

# **Compiling the evidence: coaching, leadership and school improvement: Experiences of graduate student learners at the University of Victoria**

**Dr. Catherine McGregor  
Alison Brophay  
University of Victoria**

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this paper is to present preliminary findings of a study undertaken by the University of Victoria, in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. The study, which is ongoing, seeks to determine the benefits and outcomes of a coaching experience among school leaders and administrators offered in conjunction with the CSML (Certificate in School Management and Leadership) Graduate Certificate program. Specifically it seeks to trace the benefits and outcomes of a mandatory twelve month facilitated coaching experience in which experienced and less experienced school administrators/teacher leaders are matched and complete a student-directed professional leadership growth plan that includes a focus on improving learning among teachers and students at their own school site or work location. The study set out to answer a number of questions, among them: How is school leadership preparation affected by a facilitated mentorship experience in which experienced and less experienced school administrators/teacher leaders are matched over a period of about 12 months? What benefits accrue to the graduate student learner? Finally, to what extent do these coaching/mentoring relationships support wider learning in the school context?

To accomplish this task, the paper is divided into several sections; first, it will set out a short history of the CSML program and provide a general overview of the design principles which inform this unique leadership development program. This will be followed by a brief discussion of the mentoring/coaching literature as it offers the foundation for the primary feature of the CSML program's design and structure of leadership field experiences. The literature review also highlights recently completed studies of how leadership effects student learning, an important second feature of this paper. This is followed by a discussion of the study's methodology and its phased approach, focusing in particular on the use of an online survey. The final sections of the paper set out some early findings based in a preliminary analysis of the survey, focusing in particular on the ways in which coaches enable leadership learning and how CSML learners reported on the benefits of the coaching relationship, the ways in which they describe their newly developed leadership competencies, especially on those attributed directly to the coaching experience. The paper concludes by setting out some preliminary ideas about the strengths and limitations of the CSML coaching experience, its potential benefits to British Columbia school learners, and sets out next steps for the second phase of the research study.

## **THE CSML Program and Design Principles**

The CSML program was launched initially in 2005 at the University of Victoria after year long negotiations with the BC educational Leadership Council<sup>1</sup>. Initially understood as a direct response to a growing demographic concern with a shortage of skilled and knowledgeable school principals in the face of an aging

---

<sup>1</sup> The BC Educational Leadership Council was created by the BC Ministry of Education in 2007 in response to a Throne Speech promise to develop the "Pacific Leadership Agenda", which included a commitment to enhancing leadership training for teachers.

administrator population, the CSML program offered a one-year, 6 unit<sup>2</sup> graduate certificate with a strong focus on the practical skills of educational leadership and the work of the school principal. The design of the CSML program relies on several key principles and ideas:

- Providing an evidence based model of leadership preparation based on case study research of effective educational leadership development in Canada and literature that supports the primary role school principals can play in enhancing student learning
- Making a more deliberative link between contemporary, theoretically informed research about good educational leadership practice and field focused educational school based work
- Drawing extensively on leadership theory related to school improvement, with an emphasis on distributed forms of leadership
- A belief in the power of learning communities and inquiry as primary tools for learning leadership
- The power of networking as a strategy that supports ongoing professional learning
- Teaching and learning pedagogies that are more informed by adult learning theories, particularly in understanding the potential of personally shaped inquiry processes
- The importance of dialogue in self reflective thinking and meaning making
- The ethical commitment to a democratic learning community in which knowledge is produced and shared by both learners and teachers
- The need for equity based practices that promote the success for all students and learners

Finally, a description of the CSML program would not be complete without mention of its central feature: the inclusion of a coaching training session and subsequent leadership learning project. The program begins with a coaching training session and the introduction of creating a professional learning plan or leadership inquiry. As the program continues into the regular school year, the coaches and their CSML partners are focused on the development and implementation of this leadership inquiry. The coaching model used is one developed by Dr. Jan Robertson (2005,2006); more will be said later in this paper about why this program has been selected as the central vehicle for supporting these emerging school leaders.

### **Theoretical framework**

Mentorship has a long history in the literature among human resource professionals, educators and business professionals as a workplace practice designed to support the development of new or aspiring employees; as Daresh & Playcoe (1994) notes, mentorship is a practice that is focused on either personal or career development of adults, and is usually considered part of a staged or laddered process of adult development (p. 147). While often used informally, classic mentorship programs are considered to a product of a long-term commitment between a mentor and protégé, have a multifaceted focus, and offer a rich experience for both mentor and their partner (Healy & Welchert, 1990, p. 18). Not surprisingly however, given the scope of practice in which mentorship is used (including medicine, nursing, social

---

<sup>2</sup> The University of Victoria's units are equivalent to 3 credit hours, typically understood as 12 units of study at most major institutions in Canada.

work, teaching, business and other endeavors), few common definitions or processes have emerged. Despite this lack of common definition or structure, there is considerable history of the use of mentorship in North American schools; since the 1970's educators have used mentoring as a strategy for improving teaching practice between practicing peers. Using mentoring models to support new or early career school principals or administrators is a more recent phenomena (Daresh & Playcoe, 1994) and one advanced vigorously in the face of major jurisdictions facing a shortage of school administrators and issues of succession (Hargreaves & Fink, 2005).

While a complete review of mentorship scholarship is beyond the scope of this paper, a very brief summary of some key components follows. Many of these programs incorporate apprenticeship-like features, designed to scaffold emerging skills, abilities and attributes best suited for the new role. This is in keeping with one of the oft stated purposes of mentorship, that is, guiding someone new to a field, and 'passing the torch' from one generation or practitioner to the next (Daresh & Playcoe, 1994). A number of mentorship programs also aspire to train or develop new leaders; among these are some examples of educational mentorship programs designed to prepare new school administrators (see for example the *New Visions project* for Public Schools in New York). The characteristics of effective mentors is another important strand of research that has been documented in the literature; as Galvez-Hjornevik (1986) documents in her extensive review of the field, characteristics such as age and gender can be important, as well as stage in career. However, she also found a number of studies that link the ability to develop trust, establish rapport, find common ground for goal setting, not to overwhelm with apparent expertise, work on goals related to the profession, and avoid prescribing courses of action were all important attributes (p. 8-9). More recent work by Daresh (2004) documents how mentoring has come to be considered as a mutually enhancing process; that is, one that benefits the mentor and protégé. He also notes that mentorship programs can serve several purposes, among them socialization to the norms of the profession, as well as personal or professionally focused growth. As noted earlier, mentoring programs can be formally implemented through the selection of and matching of mentors and protégés by an organization, or those new to the field or profession can more informally adopt it on an adhoc basis. For the purposes of this paper and study, it is the former that is of most interest with a goal to enhancing professional practice rather than socialization or personal growth.

Another related strand of literature and scholarship supports the use of coaching as a tool for professional and teacher development. Coaching is understood to be somewhat different than mentorship in that it implies a shared mutual learning process, rather than one in which a more experienced mentor prescribes or promotes practices based on greater knowledge or experience (Rhodes & Benicke, 2002, p. 304). The tradition of coaching in the field of education emerged from the teacher professional development literature, emphasizing its peer to peer nature, and concomitantly its usefulness as a practice for enhancing teachers' professional learning and in improving teaching practices, including an enhanced sense of collegiality (p. 301). While other scholars in business and management have developed coaching models, their applicability to education is limited in scope as these scholars and practitioners have tended to emphasize business efficiencies and management skills development in much the same way as the typical mentorship literature has. In educational settings, the goal of coaching/mentoring programs have varied, from an emphasis on learning particular tasks or processes necessary to the

role of school administrator (the socialization process referred to earlier) as well as providing support for other roles, such as that of an educational leader.

For the purposes of this study, I draw upon a limited but growing interest in the concept of *coaching* to support positive educational leadership development. Of greatest prominence within this line of inquiry is Robertson's (2005; 2006) work.

Central principles to her approach to educational leadership coaching are the principles of reciprocity, reflection, inquiry, collegiality and shared learning. Of note here is that the coaching relationship is focused on the goal of enhancing educational outcomes, understood as the primary role of the *educational* leader. Other important features include the notion of dialogue as a means of engendering mutual learning for both partners, and a focus on improving schools in order to enhance student learning. Using several guiding structures for formalizing the process of mutual inquiry and learning, Robertson's model avoids two important flaws in more typical mentoring programs: the primary one directional flow of expertise from mentor to protégé, and secondly, the tendency of the mentoring experience to emphasize socialization to administrative norms.

The central focus on learning and inquiry in Robertson's coaching model develops an important link between coaching as a leadership practice and a second strand of related research that also informs this study. Scholars and researchers have known for some time that there are important links between leaders in schools and learning (see for example Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson & Wahstrom, 2004; Bell, Bolam & Cubillio, 2003). While school leaders are understood to have largely indirect effects on student learning, the role that school leaders play in "improving schools"—that is, schools that "continue to improve student learning of all students over time" (Glickman et al 2001, p. 49) is significant. As Harris (2004) asserts, there is "international evidence that has consistently reinforced the importance of leadership in securing and sustaining improvement" (p. 11) in schools and in student achievement. After examining leadership literature and several key studies of schools with improved student learning outcomes, she argues that there is an important, but implied relationship between distributed leadership and improved student outcomes, arguing for more studies to make a stronger case for this link. Distributed leadership offers a rich and complex theoretical framework that has been used to argue for improved learning in schools (Harris, 2004; Spillane, 2006; Woods et al, 2004). In general, it argues for

leadership as an emergent property of a group or network of interacting individuals. This contrasts with leadership as a phenomenon which arises from the individual...What is most distinctive about the notion of distributed leadership is summed up in what Gronn (2002b: 3) terms 'concertive action'...Concertive action is about the additional dynamic which is the product of conjoint activity. Where people work together in such a way that they pool their initiative and expertise, the outcome is a product or energy which is greater than the sum of their individual actions (Woods et al, 2004, p. 441).

When the product of such conjoint activity is focused on the improvement of student learning, as is envisioned by many current scholars in school improvement, its potential seems huge. The theory is not without limitations; as Muijs and Harris (2007) argue, the idea of sharing leadership may not be compatible with current organizational structures in schools. Nor can it be assumed that all distributed efforts

at school improvement are necessarily positive. Finally, as Harris (2004) notes, there have been few empirical studies that have been able to document the specific links between the theory and student performance.

Robinson's (2008) and Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe's (2008) recent work goes a considerable way in meeting the demand for greater research evidence. Their recent publications draw upon an empirical review of 30 studies designed to illustrate how particular leadership styles are implicated in student learning. The authors conclude that distributed leadership behaviours (or dimensions) have the largest effect on school improvement, particularly those behaviours which are targeted to promote and participate in teacher learning and development (Robinson, 2008, p. 244). Drawing on a range of scholarship in school improvement and leadership, she convincingly argues that it is time to consider distributed leadership as a central practice that can promote student learning:

Leaders' involvement in teacher learning provides them with a deep understanding of the conditions required to enable staff to make and sustain the changes required for improved outcomes (Robinson, Lloyd & Rowe, 2008, p. 667).

Importantly, the authors go on to note that an implication of this is not that the role of principal or administrator is key, but rather that, given the implications of distributed leadership theory, that it is the frequency of intervention from many sources that becomes central to making sense of this finding (p. 668).

Robinson's work is significant in that it offers a detailed look at the components of distributed leadership. She argues that our investigations as scholars need to carefully consider how the study of distributed leadership needs to go beyond documenting distributing task activity and needs to identify influence activities (both direct and indirect) and look for what she calls 'smart tools' (Robinson, 2008, p. 250), practices specifically designed to promote enhanced learning and teaching. By this she means the specific strategies, activities or approaches that are used to engage teachers in a focus on learning or teaching practice.

Robinson's (2008) work has central importance to this study for a number of reasons. First, because of the ways in which the CSML program design is built around the principles of distributed learning, student achievement, and shared professional learning, it may be possible to argue that leadership coaching is an example of a 'smart tool' that promotes the growth of distributed, learning leaders into BC schools. If this implication can be documented, then the design of the program as well as the coaching component could be seen as essential tools for the development of school leaders. Such findings also highlight important research investigation themes that need to be addressed in subsequent phases of this study.

Robinson's (2008) work also is important when considering the design of programs for new or emerging school leaders: if distributed models are among those best equipped to effect schools and student outcomes, then there needs to be a concomitant emphasis on how to model and support distributed leadership learning and the refinement of strategies and practices which promote it within leadership development programming.

### **Methods, techniques, modes of inquiry**

This is a mixed method study that employed the use of an online questionnaire to survey all participants in the CSML program (both learners and coaches) over its four-year history, as well as drawing upon qualitative methods such as open-ended interviews and focus group inquiry for its later stages. Some participants will also be

asked to provide learning artifacts to represent their coaching and/or learning experiences and these data will also be included in the latter stages of the study. Video data may also be used to help illustrate key components of the training and approaches to the leadership inquiry processes. Some exemplar samples of participant responses will also be included to illustrate findings and/or preliminary analysis.

Participant observation was used early in the study as a means of reporting on the specific techniques and strategies used to train the learners and their coaches during August 2008. As preliminary background to the study, curriculum and planning documents were also examined to establish the historical context and the scholarship that informed the training design and programmatic elements of the CSML program.

### *Survey Design*

A team of researchers at the University of Victoria designed the survey. The lead author developed a series of questions designed to focus in on the specific elements of the coaching experience, as modeled during the training offered to coaches and participants. In particular, it sought to establish the degree to which the coaching partnership shaped emerging leadership practices, as identified by participants. Dr. Paul Shaw, a collaborator in this research study, developed other questions that reflect his research goals as lead investigator on a related study designed to trace the effects of the CSML program on student learning. This involved adding new questions to the survey designed to probe for particular practices of leadership, and in particular, to consider the school or district conditions that either enabled or constrained the individual's capacity of leading for school improvement. These questions were then jointly reviewed and finally put into an online form.

Surveys were distributed electronically to all former and current coaches as well as current and former CSML students; in total there are four cohorts that have been involved in the program. Close to 100 possible CSML participants were identified and about 45 coaches. A total of 60 surveys were returned; this represented a 40% return among the CSML learners and a 25% return among the coaches. There was a stronger return rate from two of the four cohort groups; this we believe is a product of having more recent contact data, as well as enhanced interest among cohort members, many of who are also U Vic Masters degree students or very recent graduates.

### *Data interpretation*

For the purposes of this paper, preliminary document analysis and survey data were used to inform this preliminary review of our findings. Both authors of this paper worked independently in coding the initial survey data, and then met to discuss their findings in order to finalize data categories, and to re-evaluate or review inconsistencies. Once this work was completed, data tables were developed to summarize each question from the survey. These tables were then used to develop some preliminary observations and tentative findings. These early interpretations of participant responses will also be used to refine our proposed questions and focus group discussions so as to probe more deeply into participants' experiences in order to more fully document the potential links between coaching practices modeled in the CSML program and school improvement practices used by school leaders.

## Discussion

The survey data focuses on two important sources of information about the CSML program: coaches and CSML learners. Each will be discussed briefly in turn. The data provided by the experienced school and district leaders who serve as coaches indicate particular leadership strengths and beliefs including: an emphasis on building and maintaining professional relationships, a focus on self and student learning, and a propensity to practice distributed forms of leadership. The survey results revealed that 88% of the coaches subscribe to educational journals, many of them peer reviewed; 92% are actively involved in Professional development activities both as learners and teachers, and more than 50% were actively involved in developing and designing assessment for learning at the school, district and provincial level. Coaches also illustrated in their comments their understanding of themselves as learners and the value of collaborative and shared learning that emerged from the coaching relationship. For example, one coach stated “the CSML learner introduced me to new resources. After actively listening to the CSML learner, I often reflected on the gaps between what I do and what I believe I should do. This was helpful”. Another said simply “We have so much to learn from each other”. The commitment to reciprocal learning was evident in their responses, and was reinforced by the CSML coaching model that used strategies designed to enhance such possible learning and shared knowledge building. Because of these attributes and stated goals, we have described these coaches as ‘lead learners’. It is clear that they do more than provide a personal commitment to coaching students in the CSML program, they themselves are active, engaged catalysts in many parts of their professional lives. Their willingness to work with new or emerging teacher leaders is a credit to their passion about the profession and the need for exemplary educational leadership for BC schools.

In considering and analyzing the coach’s responses, we also noted that these coaches supported leadership development in three very important ways. First they facilitated the identification and development of new leaders through influence and encouragement activities. As one coach said, “When a teacher comes up with an idea to support student learning, I stand and support them... thereby allowing them an opportunity to further learn and lead”. Secondly, they share existing leadership roles and responsibilities in their own work settings as a means of distributing leadership among emerging school leaders. This ranged from practices of decision-making that allowed lead teachers to take on prominent school based responsibilities or roles to appointing teachers to lead school based teaching or learning initiatives. Finally, these coaches also gave evidence of modeling leadership as a means of “walking the talk”: a number of coaches suggested that leading by example provides the best means of illustrating good leadership practice. This finding was reflected both in how the coaches described their own leadership style and in how they described the work they did with teacher leaders in their schools or with their learner in the coaching relationship. An important observation was that at least some of these leaders saw their modeling role as extending beyond the classroom and school and into the community.

CSML learners confirmed in their responses that these coaches were largely familiar with key learning outcomes of the program, and that these were emphasized in the coaching sessions held with their CSML counterparts. The CSML learners also emphasized the degree of shared learning that emerged from their coaching sessions; some CSML learners identified that their initial program coaches from earlier cohorts remain professional friends and colleagues and that their coaching relationship continues.

We asked participations to report on the nature of their coaching sessions over the one year they participated in the CSML program. Not surprisingly, nearly all of the early sessions involved establishing trust and establishing routines for meeting, and becoming comfortable with the ways in which the coaching relationship would unfold. Because the coaching process is linked to the CSML learners' personal inquiry and professional growth plan development, the middle program months (January, February, March) tended to focus more concertedly on their leadership inquiry projects. Coaches played an important feedback role for learners as they came close to assignment due dates. The final months of the coaching process (April, May, June) relied more frequently on looking back/reflecting on growth and progress. This too seems to us to be a natural part of the cycle, although we note that some learners and coaches initiated new discussions that were unrelated to the inquiry projects, and new cycles of focus and reflection were then reflected in their reporting.

The survey was designed to focus on how CSML learners described their own development as school leaders, and so we asked them to report on a range of potentially new or modified strategies, processes, or approaches they used in their own leadership practices once back in their home schools. Our CSML learners, as noted earlier, are approximately 50% practicing administrators and so have many opportunities to practice formal and informal leadership roles. However, given the program's emphasis on distributed leadership, all CSML learners perceive themselves as school leaders and were able to respond in a way that reflected their informal roles as school leaders.

Our questions were divided into categories that reflected key goals of the program including: communication, decision making, policy development, social and cultural inclusion practices, school improvement, managing for student learning, team building, relationship building and the maintenance of professional contacts. In almost all cases, CSML learners reported significant new or modified strategies were becoming regularly incorporated into their leadership repertoire. Some areas of considerable growth included communication and interpersonal or relationship building strategies: frequently mentioned ideas included greater use of technology for communication, networking with peers in the program on a regular basis, engaging in practices that distributed leadership with others on their staff, and working on developing deeper levels of trust, including the use of collaborative or shared learning and teaching opportunities. As with the coaches, we saw considerable evidence that modeling leadership behaviours—both in formal roles and informal roles, largely focused on learning and enhancing teaching—were prominent in their responses. For example, many of the participants identified the inquiry process—the process of investigating their own leadership and learning questions—as a primary means of engaging other teachers in collaboration and school improvement initiatives. By demonstrating their own efforts, either in the CSML professional learning plan work or as members of the NPBS<sup>3</sup>, they verified these as essential strategies for effecting change for themselves and for students. Not surprisingly, given the emphasis on student achievement at a provincial and local level, assessment emerged as an important leadership and teaching practice. However, in the case of these participants,

---

<sup>3</sup> The Network of Performance based schools is a Ministry funded network that focuses on assisting schools and teachers become more familiar with the performance standards as a means of engaging in assessment for and as student learning. The Network of Performance Based Schools is a voluntary action research community focused on improving student learning and strengthening public education. Close to 300 BC schools belong to the network.

assessment *for* learning was more often identified as a key strategy for school improvement, for managing student learning, and for policy development.

We noted two areas that had significantly smaller numbers of suggested strategies or approaches that had been taken up for use by these CSML leaders: cultural and social inclusion and policy development. While it is too soon to make any conclusions about the reasons for this apparent gap, we note that it appears to be an area in which CSML coaches also failed to highlight as areas of leadership strength: this can perhaps be interpreted as a shared gap, and as a result, little attention was paid to these fields of leadership practice. However, given their emphasis in the program and how cultural and social inclusion have been identified as provincially important educational goals, both from a policy and practice perspective, we hope to probe more deeply as to why this gap may exist.

### **Tentative and preliminary analysis**

In general, we believe that the data supports strong agreement with the CSML programs goals and emphasis on practically situated forms of leadership development among existing and former CSML learners and coaches. In particular, learners and coaches alike expressed strong support for the coaching component of the program, and urged that the University not make any significant changes to its design. There was some evidence to suggest that learners and coaches would like to meet face-to-face more frequently; this is likely a result of the large distances that separated many of the coaches and learners. In a province the size of British Columbia, hundreds of kilometers can separate schools and school districts. A suggestion for using technology as a means of bringing learners and coaches face to face, recognizing the obvious concerns with the large costs that would be associated with bringing everyone together in a central location seems a reasonable avenue to pursue, and will likely form a part of our final recommendations to the University of Victoria.

Perhaps of greater interest were the ways in which we were able to trace the links between leadership, learning, and coaching and its potential effects on student learning. Like other scholars and practitioners, we recognize that distributed forms of leadership have become a priority for investigating how to best support enhanced student learning (Harris, 2004). Robinson et al's (2008) very recent meta-analysis of leadership styles and their effects on student learning that suggests that distributed forms of leadership have twice the effect on student learning make our study of its evidence in this research even more compelling. We also believe that our survey data supports the evidentiary framework she outlines that links how particular distributed leadership practices support learning. She identifies three components of distributed leadership including: task distribution, direct and indirect forms of influence, and the use of smart tools for enhancing learning as a lens for analysis for demonstrating leadership effects. This model of analysis may enable us to infer how it is that the CSML program can be a tool for improving student learning. While a very preliminary and tentative conclusion, we hope that this promising result can be confirmed in subsequent phases of the research we are undertaking at the University of Victoria.

We also believe that Robinson's (2008) labeling of some strategies as 'smart tools' opens a window into thinking more about the ways in which the coaching experience, as a part of the CSML program, might be similarly viewed as a tool that enables a focus on learning. In this case the coaching process and inquiry based learning enable leadership learning while simultaneously modeling how learning is the central value of the best school leaders. As such, it offers both a pedagogical and

practical tool for distributing pedagogical and professional knowledge among leaders and teachers.

### **Limitations**

There are several important limitations to this work. Firstly, as has been noted earlier in this paper, the findings described here are tentative, as they rely only on the data collected in the survey and may alter when additional field data is collected. Secondly, the limited scope of responses means that it becomes difficult to generalize results, and therefore readers should remember this when considering the findings and their potential for replicability. Finally, the results of this survey rely solely on the self-reporting of participants. Subsequent stages of the research are designed to reduce this limitation.

### **Educational importance of the study**

This study offers an important bridge between two different strands of promising research, one that seeks to consider how formal mentorship and coaching practices and forms of action-based inquiry focused on school improvement and student learning might enhance the preparation of British Columbia educational leaders. In the context of Canadian school leadership preparedness, few studies have been completed which seek to document leaders' own learning processes and how these approaches may influence or enhance the ways in which learning is understood and modeled in professional settings. As a result, this study may offer important findings that will inform the design and implementation of post secondary education degree programs, both from a policy perspective as well as for the development of best practices among school leaders.

### **References**

- Bell, L., Bolam, R., & Cubillo, L. (2003). *A systematic review of the impact of School head teachers and principals on student outcomes*. London: EPPI-Center. Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education.
- Daresh, J., & Playko, M. (1994). Mentoring for head teachers: A review of major issues. *School Organizations*, 12, 2: 145-152.
- Daresh, J. (2004). Mentoring school Leaders: Professional promise or predictable problems? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40, 4: 495-517.
- Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1986). Mentoring among teachers: A review of the literature. *Journal of Teacher Education*.
- Glickman, C., Gordon, S., & Ross-Gordon, J. (2001). *Supervision and instructional leadership. A developmental approach*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Harris, A. (2004). Distributed leadership and school improvement: Leading or misleading? *Educational management, Administration and Leadership*, 32, 1: 11-24.
- Healy, C., & Welchert, A. (1990). Mentoring Relations: A Definition to Advance Research and Practice. *Educational Researcher*, 19, 9:17-21

- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2005). *Sustainable Leadership*. Jossey Bass: San Francisco.
- Leithwood, K. A. & Jantzi, D. (2000). The Effects of transformational leadership on Organizational conditions and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38, 2: 112-139.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahstrom, I. K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.
- Muijs, D., & Harris, A. (2007). Teacher leadership in (in)action: Three case studies of contrasting schools. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 35, 1: 111-134.
- Robinson, V. (2008). Forging the link between distributed leadership and educational outcomes. *Journal of educational administration*, 46, 2: 241-256.
- Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational administration quarterly*, 44, 5: 635-674.
- Robertson, J. (2006). *Coaching Leadership: Building educational leadership capacity through coaching partnerships*. New Zealand: NZCER press.
- Robertson, J. (2005). Coaching Leadership: Towards a Knowledge of Practice. *BC Educational Leadership Research*, 5, 1-5.
- Rhodes, C., & Beneicke, S. (2002). Coaching, mentoring and peer-networking: challenges for the management of teacher professional development in schools. *Professional development in education*, 28, 2: 297-310.
- Spillane, J. (2006). *Distributed Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Woods, P., Bennett, N., Harvey, J., & Wise, C. (2004). Variables and dualities in distributed leadership. Findings from a systemic literature review. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 32,4: 439-457.