIN); another programme (IS) leads to 30 credits and a graduate diploma; also the described programme in Norway leads to academic credits. No certification is given in one case (LV).

The certification rate is rather high; in one case, it is as low as 50% (IRL), but in all the other cases where there is a kind of certification, the certification varies between 72% and 100%. There is no relation between this rate and the basis on which the certification is awarded. Exams, portfolio, assignments lead to high rates of certification, as do the cases of certification only on the base of participation. There are also big differences in the numbers of students completing the programmes. These numbers vary between 6 (IS, LV) and 150 (NL) or more than 200 (SLO) in a year.

The students: entry qualifications and assessment

Entry qualifications are required for almost for every programme. But there is large degree of variation in these qualifications. Criteria include:
Eric Verbiest, ed.

- experience as a manager: being a member of a management team (B);
- being a principal (NL);
- former studies: being a teacher (CZ1, IS, IRL);
- having a university degree (BUL, FIN);
- combinations of the above (CZ2, LV).

In some cases, the criterion that one must be a principal implies that one is a teacher (NL). In one programme, applicants are selected in conjunction with the municipality concerned (S1).

Only for two programmes is an assessment part of the selection process. The Dutch programme contains a self-evaluation of learning needs and learning style and in an intake interview student and tutor make a comparison with the demands of the programme. In some exceptional cases, the student is advised not to participate in the programme. In one of the Polish programmes (PL2), the assessment refers to general knowledge of the educational system in Poland and to the ability to plan for professional development. For this second criterion, it is indicated in the questionnaire that ‘most candidates do not know how to do it’. So it seems that this assessment is not selective. In general, the entry qualifications are rather formal, related to educational qualification and/or years of experience or work experience. As far as there are assessments, they are hardly selective.

The students: gender, age and number

Table 3 shows the proportion between male and female students.

In most cases, there are more female students. Only in 4 cases (B, CZ2, IS, NL) there are more male than female students. In one case (IRL), the proportion is 1:1. It would be interesting to compare these figures with the proportion between male and female school leaders in the respective countries but the figures give some indication that school management is becoming a female job with Belgium and The Netherlands as exceptions.

Table 3: Proportion between male and female students (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>BUL</th>
<th>CZ1</th>
<th>CZ2</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IRL</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>PL1</th>
<th>PL2</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>SLO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Average age of the male and the female students in the programs (years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>bul</th>
<th>CZ1</th>
<th>CZ2</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IRL</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>PL1</th>
<th>PL2</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>SLO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average age of the students can be seen in table 4. Only in three cases the average age of the female students is higher the average age of the male students (N, PL2, S1). In one case there is no difference (B). So in most cases the average age of the male students is higher then the average of the female students, although the difference is not significant. A part of an explanation can be as follows. In a survey of the Dutch programme here described, it appeared that male school leaders start the course earlier, but have more years of experience as school leader. Male school leaders start the course on average after 12 years of experience as a school leader, female school leaders after 7 year. Men thus assume the role of school leader earlier in their careers. It may be that female school leader like to have more professional support compared with male school leaders (Verbiest, Ballet, VandenBerghe, Kelchtermans, and Van de Ven 2000).

The number of students enrolled at any one cohort shows big differences: varying from 19 (PL2) to 220 (SLO).

**Comparative Description of the Content**

Two main questions about the content of the programmes appear in the questionnaire: the place and importance of certain topics and the underlying ideas about the content of the programme. The topics were mainly based on ideas about school effectiveness. However, school effectiveness is a concept open to many interpretations (for example Chapman 1993; Van Wieringen 1993a; 1993b; Verbiest 1998). It is useful to distinguish different aspects of school effectiveness. A typology of effectiveness can be based on two dimensions (Quinn 1994):

- the focus of the educational organisation (is the school orientated inward or outward?);
- the structure of the organisation (stability and control or flexibility and change?).

A combination of these dimensions produces four different concepts of school effectiveness and, as a consequence, four domains of topics.
Table 5: The four domains: mean scores and number of items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics related to</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean number of items indicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisation and administration of the school</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>11.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum and the results of the students</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>9.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategic policy of the school</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers in brackets indicate the number of topics identified in the questionnaire:

- Topics related to the organisation and administration of the school (14).
- Topics related to the curriculum and the results of the students in the school (12).
- Topics related to the staff (15).
- Topics related to the strategic policy of the school (14).

The respondents were asked to indicate if the topics have a place in the programme and to place a value on a four-point scale of their importance in the programme. Additional topics could be added. In addition, the respondents were asked to indicate on a four-point scale the importance of some general topics (for example, general theories of education, transformational leadership or the school as a learning organisation) and to identify underlying ideas behind the programme, for example, the concept of the effective school. The content domains were then analysed according to the number of times each topic appeared plus the ratings of the importance of each topic.

The importance of the different domains

In table 5 the mean scores on the four domains and the mean number of items having a place in the programmes are indicated.

All domains appear important. The lowest score on a four-point scale is 2.71. ‘Staff’ is evaluated as the most imported domain, followed by ‘the strategic policy of the school’, ‘organisation and administration of the school’ and ‘the curriculum and the results of the students’. Most topics appear in the domain ‘the organisation and administration of the school’ followed by ‘the strategic policy of the school’, ‘the staff’ and ‘the curriculum and the results of the students’. ‘The staff’ is the
most important domain in 8 countries although in three of these countries it is ranked equal with another domain. ‘The strategic policy of the school’ is the most important in five countries (in one case ranked equal). The two other domains are only most important in two countries (in two cases ranked equal).

With regard to the numbers of items having a place in the curriculum, in 7 countries the highest number of topics (7) is situated in the domain ‘the organisation and administration of the school’, followed by ‘the staff’ (6). The domain ‘the strategic policy of the school’ appears in only two countries as the domain with the highest number of items. The domain ‘the curriculum and the results of the students’ is in no country the domain with the highest number of items. One can conclude that in most countries, the domain ‘the staff’ is the most important domain in the curriculum for educational leaders whereas the domain ‘the curriculum and the results of the students’ is seen as the least important. There is no relation between the importance of a domain and the fact that the country belongs to the Eastern or Western parts of Europe. We shall now consider each of the four domains separately

*The organisation and administration of the school*

All the topics related to this domain have a place in one or more curricula. Many topics appear in almost all curricula. So the domain receives a lot of attention in the curricula. Most important topics in this domain are the culture of school; school structure and organisation; information and communication within the school; decision-making procedures within the school; and consultation procedures within the school. The least important topic is school building maintenance. The ‘soft’ topics within organisation and administration of the school, such as culture and communication, receive the most attention.

*The curriculum and the results of the students*

All the topics in the domain ‘curriculum and results of students’ have a place in one or more curricula. This domain, although lowest in importance, receives a lot of attention in the curricula. Most important topics in this domain are development of the curriculum; school planning; quality-assurance and classroom observation. Of lesser importance are standards of discipline and teaching styles.
The staff

All the topics in the domain ‘the staff’ have a place in one or more curricula. The domain ‘is the most important domain in the curricula. Many topics are seen as important in the curricula. The most important are: human resource management; team building; professional development and training; team meetings; managing conflicts with staff; teacher morale and commitment; gaining support and co-operation of teachers with management roles and assessment the strengths and weaknesses of the staff. Of lesser importance staff recruitment; staff discipline, dismissal and redeployment of ineffective teachers and financial or administrative restrictions of teacher recruitment.

The strategic policy of the school

All the topics in the domain ‘the strategic policy of the school’ have a place in one or more curricula. The domain is also (just as ‘staff’) a very important domain in the curricula. Many topics are seen as important in the curricula. The most important topics in this domain are education policy of the national government; education policy of the local government; school vision; strategic policy for the school; implementing new ideas and innovations. Of lesser importance is dealing with unions and professional organisations.

The most important topics

Regardless of the domains the most important topics (value on a four-point scale) are:

- The culture of the school (3.83).
- School vision (3.71).
- Implementing new ideas and innovations (3.62).
- Human resource management (3.58).
- Strategic policy for the school (3.57).

Topics with the lowest value are:

- Attracting applicants for teaching positions (2).
- Staff discipline, dismissal and redeployment of ineffective teachers (1.8).
- Dealing with unions and professional organisations (1.62).
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- Financial or administrative restrictions of teacher recruitment (1.5).
- School building matters (1.33).

The respondents were also asked to formulate some underlying ideas behind the content of the programme. In the questionnaire were five general ideas already formulated:

- General theories on educational management.
- Transformational leadership.
- The school as a learning organisation.
- Creating a network of professional colleagues.
- Enhancing the reflective competency.

The respondents were asked to give an indication of the importance of the topics on a four-point scale. All the topics have a place in most of the curricula. Four of the five topics appear in ten or more curricula while the topic with the lowest score, ‘Enhancing the reflective competency’ still appears in 8 curricula. All topics formulated in the questionnaire are seen as important the lowest score being 3.27. Across the countries, there is a lot of agreement about the importance of these general topics.

**The Working Methods**

The place and importance of teaching methods were ascertained. All the methods mentioned in the questionnaire have a place in most of the curricula. Five of nine of the methods appear in ten or more curricula (discussions in small groups, application in a work-setting, coaching by a supervisor, training of skills and study of literature), while the working method with the lowest score, coaching by peers, still appears in eight curricula.

In some cases additional working methods were identified by respondents: role games (B, NL); plenary discussions (CZ, NL); shadowing (FIN); practice (FIN); a ‘real problem’-based approach (N); a portfolio (N, NL); ICT-based counselling (N); individual written exercise (IS, S2). All working methods formulated in the questionnaire were seen as important, except three (self-assessments, lectures and tests). There is a lot of agreement across the programmes about the importance of the working methods.
What good practice in the training of school managers is revealed by the survey? In order to identify good practice, it is necessary to know about the effects of the programmes. In the questionnaire, there were questions about the measurement of the effects and the actual effects. Table 6 summarises the responses.

In only six cases do contributors say that there is a reliable measurement of effects of the programme. That does not mean that there is no measurement at all of the effects. For example, in one of the Czech programmes (CZ1) and in the Norwegian programme there is a lot of effect-measurement but there are no data about the reliability of the measurement. Even in the case where there is a reliable measurement, the basis of this is not always clear. Effects such as satisfaction, changes in competencies or more possibilities on the labour market were not identified.

Measurement of the effects was done in various ways: tests, presentations, number of applications as indicator for interest in the topics, exams, written essays, questionnaires, student meetings, interviews on the base of grounded theory. Sometimes the judgements of former participants were taken into account. In most cases, the measurement is restricted to the students themselves. The measurements were based in almost all cases on the perceptions of students during and/or after the studies. Students are asked about their level of satisfaction and about their professional skills. In some cases, lectures and tutors provide judgements. But there were no cases of more objective observation or measurement of the operating competencies of the students.

Many different effects are mentioned such as successful experiences, mental support of the colleagues in the group, better chance to get a job, satisfaction with the opportunity to study leadership theories beyond those met in teacher training programmes and satisfaction with the programme. In addition, the building of networks with other principals and teachers, increased confidence, knowledge and self-esteem and problems with the programme (time consuming, difficulties with literature).

In relation to the professional knowledge and competencies of the students, responses included improved knowledge, skills and attitudes, growing competencies and ability to manage school systems; some problems in developing the school as a learning organisation. There was
## Table 6: Country measurement of the effects of the programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Is there a reliable measurement of the effect of the programme?</th>
<th>How are the effects measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Yes *</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Test, presentation of an idea, final discussion of the topic of the course, number of applications as indicator for interest in the topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>We measure the knowledge/skills/abilities by introducing exams after each term, at the end of the programme, and also by requiring (and evaluating) the essay written by the participant – the text should come out of what s/he is daily facing in his/her professional life and is related to the educational management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Not yet</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>No*</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Based on students’ evaluations during and after the programme: meetings with chosen representatives among students twice each semester, written evaluation at midterm and at the end of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A one and a half year survey, directed on two drafts of each 150 persons (students and people who finished two years before the course), using questionnaires and interview-method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>By the graduate thesis of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A national evaluation of the whole programme was carried out in 1998 focused on the achievement of The National goals. Effects were measures in mainly two categories: The area of school-development and the leader as a person. We have also done interviews with former participants and members of their staff, and husband or wife, in order to measure effects. A questionnaire and interviews (the national evaluation) Interviews-grounded theory (are own evaluation of former participants).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Questionnaires, interviews, evaluations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The impact of this programme was studied some years ago. The plan is to evaluate the programme in 2002.*
### Table 7: Country, relation between effects, and content and working methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Relation between effects and content</th>
<th>Relation between effects and working methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUL</td>
<td>Effect is connected to the programme.</td>
<td>No categorical conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>We get feedback from the students several times and try to reflect this information in the development of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ2</td>
<td>Content of the programme corresponds to goals.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>Those who completed the programme give support and constructive criticism.</td>
<td>Adult learning methods work best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Increased confidence, knowledge and self-esteem are mediated by a specific teaching approach rather than the content.</td>
<td>The combination of specific working methods leads to increased confidence, knowledge and self-esteem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some indication that effects are modified by the school system in which students work.

As table 7 indicates, it not easy to formulate firm conclusions about the relations between content or working methods of the programmes and the effects. Only in one case (NL) is research conducted to investigate relationships between content and methods on the one hand and effects on the other.

**Conclusions**

- Only 7% of the sampled population sent in the questionnaire, but not everybody in the network is involved in training school leaders as there are many researchers and school leaders. The criterion of programmes of 100 hours or more also limits the number of possible respondents.
Table 7: Country, relation between effects, and content and working methods (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Relation between effects and content</th>
<th>Relation between effects and working methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| s1      | The development of the school is the core of the programme and the improvement of the headteachers knowledge and skills in relation to:  
· self-knowledge  
· mission  
· relations to others within the school  
· the school as an organisation  
· the social/political environment.  
This can improve both understanding and performance | Experiential learning and a direct connection to the participants’ work. Residential courses of four days for each work with experimental methods. The models and methods used parallel the processes in the participants’ schools. Consultancy is an important part of the programme. Action based research is conducted in the participants’ own context. The stress on reflective competency. |
| s2      | According to the students, the content of the programme made them more qualified for their positions. |  |
| s1o     | The content is structured in the way that leads to better understanding of school as whole. We try to balance the managerial and leadership relevant to head teachers such as instructional leadership and the legal framework of Slovenian education. The effects are not directly measurable but are often described as ‘increased sensitivity’ for all aspects of school’s life. | We engage students in discussions and group work which is meant to increase their capability for group work and sharing the views and ideas in their own schools. We use their own expertise built on previous experiences and knowledge. We also use ‘role-play’, problem solving and case studies. |

- The people who filled in the questionnaire selected the programmes. This does not assure that all selected are examples of good practices but the characteristics of good practice can be worked out in a later phase of the project.
- Most of the programmes are provided by teacher-training institutions.
- Most of the programmes are relatively young. The need for professionalisation is becoming more urgent related to changes in the social and political context of schools and to the more difficult demands on being placed on schools and school leaders.
- Most of the programmes are in-service followed by people already occupying leadership positions.
Big differences can be seen between the programmes related to the function for which the programmes are designed ranging from a narrow group of only school principals in primary education to pre-service programmes for all kind of educational leaders.

There is a big difference between the different programmes regarding the study load for the students, the duration, the proportion of contact-time in relation to the total study-time and the costs of the programmes.

Although the need for professionalisation is high, most programmes are not compulsory, but some programmes are seen more and more as a required model or a standard for school leaders.

In most cases, there is a form of certification but the kind of certification differs a lot.

The entry qualifications are rather formal, related to educational qualification and/or years of experience or work in a certain role. Where there are entry assessments these are hardly selective.

In most cases there are more female than male students. The average age of the male students is a little higher than the average age of the female students.

The number of students enrolled differs a lot between programmes.

The domain ‘staff’ is evaluated as the most imported domain, followed by ‘the strategic policy of the school’, ‘organisation and administration of the school’ and ‘the curriculum and the results of the students’.

The most important topics are the culture of the school, school vision, implementing new ideas and innovations, human resource management and strategic policy for the school. Also underlying themes such as general theories on educational management, transformational leadership, the school as a learning organisation, creating a network of professional colleagues and enhancing the reflective competency are seen as very important. Lesser importance is given to attracting applicants for teaching positions, staff discipline, dismissal and redeployment of ineffective teachers, dealing with unions and professional organisations, financial or administrative restrictions on teacher recruitment and school building matters.

The most important working methods are discussions in small
groups, application in the work setting, coaching by a supervisor, skills training, study of literature and coaching by peers. Self-assessment, lectures and tests are less important.

- Despite the big efforts invested in these programmes, evaluation of the effects is not in many cases based on a reliable instrument. Much measurement is based on the perceptions of the students. That is of course important to enhance the professionalism, but it is not easy to formulate firm conclusions about relations between content or working methods and the effects of the programmes.

- One result so far is that the different contributors to this project feel stimulated to compare the data with their own programme looking for blind spots and making their own programme more complete.

- Caution is needed in interpreting the results. Firstly, most of the data are quantitative. Secondly, the questionnaire does not give insight in the context and the meaning of the different programmes or the different subjects and topics. For example, if people place a high value on the topic of culture, it is not clear what they mean by this topic in the context of the programme. Therefore, this report gives only rough information and is only a first step in exploring further the development of school leaders. In the next phase the project will deepen its investigation of the context and the meaning of the data.

- The next step in the project will try to reveal what is under the surface of the data by exploring the meaning of topics like culture. Participants will be involved in developing a module about culture in the school that can have a place in a European programme for educational management (Master programme). The topic is chosen because of its importance in the programmes surveyed.

- In the light of the considerable diversity seen in the programmes and the need for harmonising professional programmes across Europe advocated in the Bologna Declaration, this project will contribute to the achievement of more cross-European consistency in programmes for educational management.
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