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Leadership succession has been identified as a major issue in education. In Australia, school authorities report a shortage of suitably qualified applicants for principal and middle management positions. Research, conducted by Australian Catholic University, on behalf of Catholic school authorities in NSW, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania, confirmed this trend and identifies a number of disincentives to principalship.

In 2003, the Queensland Catholic Education Commission (QCEC) approved a number of focusussed research projects to address the issue of leadership succession. These research projects range from developing a framework for leadership, to identifying alternative models of principalship, reviewing employment practices, establishing a mentoring/coaching program, investigating principal-parish relationships and exploring the issue of formation for leadership.

This research project focussed on the first of these projects, namely, to develop a Framework for Leadership in Queensland Catholic Schools. The QCEC, acting on behalf of the various Catholic school authorities in Queensland, contracted the Catholic Educational Leadership (CEL), a Flagship of Australian Catholic University, to undertake this research project.

In taking this initiative, it was assumed that a leadership framework would assist in making responsible, informed and balanced choices in respect to leadership management and development. School authorities could use this framework to identify and support a new cohort of school leaders. In addition, this framework could guide aspirants to leadership in career planning and decisions about professional learning.

This report is offers insights into the structure, process, data and major findings of the study. A full account of the research project, including data from the electronic focus group, is available on-line (http://www.qcec.qld.catholic.edu.au). A copy is also available on request (g.spry@mcauley.acu.edu.au).
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PROJECT OVERVIEW

In recent times, education systems worldwide have identified the issue of leadership succession. Australian research consistently describes a looming crisis in leadership succession and the need for further investigation. A study of a sample of Australian public school principals found that regardless of location, type, size or level of school, gender or age, 92 per cent of Australian principals expected to retire or resign from principalship more than five years before the official retirement age (Grady, et. al, 1994). At the same time, Victorian public school teachers and deputy principals in 2000 found that 88 per cent had no intention of becoming principals (Lacey, 2000, 2001, 2002). Similar figures were found in research within Catholic education systems in NSW, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania (Carlin, d’Arbon, Dorman, Duignan & Neidhart, 2003; d’Arbon, Duignan & Duncan, 2001). These studies identify a number of disincentives to principalship, including the impact of the role on family and personal life as well as an unsupportive external environment.

Within this body of research, it is noted that this situation can cause either anxiety, uncertainty and instability or, alternatively, it can provide a unique opportunity to be proactive and take a fresh look at school leadership. Faced with these two options, the Queensland Catholic Education Commission (QCEC) opted to take the more proactive stance. In November 2000, approximately 25 people representing Queensland School Authorities met to consider the implications of a report on the issue of leadership succession for Catholic schools in NSW (d’Arbon, Duignan & Duncan, 2001). This meeting concluded that Queensland Catholic education faced a similar problem and that the same disincentives for principalship applied. The group therefore resolved not to replicate the NSW research but to seek solutions or strategies to ameliorate the problem.

Further meetings in 2001 and 2002 followed and six research projects were identified to address key issues relating to leadership succession in Queensland Catholic schools. These research projects include:

1. A Framework for Leadership in Queensland Catholic schools;
2. Personnel Practices – Selection to Development;
3. Alternative Models of Principalship;
4. Personal and spiritual Formation;
5. Changing Relationships between Schools and Parishes;
6. Mentoring/coaching for leadership.
In 2003, the QCEC invited Catholic Educational Leadership (CEL), a Flagship of Australian Catholic University, to develop a Framework for Leadership in Qld Catholic Schools. The intention here was to assist school authorities to identify and support a new cohort of school leaders by presenting a clear statement of the dimensions of the leadership role in Catholic schools and the capabilities required to perform this role. In addition, it was hoped that this framework would provide guidance to leadership aspirants in career planning and professional learning.

PRIOR RESEARCH

There have been various attempts to apply performance standards to education. Within Australia, Education Queensland has published its Standards Framework for Leaders (1997) and Australian Principals Associations Professional Development Council developed a National Framework of Competencies for School Leaders (2000). In addition, two research projects conducted by Catholic Educational Leadership (CEL), a flagship of Australian Catholic University, highlight the nature, scope and complexity of the leadership role and identify leadership development needs.

- The Millennial Principals Project (MPP) was conducted by CEL on behalf of Lutheran Education Australia (Jericho, 2003). The focus of the project was to develop and administer suitable instruments for assessing the leadership potential of teachers and middle managers within the Lutheran system. This project provided a leadership profile for applicants to the program. This profile commented upon an applicant’s leadership strengths and identified areas in need of further professional development. There were also recommendations to each applicant in respect to formal and informal professional development and mentoring.

- The Service Organization Leadership Research (SOLR) Project (Duignan, 2003b) investigated the challenges and ethical dilemmas faced by leaders in a selection of frontline human service organizations including NSW Police, NSW Department of Education and Training, Catholic Education Office, Parramatta and the Australian Conference of Leaders of Religious Orders. The findings from this study indicate the need for a change in systematic thinking and attitudes, particularly in the formation of authentic leaders and the building of leadership in service organizations.
In this current project, CEL continues this developmental activity. Our interest in developing authentic frameworks for leadership has not waned. On the contrary, the Research Team came to this current research project excited by the opportunity to develop an authentic framework for leadership in Queensland Catholic schools. As educators we were well aware of the paucity of research in this area and we valued the opportunity to make a contribution.

PROJECT AIMS

This research project aimed to develop a Framework for Leadership in Qld Catholic Schools. The intention here was to develop a comprehensive framework that named and validated the nature, scope, purpose and dimensions of leadership in this organisational setting. In particular, this research project was designed to:

- Clarify school leadership within Queensland Catholic education;
- Assist planning in areas of leadership management and development; and
- Facilitate career planning and professional learning.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In the light of prior research and the project’s aims, this research project sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the significance of a framework for leadership in Qld Catholic schools?
2. How should we approach the development of a framework for leadership in Qld Catholic schools?
3. What are the key components of a framework for leadership in Qld Catholic schools?
4. What are the dimensions of leadership in Qld Catholic schools?
5. What are the capabilities of leadership in Qld Catholic schools?
6. What is the relationship between the dimensions and capabilities within a framework for leadership in Qld Catholic schools?
THE RESEARCH DESIGN

This research project is informed by “constructivism” a distinctive research paradigm with its own ontological, epistemological and methodological claims (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, pp.111-112). From an ontological perspective, “constructivism’s relativism…assumes multiple, apprehendable, and somewhat conflicting social realities that are the products of human intellects, that may change as their constructors become more informed and sophisticated”. From an epistemological perspective it sees knowledge as created in interaction among the investigator and the respondents”. Constructivism also relies on “a hermeneutic/dialectical methodology” aimed at the understanding and reconstruction of previously held problematic constructions. Within this research paradigm, the researcher uses research strategies associated with Ground Theory (Charmaz, 2000) to gather rich data drawn from multiple sources. Analysis of these data begins early in study with more sophisticated and informed reconstructions emerging through various phases of the study.

This research project involved five phases:

**Phase 1: Towards Draft 1.**
Before the empirical phases on the project commenced, the Research Team developed an initial draft of the framework document (Draft 1). This initial draft identified the dimensions and capabilities of leadership for Qld Catholic schools as well as presenting a diagram depicting the relationship between these components. Findings from prior research (Duignan, 2003a; Duignan, 2003b), conducted by CEL, informed this initial draft. In addition, this research project was situated within three conceptual frameworks, namely, Catholic Social Doctrine, Post-Industrial Leadership and Leadership Development.

**Phase 2: Towards Draft 2.**
This phase involved consultation with 9 ‘experts’ representatives from Catholic schools and school authorities throughout Queensland. These representatives were asked to critique Draft 1 of the framework document and provide feedback to the Research Team. This feedback led to a more extensive review of the literature and the development of second draft of the framework (Draft 2).
Phase 3: Towards Draft 3.
Draft 2 of the framework document was presented at a series of meetings with principals from Brisbane Catholic Education and Qld Christian Brothers schools. Data collected during these meetings contributed to the development of Draft 3 of the framework document. Participants in this phase of the project confirmed the set of leadership dimensions presented in Draft 2 of the document. In particular, they were asked to test the efficacy of the leadership dimensions by listing the activities associated with their role and categorising these according to one or more of these descriptors. After a second round of meetings, the Research Team was confident that the leadership dimensions reflected the activities associated with principal leadership in Queensland Catholic education. These leadership dimensions were then included in Draft 3 of the leadership framework document.

Phase 4: Validating or testing Draft 3.
This phase was designed to test or validate Draft 3 of the framework document. This phase involved an electronic focus group. A customised, interactive website was created for this purpose. All principals, deputy principals, assistant principals, board chairs, school supervisors and system leadership throughout Queensland Catholic Education were invited to register to go on-line and 142 of these role holders registered to join the discussion. The website was live for 7 days with the discussion on each day focussing on a different capability of educational leadership (Appendix 1). 616 separate comments were posted during this data gathering exercise. Data generated on-line were constantly processed, analysed and presented back electronically to participants in the form of a daily report outlining emerging themes and concepts. This iterative process helped ensure that the research findings worked across a range of organisational contexts and fitted the real world by being relevant to the people involved in the research.

Phase 5: Framework presentation.
This phase involves report writing and the presentation of a framework for leadership in Qld Catholic schools.
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The Research Team situated this study within three conceptual frameworks, namely, Catholic Social Doctrine, Post-Industrial Leadership and Leadership Development. These conceptual frameworks informed the development of Draft 1 and subsequent drafts of the leadership framework.

Catholic Social Doctrine

Catholic Social Doctrine is a discernible “body of official Church teachings on the social order, in its economic and political dimensions” (McBrien, 1994, p.912). This doctrine is founded on the social implications of the Gospel and is concerned with preserving the dignity of the human person and achieving the Common Good. The broader dimensions of Catholic social teachings are emphasized in Vatican11 Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World and the encyclicals and apostolic exhortations of John XX11, Paul V1 and John Paul 11. This thought is also reflected in various post-Vatican 11 documents on Catholic education (Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, 1977, 1982 and 1888; Congregation for Catholic Education, 1997). The first of these documents, The Catholic School (1977), highlights the importance of the Christian community “working for the common good” within the Catholic school (N.60-61).

Unfortunately from a practical viewpoint, the literature offers few applications of Catholic Social Doctrine to leadership within organisations. Two Americans researchers, Alford and Naughton (2002), however, have taken up this challenge. Their work was initially in response to a paucity of teaching materials in postgraduate leadership courses. However, they also point to addressing the modern tendency:

…to accept a divided life, acquiescing to an apparent necessity to maintain a ‘split personality’. That is, often we act as one person, following a set of goals and standards in our private lives, while we become a strikingly different person – someone molded [sic] by expediency and necessity – at work" (p.7).

In a quest for personal integrity or wholeness Alford and Naughton recommend that Christians seek to integrate faith and their work by focussing on Christian social principles of the Common Good, solidarity, subsidiarity, the universal destination of material goods, and the cardinal and theological virtues as they relate to critical questions in management.
To address the issue of the “split personality”, Alford and Naughton offer a Christian perspective on the purpose of business. This purpose is best described as “the pursuit of all goods necessary for integral human development” or a fullness of life” (p.70). Here integral human development is defined holistically in terms of “bodily development, cognitive development, emotional development, aesthetic development, social development, moral development, and spiritual development ” (p.75). Integral human development is said to involve balanced growth in all these dimensions, with single dimensions complementing the others. “From the point of view of personal action, we run the constant, serious danger of addressing ourselves to certain dimensions of our development at the expense of others” (p.74). The ultimate goal should be to become whole persons and avoid split personalities.

To this end, three social principles emerge as critical to organisations contributing to human development (Alford & Naughton, 2001, pp. 72-80). The principle of “subsidiarity” posits that commensurate authority should accompany responsibility, so that people, at higher levels of administration or management, neither absorb nor supplant the authority of those at the lower levels. A second principle, “solidarity”, refers directly to working for the Common Good and presupposes “patterns of cooperation” within an organisation (p.77). A third principle of “giving priority to labour over capital” enjoins management not to treat human beings as means or instruments for the achievement of economic ends (p.78). Together, these principles serve to nurture a “community of work” and assure that managerial decisions can belong as much to the category of moral leadership as well as technical expertise (p.79). In addition, when all three social principles are applied to work they make the claim for a "vocation of management“ and spiritual leadership within the workplace. “Our work, like our worship is a public witness to our vocation” (p.79).

In this work, Alford and Naughton recommend a “Common Good Model” of leadership and management. This model requires organisational action in the pursuit of both “foundational and excellent goods” (p.65). Foundational goods refer to “material conditions” including “profits, investments, machinery for production…” and “policy conditions” including ‘ownership, structures, job design, pay policy… Excellent goods refer to “individual development” or “integral human development of each member” and the “community of work” as evidenced in patterns of cooperation. This Common Good Model is in sharp contrast to a “Shareholder Model” that focuses on the achievement of foundational goods to the exclusion of excellent goods; or a
“Stakeholder Model” that discounts participation and serves the interests of powerful individuals and groups to the detriment of those at the margins.

Alford and Naughton also recommend the application of cardinal and theological virtues to leadership and management. Here they advocate the four cardinal virtues of prudence, justice, temperance and courage as interpreted by Thomas Aquinas.

Aquinas asks: What are the dispositions that make action itself good for us, so that to act through them makes us good as agents, even if by some circumstances our particular action fails to achieve the particular end we desire? He identifies four such dispositions, and names them cardinal (from the Latin for hinge) virtues. To act well “hinges” on four virtues in the sense that no matter what end we are seeking or what means we employ, if we are to do well, we must perform every action prudently, justly, temperately, courageously. (p.88).

Interesting it is claimed that the development of these virtues does not come automatically nor does it come with solitary introspection. Rather these virtues develop in community; we learn to be virtuous by living and working with virtuous people (p.88). For this reason, leaders in a Common Good Model are primarily concerned with the development of a “community at work” that nurtures virtuous behaviour.

Post-Industrial Leadership

The theory and practice of leadership has evolved in response to the environmental turbulence and rapid change that marks a post-industrial society (Shriberg, Shriberg & Lloyd, 2002). Western culture is in a time of flux and transformation, as evidenced in “the globalisation of the economy, the rapid and continual change resulting from new technologies, the information explosion, the increasing diversity of the population”. Consequently, “we are moving away from a mechanistic worldview in which objectivity, control, and linear causality are supreme to a relational approach, a that recognizes the more contextual, holistic, complex, and relational aspects of the natural world in which we function” (p.212).

As research (Duignan, 2003b) has found the post-industrial society offers new challenges to leaders. These challenges “present themselves as complex tensions involving a contestation of values and/or ethical dilemmas and tensions” (p.4). These leadership challenges may be represented as “seemingly opposite value positions”
Recognising the challenge of leadership in a post-industrial society, theorists in the decade of the 1990s and into the new century have advanced a post-industrial paradigm of leadership. This new paradigm moves away from the industrial notion of the single, heroic leader and advocates a culture of shared leadership. The complex and multidimensional nature of the leadership challenge today requires individuals at all levels of the organisation to take responsibility for the policies/decisions they have to implement (Duignan, 2003b). To this end, future leaders must “feel empowered to contribute to the determination and realisation of the visions which are to guide their organisations and the strategies which they and their staff will be expected to implement”. They should not feel “overwhelmed by unreasonable and unexplained expectations”. They should be “equipped to handle staff relations and people management tasks” and be able to balance the “demands, expectations, roles and responsibilities” of leadership (pp.7-8).

In 1991, Rost offered a new definition of leadership that he boldly described as a post-industrial paradigm of leadership. Here “Leadership is an influencing relationship among leaders and their collaborators who intend real change that reflect their mutual purposes” (p.7). Several important implications are embedded in this definition of leadership. The leadership relationship is based on influence rather than positional authority. Leadership is episodic, rather than a permanent phenomenon, as leaders and their collaborators are motivated by real concerns and come together around specific activities. Moreover, leadership is associated with shared vision and ethical behaviour within the group. This understanding is contrary to the industrial paradigm of leadership that takes a bureaucratic view of organisations; is an individualistic view; is dominated by goal achievement; promotes self-interest; accepts a male model of behaviour and power; articulates utilitarian and materialistic ethical perspectives; and is grounded in rational, linear and quantitative assumptions.

Drawing on research and their experiences in organisations, theorists have advanced additional post-industrial models of leadership. Wheatley (1992) describes a new paradigm of leadership that takes into account contemporary understandings of chaos and quantum physics. Bensimon and Neumann (1993) offer a model of collaborative leadership on the understanding that information-rich and complex
environments require more than one mind to understand and solve complex problems. Drath and Palus (1994) suggest that leadership involves meaning-making in the context of a community of practice. Bhindi and Duignnan (1997) propose a framework for “authentic leadership” based on integrity, intentionality, spirituality and sensibility in leadership actions and interactions. More recently, Sarros (2002) has integrated recent Australian studies and ancient wisdom to identify both the “heart and soul” of leadership. The heart of leadership is all about caring and compassion, passion and conviction and communication; the soul of leadership refers to ethical and socially responsible behaviour as well as a commitment to values articulation and building credibility.

These post-industrial views of leadership are now reflected in new understandings of school leadership. Here school leadership:

… is viewed as a reciprocal process among adults in the school. Purposes and goals are develop from among the participants, based upon values, beliefs, and individual and shared experiences. The school functions as a community that is self-motivating and that views the growth of its members as fundamental. There is an emphasis on language as a means of sharing school culture, conveying commonality of experience, and articulating a joint vision. Shared inquiry is an important activity in problem identification and resolution; participants conduct action research and share findings as a way of improving practice. (Lambert et. al, 1995, p.9)

This view offers a significant shift in the depth and breadth of school leadership and builds a new school culture that nurtures and supports shared leadership throughout the organisation (Crowther, Kaagen, Ferguson & Hann, 2002). In particular, it emphasises the notion of shared leadership or “parallel leadership”, in which teacher leaders take an active role in school reform and renewal. Principals nurture teacher leadership by “communicating strategic intent, incorporating the aspirations and views of others, posing difficult-to-answer questions, making space for individual innovation, knowing when to step back, creating opportunities from perceived difficulties, and building on achievements to create a culture of success” (pp.50-65). In short, this is a new school culture characterised by the principles of “mutuality, interdependence and individual expression” (pp.38-42).

However, this perspective on shared leadership is not well-accepted, understood or appreciated within education.
To many ‘lone-ranger’ leaders suffer from stress and burnout, or sacrifice ‘life’ (balance in life, disruption of family life for the sake of ambition or the ‘job’). Leaders need to be secure enough in their own identity to share and distribute leadership responsibilities, and create a culture where others are willingly participate in such responsibilities. Such sharing is, however, not merely a matter of splitting or distributing tasks and responsibilities in a task-oriented approach.

Sharing leadership with others, however, requires a rethinking of what constitutes leadership in an organisation and how best to enable all organisational members to feel a deep sense of commitment and belonging. The assumption underpinning central issues of leadership, such as power, authority, influence, position, status, responsibility, accountability, as well as professional relationships, need to be surfaced, critiqued and adjusted where necessary, to help create a culture of shared leadership. (Duignan, 2003b, pp. 16-17).

It seems that building a culture of shared leadership requires a modification of mindsets, attitudes, practices and preparation for leaders and leadership. As a way forward:

We could start [leadership development] by developing a comprehensive framework for leadership in the organisation. We should name and validate the nature, scope, purpose and dimensions of leadership for the organisation. Then individuals could be profiled as to how best they as to how best they can contribute to leadership in the organisation. The intent is to develop the capacity of individuals to demonstrate leadership and to enhance their skills, confidence and willingness to take responsibility for making decisions on their own. (Duignan, 2003b, p.17)

Leadership Development

In the debate on whether leaders are born or made, contemporary literature comes down on the side of ‘making’ leadership by developing leadership capabilities. This position is reflected in the release, in 1995, of Enterprising Nation – Report of the Industry Task Force on Leadership and Management Skills (The Karpin Report). This report places the spotlight on leadership and management development in Australia and raises awareness of the relationship between leadership capabilities and organisational performance. In particular, it recommends a new management and leadership paradigm: rather than deal with current deficiencies managers should be more future orientated and engage scenario planning; the emphasis should be on finding long-term solutions rather than short-term fixes; management development should be linked to strategic business directions; there should be adequate preparation for staff moving from specialist operational roles to management
positions; and there should be strategies for evaluating leadership development initiatives. This new paradigm of leadership results in a more flexible and adaptable organisation with people at all levels willing to learn and change.

Following the Karpin Report, joint research by the Australian Institute of Management (AIM) and Monash University (Sarros, Gray & Densten, 2001) and subsequent AIM publications (Barker, 2003; Onsman, 2003) recommend that command-and-control, “dominator” (Hock, 1999, p.73) models of performance management and development be replaced with more collaborative approaches. Such approaches establish clear expectations and understandings about the jobs to be done and involve on-going conversation in partnership between employees and their managers. This is a cyclical process of performance management and development involving several activities including performance planning, on-going performance communication, data gathering, observation and documentation, performance evaluation, and performance diagnosis and formal/informal learning opportunities.

Here everyone has the potential for leadership with employees and managers leading and managing themselves, their peers, their bosses and subordinates.

The first and paramount importance for anyone purporting to be a manager is to manage self; ones own integrity, character, ethics, knowledge, wisdom, temperament, words and acts…The second responsibility is to manage those who have authority over us: bosses, supervisors, directors, regulator ad infinitum. Without their authority how can we follow conviction, exercise judgement, use creative ability, achieve constructive results, or create conditions that allow others to do the same? The third responsibility is to manage one’s peers. Without their support, respect, confidence, little or nothing can be accomplished…The fourth responsibility is to manage those over whom we have authority… [This] is true leadership: leadership by everyone, leadership in, up, around, and down is what the world so badly needs, and dominator management it so sadly gets. (Hock, 1999, pp. 68-73)

This collaborative approach to performance management and development points to a new understanding of leadership development that is contrary to the traditional top-down, deficit model of professional development (Onsman, 2003, pp.61-66). This new understanding draws on literature in respect to productive adult learning (Scott, 1999; 2000; Busher, Harris & Wise, 2000). This body of literature highlights the importance of flexible learning pathways, relevant programs linking of theory to practice, and supportive administrative structures as well as providing opportunities for self-managed learning and active coaching. The significance of informal, on-the-job training is also highlighted (Onsman, 2003, p.61).
Interestingly, recent research has identified the need to move beyond thinking in terms of the preparation and training for leaders, to focus on their formation as ‘depthed’ human beings”. In short:

Formation processes should assist leaders to develop their own ethical and moral frameworks for the study and analysis of complex problems and tensions they face each day. The challenge is to combine intellectual, moral and spiritual into frameworks that help transcend knowledge generation and skills development to one of reflective critique of contemporary dilemmas, the promotion of personal and professional growth and its development through an exploration of what it means to be human. (Duignan, 2003b).

Conclusion

When read together, the conceptual frameworks of Catholic Social Doctrine, Post-Industrial Leadership and Leadership Development highlight the importance of:

- Recognising the complex and multi-dimensional nature of leadership in a post-industrial society;
- Developing a culture of shared leadership with decision-making and responsibility distributed throughout the school;
- Working with and for community as evidenced in patterns of cooperation within a Christian community;
- Focusing on leadership formation and holistic human development; and
- Linking leadership capability with formal and informal learning.

These thoughts played a significant role in the development of Draft 1. A further review of the literature and data collected, analysed and interpreted in the course of research project served to answer the research questions and develop subsequent drafts of the leadership framework.
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In this section, the data collected and analysed, in the various phases of the project, are outlined and subjected to an overall analysis against the project’s research questions. It should be noted that the data generated by the project are particularly rich and only results that are significant to the research questions will be discussed in this report.

1. What is the significance of a framework for leadership in Qld Catholic schools?

As discussed above policy-makers have supported the development of various performance standards frameworks in Australia. Education Queensland has published its Standards Framework for Leaders (1999) and Australian Principals Associations Professional Development Council developed a National Framework of Competencies for School Leaders (2000). In addition, a leadership framework was development by Catholic Educational leadership (CEL), a flagship of Australian Catholic University on behalf of Lutheran Education Australia (Duignan, 2003a). These frameworks are designed with the intention of developing workable cause-effect checklists, whose implementation will make principalship/school leadership happen.

Noting this support for performance standards frameworks, Australian researchers (Louden & Wildy, 1999; Scott, 2003) have sought to clarify the significance of these documents. Unfortunately, to date, they have unable to find a causal link between the implementation of these framework and improvements in principalship/school leadership. However, these initiatives are significant in that the development processes used in compiling and validating the lists are often hugely consultative and there appears to be value in this conversation. In addition, performance standards frameworks provide comprehensive descriptions of the principal’s role that facilitate the development of performance management processes and serve the generation of targeted professional development outcomes.

Within this current research project, the Research Team also found strong support for a leadership framework. In particular, participants in this research project believed the development of a Framework for Leadership in Qld. Catholic Schools to be significant on the grounds of leadership management and development. Participants,
in the phase 2 interviews, were able to identify several examples of how a framework for leadership in Qld Catholic schools could be used to plan a professional development program for principals, to develop a mentoring program for aspirants and facilitate performance management. Again, in the phase 3 consultations, principals could see the usefulness of using a framework for self-review and guiding professional learning.

As a consequence these data, the Research Team came to the conclusion that a leadership framework was an idea ‘whose time had come’. We also accepted the need for a collaborative approach to the development of this leadership framework. We were also vary of developing yet another a cause-effect checklist that was not ‘owned’ by the Catholic school community.

2. How should we approach the development of a framework for leadership in Qld Catholic schools?

Having identified the significance of this research project, the Research Team were faced with the decision of how to approach this developmental activity. Typically, performance standards frameworks attempt to divide complex professional performances into long lists of dispositions, knowledge, or duties, including Key Responsibility Areas, Key Competencies and Key Performance Indicators. For example, a Standards Framework published by Queensland Department of Education (1999) identifies seven key responsibility areas including “educational leadership”, “curriculum management” and “people management”. Each of these is then divided into a further six or eight key competencies such as “develop an effective performance management process for all staff”. In addition, these competencies are further divided in performance indicators. All in all there are 134 separate items identified.

Australian researchers (Louden & Wildy, 1999; Masters, 1992) have criticised this style of performance standard frameworks. These standards frameworks have been classified as “frameworks of precision” (Louden & Wildy, 1999), characterised by “hierarchical list, decontextualised performances and dichotomous judgements” (Masters, 1992). Such framework documents require long list of items - sometimes hundreds - to cover the range of the principals’ work. Usually, they separate professional performance from the contexts in which it occurs. This feature is in direct conflict with a lesson of everyday experience in school leadership, which is,
that the details of the context of each event are crucial in judging the relative success or failure of a particular performance. Finally, standards frameworks offer false dichotomies. By promising to separate principals into those who reach a standard and those who fail to reach a standard, these standards frameworks did not make allowances for levels of experience and offer little encouragement for professional development.

Recognising these weaknesses, Louden and Wildy (1999), advance a “probabilistic standards framework” in place of a framework of precision. This approach to framework development uses a consultative process to describe the principal's role. It locates performance on a set of continua, not on either side of a dichotomy and it offers an estimate of performance, rather than a final determination. It uses assessment items as expendable exemplars rather than as essential elements of principals' work and it describes what can be normally be expected of people at a given level of performance rather than whether an individual has attained mastery of a skill. Here there is an understanding that the various elements within the framework are partial, temporary and open to further refinement through dialogue and testing in practice. This distinction between probabilistic standards frameworks and frameworks of precision was of interest to the Research Team. Arguments in support of this approach appear strong and this grounded research by Louden and Wildy is convincing.

Participant responses within this current research project also appeared to favour the development of a probabilistic standards framework. Here it was generally accepted by participants that a leadership framework should be seen as partial and temporary. As one participant wrote on-line:

The burden of leadership can't be appreciated by those who watch from the sides. It cannot be reduced to a relatively simplistic set of management capabilities. All attempts to do this have failed because the economic rationalist/power-over models of the Industrial age are incapable of providing a model by which we bring about "The New Reign of God" in a continually evolving cosmos (Religious Institute Principal).

Participants also support reworking to suit local school communities and individuals. In the words of one participant:

The concept of contemporary leadership generally, and educational leadership in particular, has become problematic because in our post industrial world there
is little consistency between contexts. While there are general responsibilities, the interpersonal demands associated with contemporary leadership makes each situation very unique. Hence, much of leadership is an individual response that a particular person makes to a unique set of responsibilities, accountabilities, and circumstances that are, themselves, fluid and changeable. (Religious Institute Principal)

Beyond these thoughts, participants also expressed fears that this research project would lose sight of the values (e.g., social justice) that should inform leadership in Catholic schools. As a participant wrote:

Leadership in Catholic schools, while it may be fruitfully conceptualised in the kinds of compartments that the proposed framework suggests, is a whole person response to a whole life experience. The danger in the exercise of dissection to focus on part of the whole is that the big picture is lost. No one person has it all, nor should we encourage thinking in terms of a kind of "deficit model". Industrial management theory suggests that strengths are strengthened, weaknesses identified and then remedied. This model is simply not consistent with the gospel message that we are all created in the image and likeness of God, that each person is unique and uniquely valuable. We need to develop a new language that recognises genuinely the concept of servant leadership, distributed leadership and teacher leadership and so on. The structures that we put in place as systems and schools need to reflect these considerations and values. (Religious Institute Principal)

Noting these concerns from participants, the Research Team saw the need to develop a leadership framework in the style of a probabilistic standards framework as opposed to producing a framework of precision. In line with a probabilistic standards framework this research project used a consultative process to identify a small number of assessment items. Items should be seen as expendable exemplars rather than as essential elements of the leader's work. This leadership framework was then designed to assist leaders and their supervisors to make judgements about performance and point to areas for development. There was also an understanding that the various elements within the framework are partial, temporary and open to further refinement through dialogue and testing in practice.

3. What are the key components of a framework for leadership in Qld Catholic schools?

This research project focused on naming and validating the dimensions and capabilities of leadership in Qld Catholic schools. These choices were made as a consequence of an extensive review of the literature and our experience of similar
developmental projects in Lutheran education (Duignan, 2003a) and frontline human service organisations (Duignan, 2003b).

Leadership dimensions

As previously noted, performance standards frameworks, as frameworks of precision, typically identify Key Responsibility Areas and Key Performance Indicators (eg Queensland Department of Education, 1999). In the 1990s, organisations adopted the language of Key Performance Indicators (KPI).

...KPIs are typically incorporated into a framework that comprises some area of focus (often called Key Result Areas or KRAs). The KPAs lead to KPIs, which then lead to numerical targets...Many organisations use the KRA/KPI format to structure corporate plans. The senior managers of the organisation create the top-level version of the KPA/KPI structure is then used by the level below to develop their versions. And so down the organisation, level by level. (Onsman, 2003, p.54)

Before long the language of KPIs had infiltrated performance management systems for individuals. If KPIs can be used to focus organisational effort then it seemed logical that KPI could focus individual effort. However, it is now claimed that KPIs "are not useful in guiding people to achieving higher standards of performance" (p.59). People are simply not motivated by organisational KRAs and KPIs. Instead "Goal setting is a powerful motivator for most people.... When employees set their own goals there is almost an in-built sense of ownership. The psychological pressure to succeed is immense." (pp.45-46). Moreover, we can now make the goal-setting process even more powerful by making it a shared process, whether between an employee and a manager, student and teacher, or an athlete and a coach...The responsibility of management then becomes one of ensuring that the goals are set, they are realistic and there is a follow-up process. This is far easier than the traditional one of ensuring commitment to imposed objective" (pp.45-46).

This collaborative approach to performance management means a change in style for some managers (pp. 47-0). As a first step, employees need to nominate their own performance objectives and goals. Managers should make sure that the goals are achievable, realistic and congruent with corporate plans. They should also follow up meticulously on progress. Care must be taken that management mediation of nominated objectives reflects the employee’s contribution. This requires a “question technique rather than a ‘command-and–control’ technique” (p.47). Managers also need to use a range of techniques to optimise performance. In particular, they need
to “using feedback to the greatest effect, tapping into the magic of self-appraisal, focussing on improvement rather than shortcomings, [and] agreeing on ‘stretch’ targets” (p.48). Within this approach to goal-setting and performance management, the managers framed as a “facilitators of a management process (including goals setting) rather than a controllers” and require “systematic methods” (p.50) to support this facilitating role.

These claims in support of a collaborative approach to goal-setting are in line with contemporary developments in respect to organisations. Since the early 1990s, the organisation has been conceived as a “learning organisation” that continually expands its capacity to create its own future by engaging “systemic thinking” (Flood, 1999; Senge, 1990). This style of thinking suggests a hidden order or simplicity, in a complex world with the tools of systemic thinking helping us to learn about this order. “Boundary judgements” are offered as a useful tool for systemic thinking. Here we are encouraged to draw tentative boundaries around action area as these boundary judgements provide mental constructs that guide reflection, dialogue and action. While boundary judgements enable a measure of control in the midst of complexity, this claim is made on the understanding that we can never learn everything. We will always face uncertainty and there is a place for on-going learning or a deepening systemic appreciation of a bounded area.

With these thoughts in mind, this research project opted to name a small number of leadership dimensions within the framework for leadership in Qld Catholic schools. In making this decision we put aside the language of Key Result Areas/Key Performance Indicators and command – and - control techniques. Instead, this research project opted to develop a set of leadership dimensions in support of collaborative approaches goal-setting and performance management. These leadership dimensions were also viewed as bounded action areas. As such they were seen to be partial, temporary and subject to further debate. Consequently, within this research project, there was a commitment to on-going learning and a deepening systemic appreciation of each boundary judgement.

Leadership capabilities
As well as identifying a set of leadership dimensions, the leadership framework also identifies leadership capabilities. Typically, performance standards frameworks, as frameworks of precision, attempt to identify the key competencies required within a given role (eg Queensland Department of Education, 1999). However, in recent
times, theorists (Stephenson, 2000) have argued that the uncertain and complex organisational context, requires a leadership artistry that is unlikely to emerge from the acquisition of a generic set of management competencies gained through training or apprenticeship models. Historically, leaders were more likely to experience familiar problems within a familiar context. In these conditions, standards of performance were associated with reliable delivery, performance standards, error elimination, technical expertise and the mastery of established procedures. These conditions of stability and certainty no longer exist and leaders are more likely to face unfamiliar problems and unfamiliar contexts. In these conditions, slavish applications of predetermined practices can have disastrous results.

This reality requires a much greater use of leadership capabilities rather than leadership competencies.

[A capability is] …an all round human quality, an integration of knowledge, skills, personal qualities and understanding used appropriately and effectively – not just in familiar and highly focused specialist contexts but in response to new and changing circumstances…Competency is about delivering the present based on past performance; capability is about imaging the future and bringing it about. Competency is about control; capability is about learning and development. Competency is about fitness for (usually other people’s) purpose; capability is about judging fitness of the purpose itself (Stephenson, 2000, pp2, 4).

In short, leadership capabilities include a combination of attributes, qualities, skills and knowledge that enable a person to perform to a high standard in new and changing circumstances. Such leadership capabilities include informal networks, creative solving problem, intuition, planned risk taking, courage, imagination, reliance on beliefs and values, and highly developed self-awareness and self-knowledge.

Within this research project, participants identified various accounts of leadership capabilities. For example, one principal wrote:

There are some professional capabilities/competencies/abilities that are necessary tools for a principal to have and to be able to use. Some basic management skills such as: appropriate delegation; team building; administrative capabilities such as dealing with correspondence; financial planning; task prioritisation; visioning; managing conflict and confrontation are part of the list of necessary skills. Specific knowledge about system, educational theory and the like are also necessary. These specific knowledge and skills can be both taught (or learned) and developed by instruction, reflection and practice.
Of more important to us as Principals of Catholic schools is the spiritual, moral and ethical framework that underpins the use of these types of skills. The way in which we use them in relationship with others in our school community is what counts. What we really value is transparent not in the good times but in the bad. That is when we act from a heart informed by an integrated faith/spirituality using our assembled personal and professional skills and competencies.

Here participants saw the usefulness of identifying leadership capabilities or the combinations of attributes, qualities, values, knowledge and skills that enable a person to perform at a high standard in a given context or leadership role.

4. What are the dimensions of leadership in Qld Catholic schools?

Popular writing (Flanagan & Finger, 1998; Stewart, 1998) on leadership and management often attempts to identify the dimensions or action areas associated with executive roles. The purpose here is to distil everything relating to successful practice into a practical and accessible ‘how-to’s’. Usually, this style of writing identifies areas such as ‘managing yourself’ in terms of managing self-development, time management, information management, writing and speaking skills, managing health and coping with stress. There is also advice about ‘managing others’ in terms of recruitment, interviewing, listening, facilitating learning, people skills, performance appraisal, problem staff, counselling, motivation, team building, communication and meetings. Then there is ‘managing the organisation’ which includes financial management and information, project management, decision-making and problem solving, negotiating and creativity.

Behind these ‘how-to’ guides is a new theoretical appreciation of the organisation as culture. Since the 1980s, organisational theorists have argued the case for multiple perspectives on organisational culture. For example, Bolman and Deal (1997) describe a four-frame model or four ways of looking at organisational culture. These frames are more than intellectual constructs. The “structural frame” emphasises productivity and efficiency and posits the importance of clear goals, roles and responsibilities, coordinated effort and performance accountability. The “human frame” highlights the importance of individual needs and motives as well as positive interpersonal relationships and a caring, trusting, working environment. The “political frame” points to the inevitability of conflict within the organisation as individuals and interest groups fight for scarce resources. Finally, the “symbolic frame” draws attention
to building culture, meaning, belief and faith through symbolic action involving ritual, story, metaphor and play.

These multiple perspectives on organisational culture point to multiple dimensions within leadership. Authors (Bolman & Deal, 2002) recommend that educational leaders engage “multi-frame thinking” and use the structural, human, political and symbolic frames to gain a full understanding of complex dilemmas, appropriate courses of action to address them, and eventually school improvement.

The ability to use multiple frames has three advantages: (1) each can be coherent, focused, and powerful; (2) the collection can be more comprehensive than any single one; (3) only when you have multiple frames can help you reframe. Reframing is a conscious effort to size up a situation from multiple perspectives and then find a new way to handle it. (p.3)

In a similar vein, Napolitano and Henderson (1998) recommend a “leadership odyssey” that recognises the multi-dimensional nature of leadership. This journey of reflection-in-action requires self-evaluation and feedback from colleagues and supervisors. To facilitate this journey, the authors provide a capability profile, “leadership odyssey attributes and skills assessment form” that clearly identifies the capabilities required in the role. The starting point for this journey is the Self – the “self-leadership sphere”. This is instructive because it gets at something that has not always be recognised or apprehended: that what we can do is inextricably tried to who we are. After reflecting on the Self, those on the journey are encouraged to reflect on their performance within the “people leadership sphere” in which the leader works to build a true partnership. This is followed by reflection on the “organisational leadership sphere” in which the leaders assumes the role of the designer with the intention of responding to external trends as well as dealing with internal problems. This is an inside-out process of leadership development.

This review of the literature assisted the Research Team in Phase 1 of the research project to identify a set of leadership dimensions in Draft 1 of the leadership framework document. This initial set included self-leadership, interpersonal leadership, organizational leadership and leadership for learning. Data collected in Phases 2 and 3 of the project contributed significantly to the final set of leadership dimensions (Table 1). At this point, two additional leadership dimensions - community leadership and faith leadership - were added and words were changed to address participant concerns regarding the language.
Table 1: Dimensions of Leadership in Qld Catholic schools.

Inner Leadership

Inner leadership leads to personal development. Here the leader seeks to achieve an authentic self-realisation thus enhancing their ability to serve the school community and the wider society. This requires balanced development in a number of dimensions including physical, cognitive, emotional, aesthetic, social, moral and spiritual development. Inner leadership involves personal reflection, freeing ourselves of habitual mindsets and behaviours to make conscious choices and becoming integrated and autonomous people acting in accordance with values and purpose.

Interpersonal Leadership

Interpersonal leadership focuses on building working relationships with the various members of the school community as well as the wider community. Here there is a strong commitment to integral human development for all, based on one’s personal values and a respect for the whole person within community. Interpersonal leadership involves moving from being aware of another’s presence or existence to sharing one’s personal self and being open to growth induced by the reactions of the other.

Organisational Leadership

Organisational leadership focuses on various aspects of management at school level with a view to ensuring efficiency and effectiveness. Organisational leadership is associated the Christian ethic of stewardship and requires a commitment to the Common Good. This form of leadership involves strategic thinking, developing cultural meaning through policy and practice, managing physical and financial resources, facilitating performance management and being accountable to the school community and external authorities.

Educative Leadership

Educative leadership plays a critical role in the teaching and learning process by helping teachers and other members of the school community to discover meaning in what they do, while investing in them the capacity to bring about curriculum change. Educative leadership involves futuristic thinking and links curriculum development with an inspiring vision of a preferred future. It also involves placing teaching and learning at the centre of decision-making, heightening the level of professional dialogue about educational practices and encouraging individual innovation within a learning community.

Community Leadership

Community leadership focuses on achieving solidarity or patterns of co-operation, expresses human interdependence and is the means to achieve the Common Good. Community leadership is about nurturing positive interpersonal relations, as well as facilitating social and moral development. Subsidiarity is fundamental with leaders distributing responsibility, accountability and decision-making among those directly concerned with specific tasks. It is also important to establish and support a community of ethical inquiry.

Faith Leadership

Faith leadership focuses on sharing the Catholic faith with the intention of influencing and enriching the lives of students, staff and other members of the school community. This dimension of leadership provides educational opportunities for members of the school community to encounter the Catholic faith, to experience its gift and to enhance life decisions in response to it. Guided by faith, hope and love, faith leaders support a community of life and worship through which to recognize, to accept and to cooperate with the mysterious action of God in our lives.
4. What are the capabilities of leadership in Qld Catholic schools?

Within this research project, the Research Team found a small but growing body of work in respect to the notion of leadership capabilities. Research, by Duignan (2003b), in frontline human service organisations, found that leadership requires a series of attributes including being: critically reflective; intuitively connected; ethically responsible; intellectually capable; professionally committed; marginally competent; strategically ready; emotionally mature; and culturally sensitive.

Extending this thought, Australian researchers have identified leadership capabilities in respect to educational leadership and principalship. Research by Louden & Wildy (1999b) identifies a list of essential qualities for principalship, including a set of interpersonal skills (eg listening, negotiating, leading, confronting complexity and collaborating) as well as a set of moral dispositions (eg. sensitivity and tact, courage and decisiveness, flexibility and creativity, fairness and consistency and patience and persistence). Duignan(2003a) identifies the competencies of educational leadership in Lutheran education in terms of the knowledge and skills associated with decision-making and problem solving, analyzing and planning, communication and human interaction, change management and networking; and, core qualities including personal, moral and relational dispositions. Scott’s (2003) research among practicing principals identified:

   Emotional intelligence (personal): being able to remain calm, sense of humour and perspective; wanting to achieve the best outcome possible; being able to bounce back from adversity; an ability to take hard decisions; being willing to face and learn from errors.

   Emotional intelligence (interpersonal): being able to deal effectively with conflict situations; ability to empathize and work productively with people from a wide variety of backgrounds; willingness to listen to different points of view before coming to a decision; being able to contribute positively to team-based projects.

   Intellectual abilities: Being able to set and justify priorities; being able to identify from a mass of information the core issue in any situation; being able to readjust a plan of action in the light of what happens as it is implemented.

   Generic and specific skills and knowledge: having a clear, justified vision for where the school must head; being able to organise work and manage time effectively (p.20).
Following this review of the literature, the Research Team initially identified three key leadership capabilities - personal, relational, professional capabilities - in Draft 1 of the framework document. In phases 2 and phase 3 of the project, participants in given an opportunity to validate or test this interpretation. There were also some interesting conversations as participants identified different capabilities under each of these headings. Interestingly, a few lone voices asked whether there were capabilities specific to the Faith Leadership dimension of the Catholic school and considered the need for missional or vocational capabilities. Subsequently, the category of 'missional capabilities' was added to the Draft 3 of the framework document. This final draft identified four categories of leadership capabilities, namely, personal, relational, professional and missional capabilities. This draft was then validated or tested within the electronic focus group in phase 4.

In phase 4, participants in the electronic focus group provided further descriptions of each of the four categories of capabilities. For example, participants wrote:

**Personal Capabilities:** It seems to me that personal vision with the integrity and courage to implement that vision; are essential to any good leader. For a Catholic leader, these qualities have to be informed by a practice of the faith that reveals a deep spirituality. Optimism, confidence and the like are good if you have them, but without a spiritual life underpinning the vision, the leader should not be in a Catholic school.

**Relational Capabilities:** The profession of teaching has always been relational. The best teachers, no matter in what age, have always made a personal impact on the students they relate to… As teaching is about much more than knowledge transmission, leading is about much more than the development and management of systems, accountabili ties and efficiencies. As teaching is fundamentally relational so is leading.

**Professional Capabilities:** There are some professional capabilities/competencies/abilities that are necessary tools for a principal to have and to be able to use. Some basic management skills such as: appropriate delegation; team building; administrative capabilities such as dealing with correspondence; financial planning; task prioritisation; visioning; managing conflict and confrontation are part of the list of necessary skills. Specific knowledge about system, educational theory and the like are also necessary.

**Missional Capabilities:** I'm not sure how one sustains this role without a sense of mission, or of "vocation", of being called to follow Jesus, to pursue, with others, the God quest, to explore with others what being disciple really means in the here and now. And sometimes it would be much easier to ride off into the sunset than to genuinely confront those questions.
Such descriptions enabled the Research Team to further refine the descriptions of each of the four categories of leadership capabilities. In the final framework document these capabilities are described in Table 2.

Table 2: Capabilities for leadership in Qld Catholic schools.

PERSONAL CAPABILITIES

- Developing self-knowledge
- Displaying imagination and vision
- Showing confidence, optimism and resilience
- Exemplifying honesty and integrity
- Integrating work and personal life
- Seeking spirituality

RELATIONAL CAPABILITIES

- Demonstrating emotional maturity
- Projecting empathy
- Displaying a trusting disposition
- Cultivating productive working relationships
- Communicating with influence
- Engaging positive politics

PROFESSIONAL CAPABILITIES

- Being contextually aware and responsive
- Displaying curriculum and pedagogical know-how
- Inspiring a communal purpose and vision
- Engaging strategic thinking and planning
- Demonstrating sound organisational and fiscal management
- Focusing on outcomes and is accountable

MISSION CAPABILITIES

- Committing to a personal journey of faith
- Giving witness to Gospel values, particularly social justice
- Developing scriptural and theological understanding
- Acting as an agent of evangelisation
- Cultivating the school’s Catholic identity
- Engaging Catholic school renewal
Beyond identifying these leadership capabilities, participants in the electronic focus group also highlighted the importance of combining a range of capabilities to ensure effective leadership.

The leader's self-respect, relational capabilities and professionalism are on show immediately any project is undertaken within the school often as an invisible thread that weaves these concepts throughout the school and on show in its students, and staff from the chalkface to the office. A leader does need to develop these capabilities through study, experience, professional updating and through good mentoring. An educational leader is one that has experience and knowledge in quality management as well as a vast and up-to-date experience and knowledge of education within the Catholic ethos. Professional leadership capabilities in Catholic Educational are essential for its reputation as an educator.

Before leaving this account of leadership capabilities, it is interesting to note that within the electronic focus group, participants were less inclined to discuss “professional capabilities”. For example, while there were 214 separate comments on personal capabilities, 109 on relational capabilities, 149 on missional capabilities, there were only 44 comments made on professional capabilities. There may be a number of explanations for this lower response rate. Perhaps participants simply lost interest on the third day of the electronic focus group or perhaps participants were unable to describe professional capabilities. If the latter is the case this suggests that there needs to be further conversation about professionalism in Catholic educational leadership.

It is also interesting that conversations during (and subsequent to) the electronic focus group have also revealed that people remain unsure of providing a separate category for missional capabilities. Apart from the word ‘missional’ being ‘unusual’, some participants have expressed a belief that in Catholic education, this capability is assumed in the other three categories of personal, relational and professional capabilities and there is no need to provide a separate capability of missional.

The Research Team, however, in this final report has maintained the separate category in order to pick up the specific knowledge and skills associated with the act of evangelisation. We agreed with one participant in the electronic focus group, who wrote:

Missional Capabilities are an important and often overlooked dimension of Leadership in Catholic education. As leaders in Catholic schools we actively share in the promotion of the mission of Jesus Christ as a member of the
Church. Our understanding of this, appreciation of this and commitment to this is critical. It can be enhanced through studies in theology and scripture, and a solid foundation in these areas is mandatory. For many students attending Catholic schools, their only experience of Church, liturgy, sacrament and catechesis is the school - and the school leaders exemplify a ministerial, pastoral, priestly role to them - often the most significant experience of this in their lives. The significance of this cannot be lost or underestimated, placing an enormous responsibility on leaders to have highly developed and positive missional capabilities.

Whilst keeping a separate category of Missional Capabilities, we do suggest that Diocesan Catholic Education Authorities and Religious Institutes intending to use this framework, further consider the usefulness of retaining this category.

5. What is the relationship between the dimensions and capabilities within a framework for leadership in Qld Catholic schools?

Depicting the relationship between the leadership dimensions and leadership capabilities within the framework proved challenging. During the research project, participants rejected several draft versions, as being far too “rigid”, “inflexible” and “fragmented”. As a consequence, the Research Team struggled to develop a more dynamic and holistic version. In this report, Figure 1 seeks to illustrate the relationships between the dimensions and capabilities of leadership.

This figure identifies six leadership dimensions, including inner leadership, interpersonal leadership, educative leadership, organisational leadership, community leadership and faith leadership. Throughout this study, the data reminded the Research Team that separating out the various leadership dimensions into discrete action areas is somewhat artificial. As one participant wrote:

The breaking down of leadership into its components and depicting them as they are in the diagram tends to lose sight of the integrated nature of these. The whole is greater than the sum of the parts. Suppose we had a real test (a black box) for each of the components and we lined each of the leaders up and tested them on each of the isolated elements. Further, suppose there was one leader who scored highest on each and all of the tests - This leader may not be the best leader of the group. Why? Because these skills may not be well integrated into the whole person. An athlete who has the record in every leg of a triathlon may never win the whole event because the athlete cannot put them altogether in one event. Do you need to consider the binding forces between these elements that speak to the integrity of integration and the synergetic force there in.
Although the Research Team agreed with this comment, for ease of explanation it was decided to represent the six discrete leadership dimensions as ‘red’ spheres. The Research Team came to this graphical representation as it suggested the “spheres of influence” (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998) open to leadership in Qld Catholic schools. Some participants liked the dynamic nature of this depiction. While others likened the spheres in this figure to the number of ‘balls’ that leaders have to ‘juggle’. The purpose here was to describe in broad strokes a small number of bounded action areas in order to provide a useful guide for managers and employees seeking to engage a collaborate approach to leadership management and development. As bounded action areas these dimensions are partial and temporary and open to debate.

Figure 1 also depicts the four broad leadership capabilities of personal, relational, professional and missional. The purpose here was to provide a small number of leadership capabilities that could be used to facilitate professional development planning and career planning. These leadership capabilities are presented as discrete elements even though participants constantly reminded the research Team of the interrelationship of the various leadership capabilities.

Recommendations such as the following from one principal were noted.

Missional capabilities must assume the existence of personal, relational and professional capabilities. This is not to say that any one set of capabilities is more or less important. Rather, they all contribute to the overall effectiveness of the leader. I visualise this as a 3D triangle with each side “bleeding” into each of the others. The colour when all aspects of each side of the triangle richly merge is a measurable indicator of the quality of the leadership (It is as if a litmus test can be done by mapping one’s overall capabilities). Without missional capabilities (to be driven to bring Kingdom here within our schools) each of the others merges less with each other.

Again for easier if explanation, the Research Team decided to depict the various leadership capabilities as separate items. There was also general agreement that, within the research project, personal, relational, professional and missional capabilities are found at the “heart of leadership” in Qld Catholic schools. Leadership management and development requires deliberative efforts to build these capabilities in the context of these leadership dimensions. For this reason these leadership capabilities are placed at the centre of Figure 1. As efficacy within the various leadership dimensions is dependent upon the leader’s ability to integrate these
various leadership capabilities, these are no obvious boundaries separating the various capabilities.

Finally, the dimensions and capabilities of leadership identified in this framework are situated within the overall vision and mission of Catholic education. Over time, a series of Vatican documents (Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, 1977, Congregation for Catholic Education 1982, 1988, 1997) have informed Catholic education. In Queensland, the thoughts expressed in these documents are reflected in the report of the Queensland Bishops’ project – Catholic schools of the 21st century (Queensland Catholic Education Commission, 2003) as well as the vision/mission statements and corporate plans of the various education authorities in Queensland. This figure reminds us of the importance of using the vision and mission of Catholic education as a ‘touchstone’ for decision-making in Catholic education. In a practical sense, claims in respect to leadership dimensions and capabilities as well as the processes for performance management and development should be checked against this touchstone. Managers and employees in conversations about goal-setting and performance reviews must remind each other to keep in mind the vision and mission of Catholic education.

Figure 1 present a framework for leadership in Queensland Catholic schools. Although the Research Team are reasonably happy with this representation, we do recommend that Diocesan Catholic Education Authorities and Religious Institutes, as a first step in using this Framework, critique our effort and produce alternative versions. The process of developing an alternative version will assist groups to come to become familiar with the leadership framework itself before applying it in practice.
Figure 1: A framework for leadership in Qld Catholic schools.
CONCLUSION

This research project followed a concern for leadership succession in Qld Catholic education and aimed to develop a framework for leadership in Qld Catholic schools, which, in turn, could be used as a platform for leadership management and development. This project is informed by a number of conceptual frameworks including Catholic Social Doctrine, Post-Industrial Leadership and Leadership Development. The design of this project is situated within a research paradigm of constructivism on the understanding that knowledge about leadership is best created in interaction between the researcher and key practitioners. Within this research paradigm, this project adopted grounded theory approaches to data collection, analysis and interpretation. This project involved a review of the literature and five phases of data gathering, analysis and interpretation.

This research project found that:

- There is strong support for the development of a framework for leadership in Queensland Catholic schools. It is expected that this framework will play a significant role in leadership development.

- Leadership dimensions and leadership capabilities are the key components of a leadership framework, when the purpose of this document is to support leadership management and development.

- Leadership dimensions are best described as bounded action areas and these dimensions facilitate conversations about performance objectives and during performance reviews.

- Six leadership dimensions are appropriate to leadership in Qld Catholic schools. These dimensions include inner leadership, interpersonal leadership, organisational leadership, educative leadership, community leadership and faith leadership.

- Leadership capabilities refer to an integrated understanding of knowledge, skills and personal qualities. These leadership capabilities facilitate
conversations and planning in respect to professional learning and development.

- Four leadership capabilities are required within leadership in Qld Catholic schools. These capabilities include personal, relational, professional and missional capabilities. Efficacy within the various leadership dimensions is dependent upon the leader's ability to integrate these various leadership capabilities.

- Leadership development requires a deliberative effort to build these capabilities in the context of these leadership dimensions.

- The *Framework for Leadership in Qld Catholic Schools* is offered on the understanding that the items identified in this framework document should always be seen as partial, subject to further debate and therefore temporary.

As a starting point for using this leadership framework, it is recommended that individuals and groups look closely at the various leadership dimensions and leadership capabilities identified in the document and refine the various descriptions to suit local language, conditions and priorities. To be truly worthwhile such frameworks should be reworked to suit local school communities and individuals. It is also recommended that Diocesan Catholic Education Authorities and Religious Institutes use this framework document in the development of professional learning programs (eg mentoring, short course programs) and performance management systems (eg goal setting and appraisals). It is through testing in practice that the true value of the framework will be realised. Various Catholic School Authorities have already used this leadership framework. Edmund Rice Education Services has used the framework in the trial Mentoring Program for Religious Institute schools conducted on behalf of the QCEC. Brisbane Catholic Education has also used this framework in the development of a program for principal professional development. Although these are early days, the framework seems to be widely accepted with educational leaders finding it helpful in making sensible, informed and balanced decisions.
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APPENDIX 1: Electronic Focus Group Discussion Starters.

Monday 18 August

Personal Capabilities:
List and/or comment on the significant personal capabilities, which would fit an educator to be an effective leader within a Queensland Catholic school. Choices made in one’s personal, spiritual and social life have significance for one’s leadership style, motivation and ability to witness to the Catholic faith.

Tuesday 19 August

Relational Capabilities:
List and/or comment on the relational capabilities, which would fit an educator as suitable to engage in a leadership role within a Queensland Catholic school. Relationships are enhanced with one’s God, oneself and others, including students, staff, parents and other ancillary bodies. These relationships develop in a variety of operational contexts, both pastoral and educational. They enable an effective realisation of the aims of that Catholic school.

Wednesday 20 August

Professional Capabilities:
List and/or comment on the professional capabilities, which would fit an educator as suitable to inspire, direct and to guide a variety of dynamic contextual situations. This educator would require a broad range of intellectual, academic, managerial and social skills. The implementation of this educator’s leadership would be recognisably Catholic with the means to the end reflecting gospel values.

Thursday 21 August

Missional Capabilities:
List and/or comment on the missional qualities, which would fit an educator as being suitable to understand, to absorb and to implement the mission of the Queensland Catholic School, set within a local and broader contextual situation. The implementation of a particular charism or agenda for a particular Catholic school will require special qualities, including a personal spirituality and a commitment to Church. One’s personal sense of vocation will be important here.

Friday 22 – Sunday 24 August

General Discussion:
It is one’s personal ownership and application of gospel values, which are primary to one’s success as a leader in a Queensland Catholic School. Secondarily, the leader will require an extraordinary range of personal, academic, intellectual and social skills to inspire, to guide and to extend a dynamic educational endeavour. Yet, for all this, what other capabilities are required to produce a successful, quality Queensland Catholic School? Then again, how does one quantify and measure “success”?