



Children's Services Integration in Scottish Schools: Research Seminar Proceedings

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
University of Aberdeen
RESEARCH PAPER 13 • JUNE 2006

**Children's Services Integration in Scottish Schools:
Research Seminar Proceedings**

Joan Forbes (Editor)

(School of Education, University of Aberdeen)

School of Education, University of Aberdeen

RESEARCH PAPER 13

**CHILDREN'S SERVICES INTEGRATION IN SCOTTISH SCHOOLS:
RESEARCH SEMINAR PROCEEDINGS**

**Research Paper Editor:
Joan Forbes
University of Aberdeen**

In June 2005, the first research seminar linked to the annual series of one day *Values, Vision and Vital Voices* series of conferences was held at King's College, University of Aberdeen, to share recent research concerned with development and change in teacher professionalism and interprofessional, inter-agency practice in the current Scottish policy context of school change and the integration of children's services.

The papers from the 2005 research seminar are brought together in this collection, *Children's Services Integration in Scottish Schools: Research Seminar Proceedings*, published in the *Research Papers* series of the University of Aberdeen, School of Education. As with previous *Research Papers* publications in the *Values, Vision and Vital Voices* series, this collection is intended for practitioners, managers and leaders, academics and policy makers from the fields of education, health and social care.

Since the NEXUS research group of the University of Aberdeen, School of Education organised the first *Values and Vision* conference in 2003, the series has presented thoughtful and challenging analyses of recent developments in Scottish education, critically critiquing issues of integration, collaboration, community and social justice. Key debates from the conference proceedings are published in previous *Research Papers* in the series:

Values and Vision: Working Together in Integrated Community Schools?
(2004) School of Education, University of Aberdeen, Research Paper 10.

Service Integration in Scottish Schools: Values, Vision and Vital Voices.
(2006) School of Education, University of Aberdeen, Research Paper 12.

Research perspectives on service integration.

Copyright 2006 Walter Humes

Support your local Co-op: Developing co-operative approaches to speech and language therapists and teachers supporting children with language impairment.

Copyright 2006 Elspeth McCartney, Sue Ellis and James Boyle

Social capital: A lens to examine professional ties in school hubs?

Copyright 2006 Joan Forbes

Step change or fancy footwork? Primary headteachers' perspectives on integrated community schools.

Copyright 2006 Michael Cowie and Audrey Hendry

Changing roles, changing boundaries, changing professional identities: Guidance and pupil support – a holistic view.

Copyright 2006 Leila Holm

Published by the School of Education, University of Aberdeen
Printed by the Central Printing Service, University of Aberdeen

ISBN 1-903714-13-3

RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES ON SERVICE INTEGRATION

Walter Humes
University of Paisley

The current interest in inter-professional working and integrated children's services has its origins in several sources. There have been high profile cases where the failure of professionals to share information and intervene effectively has allowed child abuse to continue unchecked, sometimes resulting in the tragic death of the victim. The reports on these cases have recommended much better communication between the various agencies (police, social work, hospitals, schools), clearer lines of responsibility, better training for case workers, and firmer managerial control.

Another strand of influence has been the introduction of Integrated Community Schools which seek to provide an improved level of service to parents and children, bringing together education, social services, health provision and community development under one roof and avoiding the need to negotiate separate bureaucratic systems. That at least is the theory, though early evaluations have indicated that there remains a gap between aspiration and achievement. The language used by different professionals, the varied structures within which they have traditionally operated, their different career paths, including their education and training, all create areas of potential confusion and misunderstanding. There are also sensitive issues to do with status and professional identity which are difficult to explore in ways that do not exacerbate rather than diminish tensions.

At a political level, there has been growing recognition of the need to develop policy on an integrated basis, using 'joined up' thinking rather than relying on the fragmented approach of separate government departments pursuing strategies which fail to take proper account of the way their sphere of operation impacts on other policy objectives. In the area of social disadvantage and educational underachievement, for example, the influence of health, housing, poverty, crime, unemployment, and community resources on the capacity of children to benefit from what schools offer is now widely

acknowledged. Again one of the implications of this is that professionals working in different public services need to develop a better understanding of the work of colleagues who may share many of the same social objectives, in terms of improving the life chances of children and families, but who may start from a different set of operational assumptions.

Against this background, the papers in the present collection offer timely insights into both the obstacles to inter-professional understanding and the practical strategies which might have a positive impact on the experience of children. The paper by Elspeth McCartney, Sue Ellis and James Boyle is concerned with the way in which teachers and speech and language therapists (SLTs) can work together to meet the needs of those children with language impairment, a condition that affects their capacity to access the curriculum and to develop in ways which allow them to reach their potential. In their use of terms such as 'integration', 'joint working' and 'partnership', the authors invoke the discourse of inter-professionalism that is now to the fore. They show, however, that there are different models of inter-professional working ranging from the relatively weak (liaison), through intermediate (co-operation), to relatively strong (collaboration). Their conceptual analysis is balanced by a realistic sense of the occupational frameworks and practical constraints under which both teachers and SLTs have to work. These include the fact that whereas SLTs are mostly employed within the National Health Service and are regulated as allied health professionals by the Health Professions Council, teachers are employed by local authorities and have to be registered with the General Teaching Council for Scotland. Demand for the expertise of SLTs outstrips supply and this sets limits to the service they can provide, even allowing for the input of support workers. The pressures of the school day mean that the time available for teachers to work co-operatively with SLTs is limited. McCartney and her colleagues take account of these constraints in the Language Support Model which they propose, setting out a time-frame for action, the people involved, the purposes of meetings, decisions to be taken and necessary documentation. They argue that at present a fully collaborative model is not possible but that regular and open communication, which allows for the sharing of

information, should contribute to improved language teaching, drawing on both the teacher's expertise in learning and the SLT's specialist knowledge of speech, language and communication development.

Joan Forbes in her contribution is also concerned with the way in which teachers and therapists might work constructively to offer an improved service. An important part of her analysis is the account she offers of the legislative and policy context of recent developments. She states: 'The central focus of current Scottish policy and practice is on user-focused children's services and inter-agency working for social inclusion and social justice'. The philosophy of Integrated Community Schools (ICS) is aimed to tackle the cycle of disadvantage which has prevented some 20% of the school population making real progress in terms of educational achievement and attainment. However, for this to be effective, the various professionals involved (psychologists, teachers, social workers, health service personnel) will have to learn new ways of working. The scale of the challenge should not be underestimated. As Forbes observes, 'Moves to integrate service provision will not be easy or straightforward and a number of practical and cultural problems will be encountered in the changing governance, management, leadership and practice of professional groups'. Different occupations develop different cultures which, in turn, shape the professional identities of members. To question these can be unsettling and even threatening. The task, therefore, is to find ways of opening up inter-professional dialogue – through, for example, shared staff development opportunities – in ways that allow serious reflection on cherished beliefs leading to constructive transformations of attitude and practice.

Forbes argues that the concept of social capital has considerable potential in terms of enabling this process to take place. She acknowledges that social capital is a slippery term but its focus on shared understandings, reciprocal relationships, supportive networks, and developing trust clearly has relevance to inter-agency working. The classification of different types of social capital – bonding, bridging and linking – allows for a thoughtful exploration of the different kinds of ties that exist (and might exist) within and between different professional groups. The paper concludes by suggesting that

the various forms of social capital can serve as useful tools to identify and analyse the kinds of transformations in thinking and practice that the new policy agenda requires.

Michael Cowie and Audrey Hendry also invoke the concept of social capital in their study of headteachers' perspectives on Integrated Community Schools. Part of the rationale for such schools is that they provide sites for inter-agency working which should provide an improved service to pupils, parents and communities, thereby enabling more youngsters to reach their potential and so benefiting both individuals and society as a whole. Cowie and Hendry trace the origins of the ICS initiative and its representation in policy documents, noting the limited research evidence from the experience of American Full Service Schools to support the claim that inter-agency working necessarily leads to improved outcomes for service users.

The paper poses a series of important questions relating to the leadership of Integrated Community Schools. How do headteachers define their role in this new context? What are their views on collaboration? How do they regard inter-agency working? How effective do they consider emerging patterns of practice to be? A number of interesting views emerge from the interviews they conducted. Although most headteachers broadly supported the principles underpinning Integrated Community Schools, many complained about the lack of consultation prior to the introduction of the policy. Issues of power and control surfaced, with headteachers wishing to retain overall authority in relation to projects which involved inter-agency cooperation. This is perhaps understandable since the school is the site in which such projects are located and, should anything go wrong, headteachers would certainly be seen as bearing some of the responsibility. At the same time, as Cowie and Hendry acknowledge at the end of their paper, it would be worth accessing the views of partners from social work and health to see if they perceived school hierarchies as sometimes limiting what they felt was needed in particular cases. In collaborative working, the nature of leadership needs to be considered carefully. Traditional formal structures are likely to be less successful than more flexible arrangements which distribute leadership functions within an agreed set of aims and priorities. A change of this sort cannot be imposed. It takes time, willingness to adapt

and to engage in a process of social learning. The role ambiguity among headteachers which Cowie and Hendry report can be interpreted either as evidence of resistance to these requirements or simply as an indication that the ICS initiative is still at an early stage of implementation. They cite Michael Fullan's notion of 'interactive professionalism', which moves beyond collaboration among committed individuals to more firmly rooted institutional partnerships, as a possible signpost for future developments.

The final paper in the collection, by Leila Holm, looks at the way in which a number of policy developments have combined to impact on the guidance system in Scottish secondary schools. These include not only the introduction of Integrated Community Schools, but also reforms in the structure of promoted posts following the recommendations of the McCrone report, and the general aim of promoting social inclusion and reducing underachievement.

Holm's study focuses on the perceptions of a wide range of stakeholders. Within the schools, the views of managers, teachers and pupils are all represented. What is evident, however, is that there are significant variations amongst teachers depending on whether they are primarily subject specialists, or whether they have a particular remit for guidance, support for learning or behaviour support. One of the implications is the need to get the balance right between, on the one hand, generalist understanding and effective communication between all the partners and, on the other hand, the provision of dedicated specialist expertise where necessary. It is unreasonable to expect everyone involved to be equally competent in all the forms of support that might be required and, from the pupils' perspective, what matters is having a trusted point of contact who can be relied upon either to deal with the issues directly or to call upon specialists if required. The external perceptions – of parents, social workers, psychologists, careers advisers, health personnel – are also interesting because they serve to question some of the assumptions of school staff. While there may be a shared desire among all parties to improve the quality of service for children and young people, there are likely to be divergent views on the best means of achieving this and the respective roles of the

various professionals involved. The challenges in terms of mutual understanding, respect and trust are considerable. Several of the respondents emphasise the importance of good personal relationships as well as effective systems and clear lines of responsibility.

Underlying all of this are difficult questions to do with how professional identities are formed and transformed. For some teachers their subject allegiance is central – they see themselves primarily as teachers of English or Mathematics or Science. For others, the subject allegiance may be less important than a commitment to learning in general or the personal welfare of pupils. There is also a developmental aspect to this. Some teachers remain relatively static in their view of themselves and their role throughout their career, while others undergo transformations and redefine how they see their function in the light of experience. For Integrated Community Schools to succeed, there has to be an openness to change, a preparedness to look at traditional boundaries and to explore new ways of doing things, in association with other professionals coming from different backgrounds.

The heightened expectations for schools to meet the social inclusion agenda mean that the environment in which teachers and headteachers work has become more complex and that they now have to see themselves as part of multi-agency networks which extend beyond the school, rather than as autonomous professionals. Taken together, what the papers in this collection suggest is that there is a considerable amount of goodwill on the part of most professionals but that they are encountering a range of conceptual challenges and operational difficulties as they try to respond to policy directives.

SUPPORT YOUR LOCAL CO-OP: DEVELOPING CO-OPERATIVE APPROACHES TO SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPISTS AND TEACHERS SUPPORTING CHILDREN WITH LANGUAGE IMPAIRMENT

Elspeth McCartney, Sue Ellis and James Boyle
University of Strathclyde

Abstract

Speech and language therapists and teachers work together in schools to meet the needs of children with language impairments. This paper reviews the policy context within which joint working takes place, and the restrictions imposed by limited staff on possible models of working together. It is concluded that a co-operative rather than a collaborative model is feasible, and a research project that developed such a model through discussion amongst teachers and SLTs is outlined.

Introduction

This paper considers how speech and language therapists (SLTs) and teachers can work together to meet the needs of children with language impairment in Scottish mainstream primary schools. Scotland's separate educational and legislative framework for children with additional learning needs warrants separate consideration, although relevant policy development has taken place throughout the UK (Lindsay *et al.*, 2005a, 2005b). Children with language impairment comprise a fairly large group, estimated at around 7% of school entrants (Tomblin *et al.*, 1997), whose additional educational and language learning needs are frequently catered for in their local mainstream schools, in line with policies of social inclusion. Their language learning difficulties are developmental and do not result from any known cause such as hearing loss, intellectual impairment nor lack of language learning opportunity. Their difficulties are pervasive and long term (Stothard *et al.*, 1998) and continue to affect access to the school curriculum, but unless they have additional problems language teaching procedures effective in developing expressive language ability can be delivered without the specialist skills of an SLT (Boyle *et al.*, 2006). Meeting such children's learning needs therefore calls for joint working between SLTs and educational services.

The policy context

Within Scotland, as in other countries of the UK, integration of services has become a major goal within the public sector, as policies of 'joined up thinking' (DfEE, 1998) introduced by the new Labour government since 1997 roll out and are developed. Joint working across public services has since then been 'a true part of core business' (DoH, 1998, p.30) as the 'duty of partnership' established between the national health service (NHS) and local authorities has moved from examples related to health and social services to encompass education and children's services. Integrated children's services in Scotland have been developing since the report *For Scotland's Children* (Scottish Executive, 2001), with at least 40 partnership documents and initiatives moving the public sector towards integrated service planning (Lee, 2005). Such policies stem from the belief that 'radical improvement of opportunities and outcomes for children and families' will result from planned, cross-professional approaches rather than independent initiatives.

SLTs in the UK are mostly employed within the NHS, even when they work in schools, and are regulated as allied health professionals by the Health Professions Council. Their work in schools therefore crosses public sectors. Earlier work specifically considering SLTs working in schools (HMI 1996; Reid *et al.*, 1996) has been subsumed into current policy, especially that regarding the education of children with additional learning needs (Scottish Executive, 2004a). Education authorities are directed to request help from 'appropriate agencies' such as SLT services to carry out educational functions (Scottish Executive, 2004, 23.1: 18) and close integration is suggested. SLTs' professional body, the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT), also advocates integrated approaches, with SLT services in mainstream schools aiming to 'provide speech and language therapy assessment and intervention for children with speech and language difficulties as an integral part of their school life, ensuring that speech and language therapy input is part of a total programme for a child' (RCSLT, 1996: 54). SLTs therefore expect to work closely with educationalists in constructing and delivering additional language learning programmes for children, recognising that opportunities

arise within the classroom to foster language and communication skills in an appropriate social setting and to generalise learning, particularly through the 'talking and listening' strand of the Scottish 5 - 14 Curriculum. An SLT's expertise in speech, language and communication development and the class teacher's expertise in learning are recognised as elements that together contribute to effective language teaching.

Such arguments have led to the practice of SLTs working through others (called 'indirect' work, from the SLT's point of view) becoming a main means of delivering SLT services in schools (Law *et al.*, 2000, 2002; McCartney *et al.*, 2004a). 'Others' include parents, classroom teachers and their classroom assistants, and SLT assistants employed by SLT services (currently a small staff group but expected to grow, since NHS policy is committed to a health workforce where support staff extend their skills to undertake work previously carried out by regulated professionals (DoH 2004, para. 3; Scottish Executive, 2004b, para. 11).

However, as well as offering potential language learning advantages, working through others is also a response to limited availability of SLTs. SLT is listed as a 'shortage occupation' in the UK (Home Office, 2004), indicating an acute scarcity of suitably qualified and skilled workers in the resident population. A review of SLT service provision for children (Scottish Executive, 2003, p.32) showed that in 2002 (and with some data missing) 520.84 whole-time equivalents (WTE) SLTs worked with the entire child population of Scotland, including pre-school children. This gave a range of 7.42 – 14.13 SLTs per 100,000 mainland population (p.97), supported by 68.6 WTE support workers (including SLT assistants: p.32). The delivery of language intervention by indirect means is related to the fact that the relatively low number of SLTs in Scotland could not deliver direct services to the large number of children seeking to access them, even if they wanted to. Indeed, commenting on a similar situation in England and Wales, Lindsay and Dockrell (2002, p.200) questioned whether working through others had become SLTs' method of choice for professional reasons, or for pragmatic reasons related to difficulties in providing cover for many mainstream schools.

Models of working together

In this context, it is worth considering the ways in which SLTs and teachers may interact since opportunities to share practice are limited by heavy demand for service delivery. Models of collaboration across professions are classified as functions or goals of services (McCartney, 1999), arising from wider goals of service integration. They are usually defined by three parameters: who decides on the targets or objectives to be set, who carries out planned activities, and how egalitarian are relationships. Within professional teams egalitarian relationships are often asserted (although not always practised) and some teams are constructed as 'multi-disciplinary', where professionals set and implement their own objectives independently, but meet and discuss these with other professionals and families. 'Inter-disciplinary' teams also exist where objectives are set jointly through discussion, but usually implemented by professionals separately (McGrath & Davis, 1992). 'Trans-disciplinary' teams may also be found, often within specialist settings, where objectives are set and implemented jointly, with considerable role-release (Mackey & McQueen, 1998). Where overt differences in responsibility exist, such as within professional-assistant pairs, expert/aide models (Cunningham & Davis, 1985) pertain, with the professional 'expert' setting objectives and supervising the work of the assistant who implements them (McCartney *et al.*, 2005a). Good relationships often exist, but by definition not egalitarian relationships. The most common model of joint working found by Law *et al.* (2002) in mainstream schools in England and Wales was where SLTs acted as 'consultants' to schools, giving advice and guidance on language teaching procedures for children that were then delivered by school staff. In this 'consultant' role the SLT is acting as an 'outside expert', but advising other professionals rather than directing the work of aides. This role preserves the professional responsibilities of teachers and SLTs, and may allow for discussion and agreement on goals, but attainment of objectives depends upon the advice offered being taken up and learning activities implemented.

With respect to SLTs and teachers working together these parameters have been combined into named variants, reflecting 'levels' of interaction, sometimes represented as steps on a staircase. Models use a variety of terms, with varied meanings, and different numbers of 'steps': Martin (2000) has two ('liaison' and 'collaboration'), DiMeo *et al.* (1998) have three ('compliance', 'co-operation' and 'collaboration'), Marvin (1990) has four ('co-activity', 'co-operation', 'co-ordination' and 'collaboration') and no doubt other models with further levels exist. As illustration, the DiMeo *et al.* (1998) three-level model defines:

- *compliance* - where there is independent professional responsibility in recognising the contributions of others, and regular sharing of information; through
- *co-operation* - where there is regular and open communication and interpersonal comfort, and mutual requests for information and advice about what to do; to
- *collaboration* - where there is trust, mutual respect and personal support, free and honest discussion and shared responsibility for planning. Collaboration is constructed through positive interactions, and requires relationship building.

Higher levels of interaction flourish where there is continuity of staffing, and time to plan together and discuss. Wright (1996) reports that the more SLTs and teachers have opportunities to collaborate the more they value it, and that close working proximity helps information exchange. DiMeo *et al.* (1998) note that building a collaborative working relationship is rather like building a personal friendship, requiring time to develop and sustain. They recognise that it is not reasonable to expect SLTs or teachers to attempt to engage in high levels of collaboration with all professionals with whom they interact, due to interpersonal factors. There is also likely to be limited opportunity to build and maintain collaborative partnerships when SLTs and teachers are managing demanding workloads, and when mainstream rather than specialist settings are considered (Lindsay *et al.*, 2005b). Hargreaves (1998) makes the point that when 'collegiality' becomes an institutional principle rather than a personal preference it moves from a culture that is 'spontaneous, voluntary, development-orientated, pervasive across time

and space and somewhat unpredictable' to a culture of contrived collaboration that is 'administratively regulated, compulsory, instrumentation-oriented, fixed in time and space and predictable'. Since working together in Scotland has become a matter of policy, and since opportunities to create and sustain partnerships are limited, it is unlikely that collaborative relationships characterised as professional friendships will become the norm.

However, current 'consultation' approaches have limitations. In particular, they run the risk that activities recommended by an SLT may not be implemented systematically in the classroom. McCartney *et al.* (2004a) found that manualised language intervention activities shown to be effective in developing expressive language for children with language impairment when delivered by SLTs or SLT assistants (Boyle *et al.*, 2006) were less effective when delivered by classroom staff. This appeared to be related to the amount of time children spent on the activities, which was less than in the Boyle *et al.* study and which varied considerably across schools. SLTs can advise, but if classroom staff can not deliver language activities consultation approaches may not result in particularly effective experiences for children.

Building a 'good enough' model

If time, resources and case pressures tend to militate against full collaboration, and consultation models have limitations, something between the two may be needed. This should not be considered as failure, but as a reasonable adaptation to the challenge of delivering services to all children with language impairment in their local mainstream primary schools with the numbers of staff available. The joint work of SLTs and teachers in mainstream depends upon managing the best level of collaboration they can achieve, and agreeing that, although it may not be perfect, it may be 'good enough'.

There have however been few attempts to build such a model (but see Essex County Council, 2004; Cambridgeshire County Council, 2005). Little is known of the views of classroom teachers or community SLTs on acceptable and sustainable practice. A research project entitled 'The development and validation of materials for use by

classroom teachers working with children with primary language impairment' (McCartney *et al.*, 2005b) was therefore carried out, funded by the Chief Scientist Office through NHS Programme Grants, to investigate this area.

The research study

Previous research (Boyle *et al.*, 2006) had developed a 'manualised' intervention approach shown to be effective for children with expressive language impairment when language learning activities were delivered by SLTs or SLT assistants three times a week over a 15-week period. Activities from the therapy manual developed for that project (McCartney *et al.*, 2004b) had been used by classroom staff in a further research project with children selected on similar criteria (McCartney *et al.*, 2004a), using a consultancy model, and materials for classroom staff that explained the language teaching principles had been constructed for the second project. Schools had varied considerably in the amount of language teaching they had undertaken during the second project, suggesting that not all schools or classrooms had been able to act upon the advice given. A third study (McCartney *et al.*, 2005b) was therefore undertaken to investigate the views of classroom teachers and community SLTs on the usefulness of these materials, and how SLTs and teachers could work together more effectively.

The research design was participatory evaluation employing group interview. Two sets of mainstream primary school teachers who had experience of working with language impaired children participated. One set had been actively engaged in the McCartney *et al.* (2004a) research project, and were therefore experienced in using the draft language teaching materials. They were joined by the SLT who had acted as researcher and consultant in that project. The second set of teachers came from three education authorities who had not taken part in previous research studies and who were therefore new to the draft language teaching materials, although they had worked with SLTs using consultancy approaches. They were joined by community SLTs from their cognate health service. Each set of participants met on three occasions. Data were collected during meetings as field notes by two researchers, and summarised and fed back to participants for member checking of accuracy during later meetings. Short

questionnaires about materials and aspects of service delivery were constructed for group members to complete before or between meetings, and results summarised. The audit trail comprised responses to questionnaires, notes and summaries of meetings, and resulting revised materials.

The teachers who had been involved in the McCartney *et al.* (2004a) project reflected upon their experiences, and further developed and edited the materials produced in that study. They also discussed the characteristics that would for them comprise an 'optimal' language support model, detailing the meetings and discussions that should take place between a child's school staff and SLT to facilitate implementation of language teaching in the classroom.

This model was developed to take account of a class teacher's perspective. Children within a class can be identified as in need of language support at unpredictable and varied times in the school year, and decisions about in-class language work are often made by those other than classroom teachers (although good practice would suggest their inclusion). Thus class teachers may be involved only after a child's language abilities have been assessed, after an SLT has decided that SLT-specific skills are not required but in-class language support is recommended, after a head teacher has agreed it is feasible to deliver language work within the child's classroom, and after parents have given consent. This means that class teachers are frequently asked to organise the delivery of language activities at short notice, at a time when their detailed classroom plans and timetables have been completed and when classroom assistant time has already been allocated. Language activities for an individual child do not always mesh neatly with those planned for their classmates, and, although in-service training on language impairment and language activities is welcomed by teachers, many have to undertake language activities in advance of opportunities to train. A fast response with minimum set-up time is required.

These limits, and the limits of staff time and availability, were accepted, thus moving SLT and teachers' models of working 'down' from collaboration - mutual trust and respect can not be assumed when professionals work together for the first time, although professional responsibility can. However, the actions to be taken by both schools and SLT staff were detailed, so moving the model 'up' from consultancy, as both services must commit to their role in implementing a programme of work, not simply to offering or receiving advice.

The experienced teachers therefore constructed a Language Support Model relevant to the classroom teacher that could start at any time within the school year. It would begin with a meeting between the SLT and teacher, head teacher and learning support teacher (if appropriate) to explain what was to happen, and to timetable language activities. This would be followed within three weeks by another meeting, where language targets were set for an individually determined number of weeks (typically six to nine), and language activities planned. This would be followed by emails confirming that intervention was taking place as planned, or noting and adjusting to any problems that arose. A third meeting at the end of the predetermined activity period would confirm or adapt language targets. The process would be repeated as many times as necessary, until the child moved on to a different model of service or was discharged from the SLT's care. Documents to accompany meetings and to support language teaching are included, using final versions of the documents drafted during previous research giving principles of language intervention. Access to published language activity materials would be organised centrally, via school library services.

This outline language support model and the accompanying documents were then presented to the teachers and SLTs who had not been involved in previous projects and had not seen previous drafts of materials, for comment and evaluation. These 'potential user' staff evaluated them positively, with 69% of judgments stating that the model and materials were very clear and 66% that the ideas were very useful for teachers, and made

some final revisions. Appendix 1 gives an outline of the final version of the language support model.

However, only 52% of potential users' judgments were that the language teaching activities suggested were very realistic. Their recorded comments suggested that they considered finding time to liaise between services and time and personnel to implement language work in class to be the principal barriers to implementing the language support model, and that securing resources could be difficult. In addition, despite the model being designed to deliver language intervention in a flexible way, they thought that budgeting and planning for such work was required before teaching could begin, implying the need for service-wide decision-making. These structural and functional issues were not addressed in the language model, which was designed to operate at the process level, but clearly require to be considered at SLT service and educational authority level when setting up integrated services.

Discussion

The research project built a model for SLTs and teachers working in mainstream schools that advanced the consultancy model by clarifying joint working processes and detailing the responsibilities of schools and SLT services, and by providing tailored materials for school use with systematic feedback and support as language teaching activities are implemented. The model developed approximates to the 'co-operation' level of DiMeo *et al.* (1998), with regular and open communication and interpersonal comfort, and mutual sharing of information, although the advice given on language teaching comes from an SLT and remains rather one-way, as in a consultancy model. Implementation in practice would require consideration of resources, and management of implementation packages, and indeed an agreement between an SLT service and an education authority that the model was to be implemented. The fact that the amount of contact time between SLT and educational staff is predetermined would allow the model to be costed, but the time taken to implement language teaching activities would still have to be found from school resources, as with current consultancy models.

Although based on effective techniques, the final model has not been systematically evaluated nor assessed for efficacy. But it was developed as a result of a principled and discursive process amongst classroom teachers and SLTs, and offers a starting point for those attempting to improve levels of service integration in mainstream primary schools.

References

- Boyle J., McCartney, E., O'Hare, A., Forbes, J. & Beirne, P. (2006) *An RCT and economic evaluation of direct versus indirect and individual versus group modes of speech and language therapy for children with primary language impairment*. Final Report to the National Co-ordinating Centre for Health Technology Assessment.
- Cambridgeshire County Council (2005) *Speech and language needs: Descriptors and responses*. Cambridgeshire County Council Children and Young People's Services, Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge, CB3 0AP.
- Cunningham, C. & Davis, H. (1985) *Working with Parents: Frameworks for collaboration*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- DfEE (1998) *Meeting special educational needs: A programme of action*. London: Department for Education and the Environment.
- DoH (1998) *Partnership in action – New opportunities for joint working between health and social services*. London: Department of Health.
- DoH (2004) *Enhancing public protection: Regulation of health care staff in England and Wales. A consultation document*. London: Department of Health. <http://www.dh.gov.uk/Consultations/ClosedConsultations>. Downloaded 5 July 2005.
- DiMeo, J. H., Merritt, D. D. & Culatta, B. (1998) Collaborative partnerships and decision making. In D.D. Merritt & B. Culatta (Eds.), *Language in the Classroom*. San Diego, CA.: Singular.
- Essex County Council (2004) *Speaking out – Speech and language framework*. Essex County Council, County Hall, Chelmsford, CM1 1LX.
- Hargreaves, A. (1998) Contrived collegiality: The micropolitics of teacher collaboration. In N. Bennett, M. Crawford & C. Riches (Eds.), *Managing change in education*. London: Chapman.

- HMI (1996) *The Education of Pupils with Language and Communication Disorders*. Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education and Industry Department/ HMSO.
- Home Office (2004) *Work permits UK*.
<http://www.workingintheuk.gov.uk/workingintheuk/en/homepage/workpermits/applyingforwork/businessandcommercial/howdoimakeanapplication/shortageoccupations/healthsector.html>. Downloaded 5 July 2005.
- Law, J., Lindsay, G., Peacey, N., Gascoigne, M., Soloff, N., Radford, J., Band, S. & Fitzgerald, L. (2000) *Provision for children with speech and language needs in England and Wales: Facilitating communication between education and health services*. DfEE Research Report 239. Norwich: HMSO. Available at <http://www.dfee.gov.uk>
- Law, J., Lindsay, G., Peacey, N., Gascoigne, M., Soloff, N., Radford, J. & Band, S. (2002) Consultation as a model for providing speech and language therapy in schools – A panacea or one step too far? *Child Language, Teaching and Therapy*, 18, 145-163.
- Lee, P. (2005) *Integration: Children's research in partnership*. Scottish Executive Conference, 14 November, 2005. Paper available from Childhood and Families: Research and Development Centre, Department of Childhood and Primary Studies, University of Strathclyde, G13 1PP.
- Lindsay, G., Dockrell, J. with Mackie, C. & Letchford, B. (2002) *Educational provision for children with specific speech and language difficulties in England and Wales*. Coventry: Centre for Educational Appraisal and Research.
- Lindsay, G., Dockrell, J., Mackie, C. & Letchford, B. (2005a) Local education authorities' approaches to provision for children with specific speech and language difficulties in England and Wales. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 20(3), 329-345.
- Lindsay, G., Dockrell, J., Mackie, C. & Letchford, B. (2005b) The roles of specialist provision for children with specific speech and language difficulties in England and Wales: A model for inclusion? *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 5(3), 88-96.
- Mackey, S. & McQueen, J. (1998) Exploring the association between integrated therapy and inclusive education. *British Journal of Special Education*, 25(1), 22-27.
- Martin, D. (2000) *Teaching Children with Speech and Language Difficulties*. London: David Fulton.
- Marvin, C. (1990) Problems in school-based language and collaboration services: Defining the terms and improving the process. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools*, 25, 258-268.

- McCartney, E., (1999) Barriers to collaboration: An analysis of systemic barriers to collaboration between teachers and speech and language therapists. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 34, 431-440.
- McCartney, E., Boyle, J., Ellis, S., Turnbull, M. & Bannatyne, S. (2004a) *A survey and cohort intervention using indirect speech and language therapy for children with primary language impairment in mainstream schools*. Final Report to the West of Scotland Research and Development Partnership. July.
- McCartney, E., Boyle, J., Bannatyne, S., Jessiman, E., Campbell, C., Kelsey, C., Smith, J. & O'Hare, A. (2004b) Becoming a manual occupation? The construction of a therapy manual for use with language impaired children in mainstream primary schools. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 39, 135-148.
- McCartney, E., Boyle, J., Bannatyne, S., Jessiman, E., Campbell, C., Kelsey, C., Smith, J., McArthur, J. & O'Hare, A. (2005a) 'Thinking for two': A case study of speech and language therapists working through assistants. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 40, 221-235.
- McCartney, E., Ellis, S., Boyle, J., Turnbull, M. & Kerr, J. (2005b) *The development and validation of materials for use by classroom teachers working with children with primary language impairment*. Final Report to the West of Scotland Research and Development Partnership. November.
- McGrath, J.R. & Davis, A.M. (1992) Rehabilitation: Where are we going and how do we get there? *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 6, 225-235.
- Reid, J., Millar, S., Tait, L., Donaldson, M. L., Dean, E., Thomson, G.O.B. & Grieve, R. (1996) *The role of speech and language therapists in the education of pupils with special educational needs*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Centre for Research in Child Development.
- Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (1996) *Communicating quality: Professional standards for speech and language therapists*. London: RCSLT.
- Scottish Executive (2001) *For Scotland's children: Better integrated children's services*. <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library3/education/fcsr-00.asp> Downloaded 5 July 2005.
- Scottish Executive (2003) *A Scottish Executive review of speech and language therapy, physiotherapy and occupational therapy for children, and speech and language therapy for adults with learning difficulties and autistic spectrum disorder*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2004a) *Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Bill [As Passed]*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.

Scottish Executive (2004b) *Consultation on the regulation of health care support staff and social care support staff in Scotland*. Scotland.gov.uk/consultations/health/rohc-01.asp. Downloaded 5 July 2005.

Stothard, S. E., Snowling, M. J., Bishop, D. V. M., Chipchase, B. B. & Kaplan, C.A. (1998) Language impaired preschoolers: A follow-up into adolescence. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 41, 407-418.

Tomblin, J. B., Records, N.L., Buckwalter, P., Zhang, X., Smith, E. & O'Brien, M. (1997) Prevalence of specific language impairment in kindergarten children. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 40(6), 1245-1260.

Wright, J. A. (1996) Teachers and therapists: The evolution of a partnership. *Child Language, Teaching and Therapy*, 12, 3-16.

Appendix 1 : The Language Support Model

SUPPORT MODEL CHART

This chart relates to the process of implementing the Support Model for an individual child. It can start at any time within the school year. Before language teaching begins, assessment will have been undertaken, the SLT will have decided the Support Model is appropriate, the head teacher will have agreed that it is feasible to deliver within the child's classroom, and parents will have given consent. The Support Model Chart starts with Meeting 1. 'Assistant' includes learning support assistant and classroom assistant. 'X' is the number of weeks a child is expected to remain on the targets set, and will be decided for an individual child when targets are set. 'X' is typically 6 – 9 weeks, but this is flexible and can be reviewed.

Support Model Weeks	Meetings and Monitoring	People involved	Purpose and Decisions	Documentation
Week 1 Start	Meeting 1 - Setting up the Support Model	HT/DHT, CT, SLT, LST* (* if relevant and available)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Understand the model 2 Exchange contact information - email, phone, addresses. Decide upon main SLT and school contact i.e. CT or Assistant. (Must be updated by the relevant service if any changes take place.) 3 Decide upon weekly time-table for delivering support, to ensure a regular, predictable time plan for the intervention, and who will undertake it. 4 Discuss how to obtain language materials. CT/HT - contact IT technicians re. setting up CDs if needed. CT/HT - contact library services re. supplying materials. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Handout for teacher(s): Introduction to the Language support Model. 2 Contact information: SLT, class/school contacts. 3 Handouts for teacher(s): Principles of the 'Communication Friendly' Classroom; Principles of Comprehension Monitoring. 4 Schools Library and IT Service leaflets.

Week 3	Meeting 2 - Setting First Targets	CT, SLT, LST*, Assistant*	1 Plan language targets. 2 Discuss language activities. 3 Confirm timetable for activities. Discuss language work recording sheets. 4 'Pencil in' target review meeting date in X weeks. 5 Inform parents of targets and timetable.	1 Handout(s) for teacher(s) on child area(s) of intervention only: Vocabulary, Grammar, Narrative. Detailed intervention ideas re. specific target(s) for the child from the Therapy Manual. 2 Materials for activities. 3 Targets set and language work recording sheets. 4 Diaries. 5 SLT - letter to parents
Weeks 4, 5	Starting activities and 'Troubleshooting'	CT contacts SLT	1 CT calls SLT if any difficulties arise, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • materials not suitable/not liked by child, • activities too easy/hard, • need for reassurance that something is 'OK', • activities missed for any reason for two weeks, • child not doing well, • materials have run out, • any other concerns. 	1 Email correspondence or telephone meeting if necessary.

Week 6	Ongoing work and Routine Email	SLT emails CT (or named school contact)	1 If no correspondence has arisen about difficulties, routine email to check all is progressing as planned. Either 1 agree to postpone target review and continue with targets for a stated number of weeks, then review, or 2 confirm arrangements for SLT to see child to set new targets, and for target setting Meeting 3.	1 Routine email to those carrying out activities: 'Since we have not heard otherwise, we assume all is going to plan. Please email back a brief comment on how things are progressing. Do be honest - improvements can often be made.'
Week X -1, (i.e. 1 week before targets are due to be completed.)	Confirm or re-schedule Meeting 3	CT contacts SLT	1 SLT sees child to carry out probes for attainment of targets, and plans next/ongoing targets. Meets with CT, *Assistant, *LST.	1 Note of postponed review date in both school and SLT diaries. 2 Note of Meeting 3 in both school and SLT diaries.
Week X	Meeting 3 - Setting Next Targets	CT, SLT, LST*, Assistant* (* if relevant and available).	2 SLT informs parents of targets.	1 Language work recording sheets completed with comments. SLT - Probes and assessment materials. New target setting and language work recording sheets. 2 SLT - letter to parents.

Starting, 'troubleshooting', routine monitoring and alerting cycle is repeated for new targets. Alternatively, a decision can be made to change the model. It could be agreed for example to stop language activities and to review after some months, or to discharge the child from SLT service, or to develop another aspect of communication, such as speech, or to move the child to direct SLT intervention.

SOCIAL CAPITAL: A LENS TO EXAMINE PROFESSIONAL TIES IN SCHOOL HUBS?

Joan Forbes
University of Aberdeen

Abstract

Speech and language therapists and teachers work together in schools to support children and young people with language and communication disorders and this paper introduces the conceptual framework of types of social capital as a suitable lens with which to examine that work relation. The paper critiques recent interprofessional, inter-agency collaboration policy as this relates to the work of teachers and speech and language therapists working collaboratively in schools, setting this within the wider Scottish policy that promotes social justice and inclusion and seeks better integrated children's services through the current roll-out of the Integrated Community Schools programme. The article identifies some of the difficulties inherent in school transformations and suggests that new tools for analysis such as those offered by the concept of social capital are needed to better understand and manage these new professional networks.

Introduction

The main argument in this paper is that moves to teacher/therapist collaboration constitute a part of an important and much wider 'radical strategy to promote social inclusion and to raise educational standards' (Scottish Office, 1998, Preface) for all of Scotland's children; and that such moves to service integration might be analysed using the concept of *social capital*. Putnam (cited in Catts, 2004) defines *social capital* as:

features of social life - networks, norms and trust - that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives. The norms include reciprocity, cooperation and tolerance. (p.2)

(and see, for example, Baron, Field, & Schuller, 2000; Putnam, 2000; Field, 2003).

This article takes the view that recent policy drives for teacher/therapist professional and agency integration constitute a part of the response to address children's needs 'in the round' and that this is part of larger moves to integrate children's services in a context where 'we move towards every school adopting the characteristics of the ICS approach by 2007' (HMIe, 2004, p.29).

This paper opens with an introduction to the current Scottish legislation and policy context of children's services integration. After addressing some of the nuances of terminology in relation to co-practice relations, the article offers the view that integrated service policy is framed by the concept of *social capital* and the notion of social capital building. It then introduces the concepts of *types of social capital* as tools with which to examine professional networks and identities. The paper goes on to track and critique the shifts in interprofessional, inter-agency policy in Scotland as it relates to the work of teachers and SLTs working together in schools; and sets this within the wider Scottish policy that seeks better integrated children's services through the roll-out of the Integrated Community Schools programme. Finally, the article identifies some of the difficulties inherent in ICS transformations, and suggests that practitioners and their leaders and managers need new tools such as those of *types of social capital* (Ozga & Catts, 2004) with which to identify, define and measure professional networks if they are to manage service integration in personally acceptable ways.

Integrating children's services: Current legislation and policy

On 7th May 2004 the Scottish Executive's Additional Support for Learning (ASL) Bill received Royal Assent. The purpose of that Act of the Scottish Parliament (The Stationery Office, 2004) is:

to make provision for additional support in connection with the school education of children and young persons having additional support needs; and for connected purposes. (p.1)

The Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004, identifies 'any Health Board' (23.2, 18) as an appropriate other agency to help in the exercise of functions under the ASL Act and states:

Where it appears to an education authority that an appropriate agency could, by doing certain things, help in the exercise of any of the education authority's functions under this Act, the authority may, specifying what those things are, request the help of that agency. (23.1, 18)

The Act specifically imposes duties on agencies such as Health in relation to the preparation, exchange of information, provision and review of 'Co-ordinated support plans' (1-10) and states that:

An appropriate agency must comply with a request made to it...unless it considers that the request – (a) is incompatible with its own statutory or other duties, or (b) unduly prejudices the discharge of any of its functions. (23.3, 18)

By its imposition of such requirements on appropriate agencies, it is envisaged that the Act will function to develop, strengthen and improve the quality of the operation of co-ordinated inter-agency strategies in order to better meet the needs of Scottish children and young people.

Setting this Act within the wider context of 'joined up working' in Scotland, *New Community Schools: The Prospectus* (Scottish Office, 1998) was a key policy document which promoted inter-agency working as an integral reform measure to address children's needs. The then First Minister of Scotland, Donald Dewar, commented in the introduction to that document that New Community Schools

will embody the fundamental principle that the potential of all children can be realised only by addressing their needs in the round – and that this requires an integrated approach by all those involved. (p.2)

The same document went further, stating that to achieve an integrated approach by all those involved 'integration of services is essential' (p.4). Those early policy statements signal the shifts to New Community Schools (now Integrated Community Schools -ICS) in Scotland and the moves in legislation and policy documentation in which partnership working and integration of practice innovations are extended beyond schools to health and social services agencies.

A recent study by Whitty and Campbell (2004) provides a detailed examination of the research evidence and policy concerns in integrating social justice and schooling in Scotland. Analysing approaches to breaking the cycle of disadvantage, Whitty and Campbell conclude that 'this cannot really be done by educational interventions alone ...It seems therefore that inter-agency working may provide the answer' (p.13).

The current policy context of inter-professional and inter-agency integration includes the institution of new school-based working relations between teaching and speech and language therapy (SLT) practitioners and their professional groups. A number of concerns have been raised about how the policy imperative that teachers and SLT move closer together towards integration in their practice actually operates. Research has identified perceived obstacles and potential barriers to collaboration (Dessent, 1996). Further, and linked to those concerns, the issue of how the work of speech and language therapists in schools might be evaluated has been called into question (McCartney & van der Gaag, 1996; McCartney, 1999; McCartney, 2004).

Sorting out the terminology

At this point, it may be helpful to clarify some of the 'terminological quagmire' (Lloyd's term in Tisdall & Wallace, 2004, p. 33) used in analyses of work relations between and among professionals and professional groups. Tisdall and Wallace (2004) cite the work of Lloyd, Stead, and Kendrick, which distinguishes between:

inter-agency working - where two or more agencies work together in a planned and formal way - and

multi-agency working - where more than one agency works with a young person, family or a project ...

A further distinction is made with *multi-professional working*, where staff who have different professional backgrounds and training work together (p.33).

As the analysis in this paper is concerned with the shifts in policy and practice in the relationship between teachers and SLT in the new policy drives to integrate the service of all professional groups working in ICS, another related term is deployed - *inter-professional*. Biggs (1997) defines interprofessional thus:

Interprofessional may refer to relations between agencies (interagency) or within teams that have members from different disciplines within them (multidisciplinary). (p.186)

As argued below, while this paper would agree that the functioning of the specific teacher/therapist relation continues to be of keen interest to the practitioners and professional groups who work together in language support core teams, the 'inter-

professional' operation of teacher/therapist relationships is now, in policy, embedded in the more general category of the 'multi-professional' interaction of the network of relations between and amongst professionals and agencies in ICS.

Social capital: A concept framing integrated service policy?

From the analysis of policy shifts offered in what follows, it would seem that ICS policy has drawn on the fairly new but potentially productive notion of *social capital* (see for example Putnam, 2000; Baron, Field, & Schuller, 2000; Field, 2003; Kilpatrick, Field, & Falk, 2003; Ozga & Catts, 2004) to conceptualise new forms of social networks and the formation of connections of trust and reciprocity in integrated community schools. As suggested previously, *social capital* is a slippery term. Ozga and Catts, for example, assert that 'there is no single definition of social capital' (p.1). Amongst a number of definitions for this concept, Ozga and Catts offer those of the World Bank:

Social capital refers to the institutions, relationships and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society's social interactions. Social capital is not just the sum of the institutions which underpin a society; it is the glue that holds them together. (World Bank, in Ozga & Catts, 2004, p.1)

and of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and as used by UK government departments:

networks together with shared norms, values and understandings that facilitate cooperation within or among groups. (Cole & Hardy, in Ozga & Catts, 2004, p.1)

As will be outlined below, recent ICS and other children's services policy in Scotland has focused on the values of social justice and social inclusion and in supporting the acquisition of social capital by children, young people and their families. The same policy documentation has signalled the concern of government to reshape the service users' experience by instituting integrated service delivery in schools. Such a reform of children's services delivery has, of course, implications too for the practitioners charged with delivering those services.

Taken together, the ICS policy initiatives have produced significant and potentially far-reaching changes for both service users and providers. If such reforms are desired, the question arises of how professionals might both retain and redesign aspects of their practice and co-practice to produce smoothly operating integrated services for users - meeting users' needs with no gaps and no overlap.

If user-focused service integration, or integrated children's services is the aim, then the multiple new ways and local variations in which services retain some previous practices and provision arrangements while reforming other aspects will need to be carefully researched – and the outcomes and difficulties for service users and providers examined. In work that is timely, the Schools and Social Capital (SSC) network of the Applied Educational Research Scheme (AERS) in Scotland (www.aers.ac.uk) will research these issues in the planned project: *Redesigning professionalism and enabling professionals to use, recognise and develop social capital*.

Types of social capital: Tools to examine professional networks and identities?

For ICS to function as a hub for services as envisaged in policy, teachers, therapists and other professionals need to develop new social capital, forging new productive practitioner networks. And, they need to risk doing so in the context of continuing change and uncertainty in relation to the construction of interprofessional and inter-agency co-practice relationships in sometimes short-term ICS initiatives and projects. In the current fluid conditions in ICS of service transformations-in-progress, it would seem appropriate and necessary that individual practitioners continuously examine the effects of emerging versions of professionalism on and for themselves. To aid them in such scrutiny, practitioners may need to acquire and use some new conceptual tools. This article suggests that the concepts of 'types of social capital' might provide such a fruitful set of conceptual resources.

By viewing the practitioner and agency connections instituted in ICS as important networks central to the development of *social capital* for service users and for themselves, teachers, speech and language therapists and other practitioners are provided with a new framework with which to understand and examine their joint

work. Ozga and Catts (2004) distinguish three types of networks which produce the types of relationships that seem to create and sustain social capital (SC):

BONDING SC: characterised by strong bonds among family members: this variety of SC can help people to 'get by' but may also be limiting;

BRIDGING SC: is less strong but builds relationships with a wider, more varied set of people, for example workplace or business associates, friends from different ethnic groups: good for 'getting on';

LINKING SC: connects people who occupy different power positions so works across differences in status: for example connecting individuals to different agencies or services (p.2: original emphasis).

Perhaps, to date, in order to 'get by' in new and sometimes uncertain co-practice relations and contexts, individual teacher and speech and language therapist partnership pairs have predominantly focused on developing reciprocal relationships and strong bonds with each other based primarily on 'mutual trust' (HMI, 1996a, p.33). To participate actively and benefit fully from the more complex and dynamic multi-agency networks characterised in ICS policy, teachers and SLTs - as other practitioners - will need to build multiple social relationships. Such new institutional networks will be needed to access appropriately and adequately the professional resources and knowledge bases of a potentially wide number of ICS colleagues on behalf of some service users.

As inter-agency work becomes embedded as the norm within ICS, speech and language therapists and teachers, who previously operated as equals may, in the kinds of new contexts of distributed leadership envisaged in the ICS policy statements discussed above, find themselves leading or managing particular projects. In these new positions they may need to network with colleagues at various levels of agencies' line-management hierarchies.

Potentially then, ICS integrated service networks may need to loosen previous bonding social capital - those strong ties among members of professional groups which are comfortable but limiting - to produce many new forms of relationships and norms of practitioner participation. The new relationships may produce and re-

produce and strengthen new, less exclusive, bonding, bridging and linking social capital networks to the benefit of practitioners and service users. Such an understanding of the benefit to all of building new social capital networks, if subsequently translated into new professional values and norms of practice, might act positively to energise professionals' efforts to work together productively.

In the context where Scottish schools are all moving towards ICS status by 2007, this article takes the view with Whitty and Campbell (2004, p.20) that 'the move towards integrated professional working and services' will be a key challenge for ICS. Moves to integrate service provision will not be easy or straightforward and a number of practical and cultural problems will be encountered in the changing governance, management, leadership and practice of professional groups. Problems of professional culture include views of children in relation to, for example, definitions of 'diagnosis', 'duty of care', 'needs' and 'entitlements'; and views of service, for example, differences between hitherto 'prioritising services' within health and the 'universal' service' provided by education.

Accepting the view that it is the lack of a shared vision that has adversely impacted on the co-construction of new frameworks for delivery in previous moves to integrate services using ICS as the hub, then forging practitioners' identifications with and positive attitudes to the norms and values of the ICS project emerges as a central and urgent problem. It is through a sense of belonging and identification with ICS and co-ownership of its values and practices that practitioners, including teachers and therapists, will be energised to actively work together to provide good joined-up service to children and families.

Policy moves integrating teacher/therapist work

A new focus on working together

1996 was something of a landmark year in Scotland for the dissemination of new thinking in policy relating to changing the school-based co-practice of teachers and speech and language therapists. In that year, research into therapist/teacher collaborative working was published by the University of Edinburgh (Reid *et al.*, 1996); professional standards for speech and language therapists working in schools were published by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT,

1996); and recommendations concerning the hallmarks of effective collaboration were made by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools in Scotland (HMI - now HMIE, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education) in the report *The Education of Pupils with Language and Communication Disorders* (HMI, 1996a).

The study by Reid *et al.* (1996) examined the existing service provision for children with speech and language difficulties in Scotland. Reviewing the conclusions of that report, Miller (1999) notes that:

Amongst its conclusions was the need for a shared framework between education staff and therapists in working with children with speech and language difficulties. Collaboration is not always straightforward and there are continuing difficulties. (p.141)

Drawing on the analysis of Norwich, Miller ascribes these continuing difficulties partly to:

limited knowledge of each other's specific skills, knowledge base and intervention assumptions (Norwich, cited in Miller, 1999, p.141).

Further, again drawing on Norwich, Miller (1999) suggests that:

There are also quite distinct cultures between teachers and speech and language therapists which can contribute to the difficulties. Experience suggests that the cultures arise partly from the education and health contexts in which they are situated. Therapists and teachers are 'brought up' differently and are conditioned during their initial professional education to think and work in different ways (p.141).

The RCSLT statement of professional standards, *Communicating Quality 2: Professional Standards for Speech and Language Therapists* (RCSLT, 1996), was concerned to address issues of knowledge, skills and information sharing; coherent and integrated programme planning and holistic management of all of the child's identified difficulties and overall needs. It addressed delivery of the service:

in such a way as to work with the education staff, incorporating the aims of the speech and language therapy programme in the planning of the language programme (p.61).

The Scottish Inspectorate report (HMI, 1996a), had identified similar concerns to those found by Reid *et al.* (1996) in relation to differences in initial professional education, cultures and practices. It stated that:

One of the most critical factors determining the quality of provision for pupils with language and communication difficulties was the quality of the partnership between speech and language therapists and teachers. (5.1: 33)

In the view of McCartney (2000), the report by HMI (1996a) might be characterised as

a statement advocating collaboration, emphasising the complementary roles of the professionals involved, and stressing joint planning and execution of plans. It implies a move away from the SLT as a 'specialist' or 'support service' and recognises the centrality of both the teacher and SLT in helping children... Such a step-change in education policy is to be welcomed. (p.54)

To implement such a 'step-change' might be seen to require a focus on the issue of joint training and pre-initial professional qualification education. In England and Wales, for example, a similar identified need to focus on improved joint service delivery produced the *I CAN Joint Professional Development Framework (JPDF)* (2001). That document was the product of a project funded by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in England and Wales and I CAN, the United Kingdom wide charity for children with speech and language difficulties. The JPDF prescribes a structured, hierarchical framework of work content, skills training and professional competence required by SLT and teachers in their integrated practice. The JPDF model of SLT/teacher continuing professional development is aimed to 'improve service delivery...promote collaborative practices...provide appropriate training to both teachers and SLTs' (p.5). Interestingly, to date, the JPDF has not migrated into Scottish service integration policies or impacted on SLT/teacher collaboration policy shifts.

Wider Scottish education policy moves

Since 1996, as the present author discusses elsewhere (Forbes, 2003), a number of wider Scottish policy developments have impacted directly on the therapist/teacher relationship. For example, developments within policy themes concerned with

individualised educational programme (IEP) planning, implementation and evaluation (HMI, 1999a, 1999b; Scottish Office Education Department (SEED)/Northern College, 2000), the promotion of 'effective' practice and performance evaluation (HMI, 1996b; SEED, 2002) and the institution of working practice 'agreements' (HMI, 1996a; SOEID, 1998) or 'written service contract' (HMI, 1996a, 5.3, 34).

HMI (1996b) suggested possible indicators of effective liaison and joint work between teachers and speech and language therapists (p.80). By 1998, those earlier policy statements seeking liaison in the work relations between specific professional groups had shifted to specifications for inclusive strategies underpinned by good multi-agency partnerships. In the wider arena of special educational needs legislation and policy, the publication of *A Manual of Good Practice in Special Educational Needs* (SOEID, 1998) constituted an important turn in Scottish policy drives to wider interprofessional, inter-agency working. Directly influencing the ways in which teachers and SLT should work together, guidance in SOEID (1998) on the working relationship between these two professional groups sits within wider prescriptions to all health services concerning co-working in Scottish schools. The manual specifies that:

The authority has identified the range of services provided by them, by relevant voluntary agencies, and by the health services in the area; a co-ordinated inter-agency approach is adopted where there is common involvement with client groups. (p.34)

The manual goes on to specify the features to look for at local authority, school and support service levels in relation to the themes of guidance and support for collaborative working and implementation and evaluation of collaborative practice. For example, amongst other criteria, SOEID (1998, p.34) recommends that:

- Joint professional development opportunities are provided to develop a common understanding of the special educational needs of the client groups and of the contribution the respective services make to meeting these needs.

- Where professional staff of different services are working together, working practice agreements are negotiated to clarify roles, responsibilities and accountability.
- Services work together to develop flexibility in approaches...
- Professional staff from relevant services involved in multi-disciplinary assessment...share their respective approaches to the assessment and identification of special educational needs with each other...
- Structures for monitoring, reviewing and evaluating services provided jointly, or for common client groups are developed. They involve multi-professional review of practice...

Another indicator that interest in the teacher/speech and language therapist working relation is now subsumed within wider professional partnership concerns is contained in SEED (2002) which updates and overtakes HMI (1996b). The quality of joint working at practitioner level is of continued interest in the more recent (2002) quality indicators evaluation document. However, the specific references made in the earlier publication (1996b, p.80) to effective liaison and joint work with SLT are not made in the SEED (2002) quality indicators.

The central focus in current Scottish policy and practice is on user-focused children's services and inter-agency working for social inclusion and social justice. In that policy context, earlier concerns and (sometimes rather heated) debates about whether, where, how and on whose terms teachers and speech and language therapists should work together have become peripheral - although of continued personal and professional interest to the practitioners concerned.

Given the above outline of multi-agency joined-up working policy in Scotland, it might seem that the earlier specific focus on the quality of the ties between teachers and speech and language therapists in their collaboration relationships has been subsumed in wider policy shifts. In the current Scottish policy position, the therapist/teacher relationship is but one amongst the many which need to operate smoothly together to produce the kinds of integrated education, health and social care services for children and young people envisaged in policy.

Integrating children's services in ICS: The policy moves

In Scotland, the 1998 publication of the UK Government's social inclusion strategy was followed by the Scottish Executive's social justice strategy: *Social Justice - A Scotland Where Everyone Matters* (1999). As outlined above, this article takes the view that recent policy efforts to develop teacher/therapist integrated working are derived from and feed into larger Scottish strategies to address children's needs 'in the round'. Policy drives to join up teacher/therapist working may thus be viewed as part of larger moves to integrate children's services in a context where all schools in Scotland will be Integrated Community Schools (ICS) by 2007.

Amongst the eight essential criteria, *New Community Schools: The Prospectus* (Scottish Office, 1998) specified

- *Integrated* provision of school education, informal as well as formal education, social work and health education and promotion services
- *Integrated management*
- *Arrangements* for the delivery of these services according to a set of integrated objectives and measurable outcomes
- *Commitment and leadership*
- *Multi-disciplinary training and staff development.* (pp.4-5: original emphasis)

The HMIE report, *Count Us In: Achieving Inclusion in Scottish Schools* (2002), views education as the arena in which the policy drives to inclusion and integration of agencies' services can be promoted. In that report by HMIE, New Community Schools and the multiplicity of initiatives to integrate education, health, social work and other services, was identified as 'a key element in the strategy to promote social inclusion and raise educational standards' (p.9).

The same report pointed to the importance of the quality of the links between schools and other support agencies in maximising the support provided for learning. In relation to working with external agencies within NCS, HMIE welcomed the initiation of 'common approaches to staff development, planning and evaluation...to make partnerships effective across all professional groups' (p.23). The report identified 'shared clarity of purpose and good liaison between different professionals, for

example...health service personnel...'(p.24) as key features of good practice with other agencies. It went on to make the assertion that schools working in partnership with others was a *sine qua non* for inclusive education – that 'inclusive education relies on schools working in partnership with others' (p.33: emphasis added) and called for

- increasingly close and effective working relationships with other agencies
- a shared understanding of aims and objectives and a clear understanding of the contribution that each agency can make towards achieving them
- a true partnership, in which all partners are prepared to share decision making and the leadership of specific pieces of appropriate ways
- staff from schools and other agencies relate to each other [in ways that] are flexible and managed responsively
- good opportunities for continuing professional development for all staff and for joint training between professional groups. (p.33)

In these HMIe (2002) policy exhortations directed to all professionals working in NCS, for example 'social workers, teachers, community education workers, police, health service personnel and voluntary agencies' (p.24), there are echoes of the earlier HMI (1996a) recommendations for 'joint goal setting...consulting...[and] joint training' (p.33) that were specifically targeted at teachers and speech and language therapists and their managers and leaders. Interestingly, the call for 'mutual trust and respect' (p.33) of each other's expertise seems to have mutated into understanding the contribution that one's own and other agencies can make.

The policy document *Educating for Excellence: Choice and Opportunity* (Scottish Executive, 2003) constituted the Executive's response to the discussion stage of the National Debate on Education in Scotland which was held during 2002. A stated Scottish Executive 'vision for the future' in that document (2003) is of 'Every school adopting the New Community School approach' (p.10). In relation to the theme of 'working together', the document notes that key comments made in the debate include 'More team working between teachers, social workers and medical services to help support young people' (p.14). The same document, within the section 'Working

together: next steps', states that between 2004 and up to and beyond 2007 the Executive plan to 'expand multidisciplinary working through New Community Schools and the Changing Children's Services Fund' (pp.15-16).

What underlies the current difficulties in service transformations?

HMIe (2004) have identified a number of difficulties in producing transformations of inter-practitioner relations in schools. As noted above, a number of concerns have previously been raised in research studies (see, for example, McCulloch, Tett & Crowther, 2004) about how teacher and SLT co-practice actually operates; and how the work of speech and language therapists in schools might work out in practice and be evaluated.

Practical obstacles to integration include the differences and complexities between professional groups' contractual arrangements concerning working hours and annual leave (Dessent, 1996). In their analysis of the differences in conditions of service specifically in relation to speech and language therapists and teachers, Reid and Farmer (2001) recognise a number of differences concerning holidays, place of work, contact time, non-contact time and professional responsibility.

But perhaps there are more fundamental differences that now need to be recognised and addressed. *The Sum of Its Parts* (2004), the recent HMIe report into the development of ICS in Scotland, concludes that:

the ICS initiative had not been fully successful in its aim of establishing a new over-arching vision and framework for the delivery of education and other children's services, using schools as the hub. (p.28)

HMIe go on to attribute this limited success in establishing a new shared vision and framework for integrated service delivery to insufficiency in the impact of the vision and ethos underpinning ICS initiatives in 'engaging the commitment of all relevant practitioners' and to the 'often limited awareness among...professionals in other agencies' (p.28).

Practitioners it would seem are not, as yet, actively and energetically engaging with the ICS vision and ethos of service integration. At issue, for ICS practitioners themselves, including teachers and speech and language therapists, is the question of how to acquire new, acceptable and productive personal and professional positions and identities in the emerging versions of networked professionalism currently being experimented with in integrated service contexts.

Service integration: To 2007 and beyond

As outlined above, the service integration 'step change' envisaged in policy has encountered a number of difficulties and failures in its implementations in practice, and there remain potential risks and uncertainties in attempting to achieve inclusion through service reform in Scottish schools. Nevertheless, the roll-out of the ICS approach continues across Scotland, drawing in all practitioner groups from health, education and social care - teachers and therapists included. Given the proliferating national policy envisioning ICS as the catalyst for and hub of joined-up working in Scotland no professional group or agency will be able to skip the change of step. None will be able to say 'count me out' or 'include us out' of ICS-based interprofessional innovations - that debate has moved on.

What seems to be at issue now in Scotland is how professional groups - including teachers and speech and language therapists - take ownership of ICS innovations that affect them and the children and parent users of their co-service. This article would suggest that ICS practitioners, including teacher and therapist practitioners, their leaders and managers and their agencies, might use the notion of 'types of social capital' - bonding, bridging and linking - as a set of conceptual resources with which to actively identify, define and measure work-relation transformations in ICS. The analytic of the types of social capital provides practitioners with new tools to examine the nature of their professional linkages, and better equips them to re-construct and manage the ICS policy vision of user-focused service integration more productively for themselves, their agency and children's services users. By applying these new conceptual tools practitioners will be better able to recognise, distinguish and carefully evaluate the new types, number and quality of work relations emerging in integrated children's services connections and networks. Recognising the

characteristics and uses of the three types of social capital networks, professionals, it is suggested, might choose to construct different types of work relations and networks and, by intensifying and improving co-operation and collaboration, create and sustain social capital to the benefit of both practitioners and service users. Opening up to question how interprofessional, inter-agency relationships currently serve as a resource, may help children's services to be changed in ways that address - and perhaps achieve - the goals of social justice and social inclusion.

References

- Baron, S., Field, J. & Schuller, T. (Eds.) (2000) *Social Capital: Critical perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Biggs, S. (1997) Interprofessional collaboration: Problems and prospects. In J. Ovretveit, P. Mathias & T. Thompson (Eds.), *Interprofessional Working for Health and Social Care*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Catts, R. (2004) *Working paper 1, Version 2: Social capital performance indicators*. Unpublished paper. Stirling: Applied Educational Research Scheme, Schools and Social Capital Network, University of Stirling..
- Dessent, T. (1996) *Meeting special educational needs - Options for partnership between health, social and educational services*. Tamworth: National Association for Special Educational Needs.
- Field, J. (2003) *Social Capital*. London: Routledge.
- Forbes, J. (2003) Grappling with collaboration: Would opening up the research 'base' help? *British Journal of Special Education*, 30(3), 150-155.
- HM Inspectorate of Schools (HMI) (1996a) *The Education of Pupils with Language and Communication Disorders*. Edinburgh: HMSO.
- HM Inspectorate of Schools (HMI) (1996b) *How Good is our School? Self-evaluation using performance indicators*. Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education and Industry Department.
- HM Inspectorate of Schools (HMI) (1999a) *Raising Standards - Setting Targets. Targets for pupils with special educational needs*. Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education and Industry Department.
- HM Inspectorate of Schools (HMI) (1999b) *Raising Standards - Setting Targets support pack: Special educational needs*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Education Department.

- HM Inspectorate of Education (HMIe) (2002) *Count Us In: Achieving inclusion in Scottish schools*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.
- HM Inspectorate of Education (HMIe) (2004) *The Sum of its Parts? The development of Integrated Community Schools in Scotland*. Edinburgh: HMIe.
- I CAN (2001) *Joint professional development framework - For all teachers and speech and language therapists working with children with speech, language and communication needs*. London: I CAN.
- Kilpatrick, S., Field, J. & Falk, I. (2003) Social capital: An analytical tool for exploring lifelong learning and community development. *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(3), 417-433.
- McCartney, E. (1999) Barriers to collaboration: An analysis of systemic barriers to collaboration between teachers and speech and language therapists. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 34.(4), 431-440.
- McCartney, E. (Ed.) (2000) *Speech/language therapists and teachers working together: A systems approach to collaboration*. London: Whurr.
- McCartney, E. (2004) 'Hard health' and 'soft schools': Research designs to evaluate SLT work in schools. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 20(2), 101-114.
- McCartney, E. & van der Gaag, A. (1996) How shall we be judged? Speech and language therapists in educational settings. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 12(3), 314-327.
- McCulloch, K., Tett, L. Crowther, J. (2004) New Community Schools in Scotland: Issues for inter-professional collaboration. *Scottish Educational Review*, 36(2), 129-144.
- Miller, C. (1999) Teachers and speech and language therapists: A shared framework. *British Journal of Special Education*, 26(3), 141-146.
- Ozga, J. & Catts, R. (2004) *Social capital: Concepts and implications: A discussion paper*. Unpublished paper. Stirling: Applied Educational Research Scheme: Schools and Social Capital Network, University of Stirling.
- Putnam, R. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Reid, J. & Farmer, H. (2001) *How good is our collaboration? Working practice agreements between schools and speech and language therapists*. Cardenden: Fife Council.
- Reid, J., Millar, S., Tait, L., Donaldson, M.L., Dean, E.C., Thomson, G.O.B. & Grieve, R. (1996) *The role of speech and language therapists in the education of pupils with special educational needs*. Edinburgh: Department of Psychology, University of Edinburgh.
- Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT) (1996) *Communicating quality 2: Professional standards for speech and language therapists*. London: RCSLT.
- Schools and Social Capital (SCC) Network of the Applied Educational Research Scheme (AERS) (2004) *Project 2: Redesigning professionalism and enabling professionals to use, recognise and develop social capital*. <http://www.aers.ac.uk/cgi-bin/aers/index.pl?qi+scc> (30.11.04).
- Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum (1993) *Support for Learning: Special educational needs within the 5-14 curriculum*. Dundee: SCCC.
- Scottish Executive (1999) *Social Justice - A Scotland where everyone matters*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Executive (2003) *Educating for Excellence: Choice and Opportunity. The Executive's Response to the National Debate*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Executive (2004) *Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Executive Education Department with Northern College (2000) *Success for all: Target setting within IEPs. A handbook for schools and education authorities*. Edinburgh: SEED.
- Scottish Executive Education Department (2002) *How Good is our School? Self-evaluation using quality indicators*. Edinburgh: SEED.
- Scottish Office (1998) *New Community Schools. The prospectus*. <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library/documents-w3/ncsp-01.htm> (16/11/04).
- Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (1994) *Effective provision for special educational needs*. Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (1998) *A manual of good practice in special educational needs*. Edinburgh: SOEID.

Tisdall, E.K. & Wallace, J. (2004) Integrated services - What do they mean for children and their parents? In J. Forbes (Ed.), *Values and Vision: Working together in Integrated Community Schools?* Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen.

Whitty, G. & Campbell, C. (2004) Integrating social justice and schooling: Research evidence and policy concerns. In J. Forbes (Ed.), *Values and Vision: Working together in Integrated Community Schools?* Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen.

STEP CHANGE OR FANCY FOOTWORK? PRIMARY HEADTEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES ON INTEGRATED COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Michael Cowie and Audrey Hendry
University of Aberdeen

Abstract

The New Community School policy in Scotland was heralded as step change towards a new and different approach to schooling, which would raise standards of attainment and achievement and build social capital in local communities (Scottish Office, 1998, p.8). Inter agency networks of professionals in education, health and social welfare, working collaboratively in the interests of children and their families, are central to the policy. This paper gives voice to the perceptions of 10 head teachers across three authorities, and considers how they have responded to the challenge of collaborative working within this new context. Meanings are extrapolated from verbatim extracts of coded interview transcripts and then related, through narrative and analytical comment, to key theoretical concepts and issues. This analysis suggests that is important to refocus and to develop the leadership and the kind of constructive networks that might be capable of dealing more effectively with the complexity of collaborative working.

Introduction

In Scotland, delivering social justice, through social inclusion, lifelong learning and active citizenship, has been a key pledge of the Scottish Executive since the re-opening of the Scottish Parliament in 1999 (Scottish Office, 1999). The creation of New Community Schools (NCS) was central to that process.

When the New Community School policy (now referred to as Integrated Community School) was launched it was argued that, without the adoption of a new and different approach to schools and schooling, many pupils from disadvantaged social and economic backgrounds could continue to expect to fare poorly within the education system. New Community School policy in Scotland is therefore aimed at 'tackling the spiral of disadvantage' in which some families seem trapped (Scottish Office, 1998, p.8). Targeting resources and restructuring schools into sites for inter-agency working is intended to realise the potential of all children and their families, raise

standards of attainment and achievement and build social capital in local communities.

The NCS policy constructs tackling disadvantage in terms of integration, partnership and collaboration and schools are urged to restructure services to allow for integrated service provision, delivered by inter-agency teams (Scottish Office, 1998).

Collaboration, seen as 'a virtue' (Tett, Crowther & O'Hara, 2003, p.40), is offered as an alternative to state and market failures to combat social problems, adding breadth and depth to intervention strategies and avoiding fragmentation, omission and duplication of services (Fairclough, 2000; Riddell & Tett, 2001; Webb & Vulliamy, 2001). Inter-agency collaboration in NCSs would, it was argued, ensure 'joint consideration of individual children's needs and joint action to address these' (Scottish Office, 1998, p.4).

New Community Schools

Initially the NCS policy aimed to create restructured schools in Scotland's worst areas of economic and social deprivation. The policy, borrowed from the 'one-stop for all services approach' of the Full Service School movement in the USA, developed there by some urban schools dealing with severe overcrowding, significant social and health problems and high drop-out levels amongst pupils (Dryfoos, 1994).

Initially five, then seven, Development Phase pilot New Community Schools were established across Scotland by the end of 1998. Phase One schools, having prepared successful bids to join the programme, were identified in April 1999 and a total of 37 schools in 30 authorities were then awarded New Community School status. Phase Two added a further eight projects in October 2000. Between phases two and three a name change occurred and New Community Schools became Integrated Community Schools (ICS) in an attempt by Scottish Ministers to highlight the inter-agency approach to service provision. Phase Three, the roll-out phase which is due to be completed by 2007, will see all schools in Scotland become Integrated Community Schools.

Models adopted have varied. A preferred model of restructuring, with one secondary school and its associated primary schools working together, made up the majority of

successful Phase One and Two bids. Taking part in the first two phases attracted additional funding of £200,000 per restructured unit. Phase Three expenditure has to be found from existing budgets and as a result Phase Three status will result in little, if any, enhanced funding.

Collaboration

ICS documentation envisages a multi-agency team made up of education, social work and health service staff, collaborating in more meaningful ways than previously found in schools. Improved co-ordination of existing services is seen as unlikely to be enough and it is argued that collaborative working requires to be guided by a set of integrated objectives, led by staff skilled in and committed to integrated approaches and set within an integrated management structure. The introduction of collaboration is seen as unproblematic.

However, there appears to be little empirical evidence to support the notion that collaborative practice results in increased effectiveness in terms of outcomes for service users (Ledwith, 1999). The creation and implementation of the ICS programme appears to be an 'act of faith,' based on 'some impressive success stories in some of the most disadvantaged urban and rural areas' (Scottish Office, 1998: Annex A). As Paterson (2000) points out, the scheme in Scotland was advanced on the basis of 'a hunch that it will work' and based on research from the United States which was 'too early to judge definitively'. Indeed, Boyd and Crowson (2000, p.63) report that the emphasis on inter-agency practice in the USA may have shifted and argue that full service schools, finding 'joined up working' difficult to establish and less effective than hoped for, have moved to 'direct pedagogical services to children' and now provide 'less activity than earlier in school-centred programs of generalised assistance to families'.

In this paper we regard collaboration as a continuum. At one end this means professionals from different agencies being aware of each other and to a limited extent working together 'to achieve some form of mutual benefit'. At the other, a more authentic interpretation of collaboration 'implies many organisations working together in harmony' with a 'shared purpose' (Tett *et al.*, 2003, p.39). At this end of the continuum collaboration demands integrating 'procedures, shared knowledge'

and developing 'a common understanding' of the aims of collaborative working (Wilson & Pirrie, 2000, p.7).

The original ICS document predicted that committed leadership and management would be important in developing effective collaborative practice. However, school managers have several problems to address and a shared understanding of collaboration is not easily achieved. Some staff, for example, may not accept that collaboration is valuable or may regard working with others as less important than their core tasks of learning and teaching. Tett *et al.* (2003) suggest that managers may fail to ensure that local project priorities articulate well with priorities set at regional or national levels and underestimate the need to make the aims of collaboration clear to others involved. Managers may become outcome driven, possibly as a result of external pressures, and fail to recognise the need to build the relationships and processes necessary for collaboration. And when relationships involve other agencies, managers do not always seem aware of the needs of others (McLaughlin, 2004). Decision-making processes can appear unpredictable and discussion about alternative courses of action may be 'bypassed' (Milbourne *et al.*, 2003, p.28).

Building inter-agency networks of professionals is a challenge for those leading and managing Integrated Community Schools. Allan, Mannion & Duffield (2004) contend that enhanced networks, with health, education and social care professionals working together to acquire new knowledge and understanding of alternative perspectives, may be one way of creating the 'reciprocity, trust and connectivity' (p. 154) necessary for sustained and effective collaboration. Clegg & McNulty (2002) also argue that enhanced networks are required and suggest that the connectedness of individuals and groups is essential for breaking down barriers to collaboration. But they also warn that work is rarely done in partnerships to enhance connectedness. As a result many collaborations are 'based on mutual warmth', dependent on individual relationships (p.591). These, they argue, are unsustainable.

Enhancing connectedness requires effective leadership and management but these are not value free concepts and processes because they are about what education should be trying to achieve. We thought it important therefore to consider headteachers' perspectives and perceptions and the values underpinning these and, following Levin's

premise that 'one can only learn about a social world from the people in it' (Levin, 1993, p. 331), we decided to interview headteachers. However, social reality is a human invention and meanings, intentions and activities are developed within the framework of social structures (Greenfield & Ribbins, 1993). This places the emphasis on headteachers as members of organisations. It was important, therefore, to capture data on their perceptions of the headteachers 'from the inside', and then attempt to explicate how they come to understand and define collaboration and inter-agency working through Integrated Community Schools. Given the significance attached to Integrated Community Schools in Scotland, how do head teachers define their world (Spradley, 1979)? What are their views on collaboration? How do they regard inter-agency working? And how effective and productive are existing practices from their perspective?

The investigative method

Our intention was to throw light on the collaborative relationships and processes involved in managing schools designated as Integrated Community Schools. We did not, therefore, attempt to refute or confirm a hypothesis. Our intention was to address relevant issues, engage headteachers' 'interpretive capabilities' (Holstein & Gubrium, 1997, p.122) and bring their constructions to bear on the Integrated Community Schools initiative. Semi-structured, open-ended interviews were therefore designed to encourage headteachers to construct answers from which it would be possible to make inferences about the how and in what way becoming an Integrated Community School changed or is changing the role of the headteacher and influences school practice, and to predict how headteachers are likely to react to changing policies and approaches with regard to the initiative. The interview design therefore represented an attempt to gain access to the meanings that head teachers attribute to their experiences so far in relation to Integrated Community Schools.

However, although our intention was to collect data which give an 'authentic insight' into the experiences of headteachers (Silverman, 1993, p.91), that is not to say that the interviews represent an attempt to reflect an existing social reality. We leaned more towards an interactionist perspective based on a belief that 'people create and maintain meaningful worlds' (Miller & Glassner, 1997, p.102) and that people act in or toward a situation according to how they define it.

Nevertheless, in any qualitative research, there is potential for bias and although we attempted to safeguard against this danger, the analysis of qualitative data is very much a personal activity and, in the conduct of the interviews and the subsequent analysis, some filtering of the data through our perspectives and attitudes is probably inevitable. Our analysis is therefore both descriptive and interpretive. Because it is interpretive it is also subjective: several interpretations of the data may be possible and others might interpret the data differently. However, we believe that the account given below is well grounded conceptually and empirically and, to confirm the validity of the study, care is taken to describe the data collection and analysis process in more detail in the next section.

Data collection and analysis

Collection

Two researchers were involved and a semi structured schedule devised with agreed probes and potential prompts. Two headteachers were invited to take part in pilot interviews because we were conscious of a need to evaluate our interview technique and to look for obvious difficulties. This also served as a control mechanism to mitigate against any tendency on our part to shape the interview and manipulate the outcome. Each headteacher spoke freely and frankly, with a negligible amount of prompting and little probing and, from unsolicited comments made at the end of each interview, they welcomed the opportunity to talk about their experiences because it enabled them to reflect on the issues concerned. Each interview lasted around 50 minutes and was taped and transcribed. Following the pilot, slight adjustments were made before the final schedule was agreed.

The analysis process

Analysis involves making sense of the data. In this study, this involved drawing on and examining headteacher responses to get a better understanding of their perceptions, assumptions and values, in order to enable consideration of the implications of that fuller understanding for policy processes and initiatives. Our objective was to 'produce an intelligent, coherent and valid account' (Dey, 1993, p. 52). On balance, it seemed appropriate to take, as far as possible, an inductive, grounded approach and to generate codes from the data. There were two main reasons for this. First, as argued above, the

focus of the study (on understanding relationships in a particular arena), pushed us into grounding our understanding in the concepts and theories of the participants; and secondly, in a more inductive approach 'data get well moulded to the codes that represent them, and we get more of a code-in-use flavour than the generic code for many uses generated by a prefabricated short list' (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p.58).

Our attempt to interrogate the data in a rigorous way, without imposing an interpretation on it, yet remaining sensitive to the context, necessitated dissecting the transcribed interviews meaningfully without destroying the relations between the parts (Miles & Huberman, 1994), and applying codes. In essence, this coding was the meat of our analysis, because the codes were chosen and given significance and did not simply emerge from the data. Decisions on what was or was not significant involved both independent selective interpretation and discussion, and defining and redefining codes involved selective conceptualisation and movement between perception and explanation.

First-level codes were generated, which in turn generated second-level non-content specific set, superordinate categories or abstract codes. These were: *setting/context* (general background information with regard to governance and policy); *definition of the situation* (from Bogdan & Bilkin, 1992) - how the headteachers understand, define or perceive the situation); ways of thinking about people (including issues to do with role definition and responsibilities); *perspectives* (including fundamental beliefs and values which govern 'how things should be done', and reference to attitudes and dispositions); *activities* (important happenings, events and processes such as policy changes); *strategies* (also from Bogdan & Bilkin, ways of accomplishing things, tactics, methods, techniques for meeting needs); *relationships* (internal or external relationships and interactions) and *outcomes* (in relation to practice, school culture or inter-agency working).

Presentation and analysis

This section summarises and analyses the data. Meanings are extrapolated from verbatim extracts of coded transcripts, informed by our knowledge of the culture and context of the system in Scotland. The category headings and sub-headings used in the hierarchical index provide the organisational framework.

Policy setting: Attitudes, purposes and perceived benefits

Without exception, the headteachers were supportive of the concept of inter-agency collaboration. This held true whether or not the individual projects they were involved in had been successful. Each identified likely gains in terms of the more effective or efficient use of resources, support available to staff and to pupils and the speed which interventions could be organised. The ICS initiative was welcomed because:

.... something that has been wrong in the past, where different agencies were going down their own avenues and quite often repeating the work that was done with children and perhaps putting additional strains on families because all the different agencies were repeating themselves. (SR, LA1)

For some, initial cynicism generated in response to being forced to constantly deal with yet another imposed initiative seems to have changed as projects developed. This resurfaced however, when projects faltered.

Headteachers saw the aims of ICS in terms of providing support for pupils and their families, and in terms of co-ordinating service provision across agencies. There is a focus on meeting the needs of the whole child, not simply on meeting education needs. For example:

I think that community schools look on a wider aspect and I think that that's good to be able to look at it from a wider perspective. (SR, LA1)

I would suggest ICS is really bringing together those agencies who can provide a support to vulnerable children and families in particular circumstances and in some way pro-actively to generate ideas for improving the well-being of families within the area. (DS, LA3)

Aims were also expressed in terms of building collaborative approaches to practice. As one put it:

(ICS) was to involve all the daily services, some of them have bases within the school, to involve the parents, to make it more open, to involve social services as well, to have a partnership of working. (UC, LA3)

However, aims reflecting the wider range of essential and likely characteristics of the original documentation were not emphasised. There is no reference to community engagement and little is said about inter-agency staff development. Perhaps more

significantly, respondents did not touch on how the aims and future direction of the school might be integrated with the objectives of other agencies.

Consultation and structure

Headteachers across the three authorities describe similar experiences of becoming involved in the initiative. The decision to include individual schools and the model used in the roll-out programme seems to have been taken at authority level, without consultation with headteachers or school staff. Respondents describe consultation as one-sided, with events taking the form of information sessions where plans, roles and responsibilities and possible areas for development were presented to headteachers. Initial development plans, even when headteachers were aware of them, appear to have been drawn up without involving headteachers. One head, for example, said:

We really weren't privy to any of the plans. The manager of the New Integrated School explained what was to happen (PA, LA 2)

Another was:

...not aware that there were very well structured developmental plans, certainly not drawn up at our end. (YF, LA1)

Consultation between headteachers and school staff, pupils and parents seems to have been similarly restricted:

I would say consultation is too big a word; staff have been kept up to speed with what is going on. (YF, LA1)

Ironically, this approach to consultation and developing shared aims and policies contrasts sharply with the collegial and consultative approach schools in Scotland are encouraged to adopt towards development planning and school improvement. For example, two key documents, *The Standard for Headship* (SOEID, 1998) and *Improving Leadership in Scottish Schools* (HMIe, 2000), stress the importance of participation and consultation in supporting effective change. Limited involvement in planning for the introduction of the initiative suggests that initial planning was less developed than school development planning. For headteachers, this was a source of frustration and one consequence was that they were unable to integrate implementing the initiative with school planning. As one put it:

We were not involved with any administration at our end in terms of what we do for our own school development planning. (YF, LA1)

Relationships with other agencies were generally good, but this was not necessarily an outcome of the initiative, because, as one reported:

relationships were always strong, nothing has changed there. (VE, LA3)

Schools across the three authorities operated within a similar framework. Each was one of an existing formal group, cluster or network of schools consisting of a secondary school and its associated primary schools, and the heads both describe and locate their schools as being part of an integrated community network, not as integrated community schools.

Networks were co-ordinated by a specially appointed co-ordinator or manager or equivalent and governed by a committee made up of representatives from several agencies. Funding for the networks was considered disappointing, particularly when compared with the initial piloting stage ('the paint has got spread a bit more thinly' - MM, LA2), and in some cases was seen as a brake on development.

Headship

Purposes, roles and boundaries

Our headteachers defined their role in broad terms and supported the initiative in principle because education was seen as:

having much wider implications than purely involvement of pupils with the curricular areas ... we need to look at the whole pupil. (BW, LA3)

Some argued that being involved in inter-agency working is only a small part of the purpose of headship. For example:

I am juggling all the balls up in the air and the Network is one of many, I have to say. (DV, LA3)

The interview data suggest a lack of clarity about roles within ICS projects. Some describe the role of co-ordinator or manager as one of leading or driving the project forward:

Well, I feel that the co-ordinator is very focused and has a clear idea of where she is going, and what kind of areas she wants to develop and I think, especially at this stage in the game, you need somebody with that kind of positive approach and who really has a clear idea of the lines that they want to go down. Because it's new to everybody so I think we are quite happy to let that happen. (SR, LA1)

Nevertheless, headteachers largely wished to retain control over the types of project work undertaken by the network and over inter-agency staff while they were working within individual schools. Some extended this degree of control to the point where inter-agency staff were regarded:

very much as extensions of our own staff. (CA, LA2)

In one authority it had been suggested that senior school staff assume direct line management responsibilities for inter-agency staff. This was viewed unfavourably:

It was at one point suggested that, I think it was a recognition of the pressure on the central manager, it was suggested that the management be devolved to local management and the suggestion was automatically treated with a wee bit of suspicion. (CM, LA2)

Management

Planning, decision-making, communication, resource allocation, accountability

As suggested earlier, planning at the education authority level was the subject of some criticism. Some indicated that the initiative had been slow to establish or had not been suitably supported at authority level. Others reported that projects in their networks had lost momentum and come to a stop:

It's easier to think in terms of when it stopped for us because it doesn't exist at the moment. It dried up for us in real terms about Christmas last year, 2003. (CM, LA2)

A sense of frustration surfaces again when respondents talk about a lack of stability in authority-level planning. Two of the three authorities were in the process of refocusing their Integrated Community School programme. Describing the coming restructuring in one authority, one head argued that:

.... the system is far too early to change. Half of the secondaries and most of the primaries have hardly got their feet off the ground in this and from my point of view that's quite demoralising. I don't know how they can even make a value judgement at this point in time on impact of networks when they haven't really had enough time to impact across the communities. Anyway that's my thoughts. (YF, LA1)

Planning at network level was limited in most cases and few had formal development plans. Without strategic leadership and management there was a policy vacuum and school and area school plans were seen as being more significant than network plans. As one put it:

...really for schools, the school development plan and the Area School Group development plan are much more relevant documents. (DS, LA3)

For headteachers, therefore, management within the initiative meant responding to proposals and suggestions from inter-agency network staff. When asked about decision-making processes, headteachers concentrated on two issues: referral systems to match pupil needs to available resources, and how small-scale developments were agreed on and supported.

Formal referral processes had been established across each of the authorities and, while these were generally seen as necessary, they were also seen as slowing down intervention and, where good systems had existed previously, adding an unnecessary layer of bureaucracy.

Communication between network members appears in almost all cases to be good. Headteachers describe enhanced links with inter-agency colleagues and welcome the ability to contact them informally for advice.

As yet, no authority appears to have established robust quality assurance mechanisms, although this may change in the short to medium term as the Scottish Executive are due shortly to publish performance indicators for Integrated Community Schools.

Collaboration and network building

Headteachers in this study readily accepted the need to collaborate with other agencies. The interview data suggest that most actively collaborated with staff in other agencies and it is clear that new or enhanced links were beginning to develop. Heads who reported little change in this regard suggested that this was linked to low levels of need within their schools. For example:

For the last three or four years we had had Local Community Networks and I have been finding that, of all the schools, we are one of the schools that would make fewest demands on the LCN. . For me I am sort of sitting and nodding and agreeing to things but there is not a great need for anything for ourselves. (BW, LA3)

Most collaboration centred round establishing new small-scale developments within schools. Inter-agency work on these small-scale projects tended to involve inter-agency staff coming into schools to work with individuals and groups.

Respondents defined collaboration as:

working closely together and supporting one another. (FA, LA 2)
talking to colleagues. (VS, LA3)

One argued that:

Collaboration means trust and sharing ideas and really just working together without any preconceived ideas and I think at the end of the day it also means breaking down barriers or preconceived barriers and really learning to trust one another. (YF, LA1)

Interestingly, however, respondents chose not to mention the goals or needs of other service providers. Collaboration was seen in terms of being helpful to develop a better greater understanding of inter-agency staff roles and responsibilities in order to better access the services available. For example, staff from other agencies are seen as helpful when working alongside school staff and being available when required:

We had community education in, they came down and worked with some of our older children establishing a buddy system and they did the training for that. (FA, LA2)

Although some collaborative arrangements pre-date the ICS initiative, others have been newly established. The agencies involved were typically community education, social work, educational psychology services, local police services and local health services (largely through health promotion). Sustaining these networks proved difficult in some cases, primarily because of frequent changes in personnel, competing demands on time and the scarcity of resources. Some headteachers had anticipated conflict but little had emerged. Effective collaboration was often put down to personal relationships and the personalities and attitudes of those involved. For example:

We tended to work at the person-to-person level and because they had the qualities that we valued, it worked. There were members of the team that didn't have that personal role quality and we found ourselves unable to get excited about their potential. (FA, LA2)

Effective collaboration was dependent on personalities and circumstances and so, except where a formal leadership position had been established, leadership was seen as problematic:

I think the concept of leadership within the local community network is a difficult one, because you're dealing with many different agencies, many different people and particularly headteachers who are extremely difficult to deal with. (CA, LA2)

Headteachers were conscious that potentially every member of the network had a leadership role, but leadership responsibility for building and sustaining authentic collaborative relationships, and developing and sharing a set of beliefs and aims in relation to integrated working, did not seem to have been worked out. One respondent, for example, regarded leadership as:

...a grey area. I don't think that has ever been resolved and I think that is one of the weaknesses in it. (HE, LA3)

Outcomes

Practice, culture, people and events

In terms of outcomes, perhaps the most obvious has been the additional events and support groups set up in these Integrated Community Schools. Each school appeared to value these changes and sought to continue or expand the range and nature of them. In one school, for example:

Provision has expanded, for example in the area of health that we were developing...and broadened children's experiences...but certainly regarding supporting some children who have behavioural difficulties, yes it has. (SR, LA1)

However, as one head pointed out, because of other external pressures, many of these events and support strategies would have come about without the involvement of ICS:

The network has perhaps widened the number of people who we come into contact with, one that springs to mind is health promotions for example, but I think again that would have happened anyway without necessarily having local community networks involved. (DS, LA3)

Nevertheless, respondents did talk about a changing culture with more active collaboration and a greater understanding of the roles of others. The initiative had barely started and, as one argued, a cultural shift needs time to develop:

....we need more time to let it become embedded. I think there are areas that we still want to develop, areas that still need to be established and we need to give them time for that. (DV, LA3)

Despite uncertain leadership, management and governance arrangements, respondents remain committed to the principle of providing integrated services but the headteachers interviewed believe that there is a long way to go before this aim can be realised. As one put it:

I think they are still very much aspiring to those aims, because I certainly don't think we have achieved it, or anywhere near achieved them. (DS, LA3)

In terms of outcomes, the ICS does not appear to have had a significant effect on the role of the headteacher. Nor has it had a significant effect on the day-to-day working

of the school. Although most headteachers could point to individual instances where pupils or families had been supported as a result of the ICS initiative, the quotations below illustrate that it has, as yet, impacted little on practice in their schools:

ICS probably hasn't added very much to the value of what is going on in our school. (BW, LA3)

I'm going to be slightly controversial here, in that I don't feel that the local community network process has really achieved a great deal more than we would have done ourselves. (DE, LA3)

Discussion

The roll-out of the Integrated Community School concept represents a significant change in Scottish education. To get some leverage on the nature of the change it is important to identify and understand the perspectives, and indeed the needs of headteachers, to cultivate new ways of relating, to conceptualise the nature of collaboration and define its conditions and purposes. By attempting to get a better understanding of their perspectives and exploring a few issues and concepts related to the Integrated Community Schools programme this paper gives some insight into what might facilitate and sustain the initiative.

What can be taken from this study? Firstly, it is possible to say with some confidence that a better understanding of the sociology of organisations and the complexity of the processes of change is required if practice is to change in a meaningful way. The headteachers in this study value coherence, are well disposed towards the concept of inter-agency working, wish to work collaboratively with other professionals and a willingness to affiliate emerges from the data. However, with only one exception, there is also a sense of disillusionment, with problems of role ambiguity, frustration and professional dissatisfaction.

The literature on change in education suggests that fundamental change is not controllable and there is evidence available to inform us about how and why reform in education fails or succeeds (Cuban, 1988; Sarason, 1990). Cuban, for example, talks about first- and second-order change. First-order change is relatively straightforward and focuses on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of existing practices without changing organisational features and role behaviour, while second-order change, which

is more fundamental and to do with organisational roles and relationships, is more difficult to achieve. One important lesson in dealing with second-order change is that strategic thinking cannot be separated from the realities of practice

If change is not manageable from the centre, then inter-agency working may be better facilitated through more flexible structures with professionals in a range of agencies and people in each community being encouraged to address questions related to means and purpose. This involves a need to engage in 'systems thinking' within the learning organisation (Senge, 1996). But systems thinking involves looking at interrelationships, not linear cause-effect chains, and processes of change, not snapshots. And because second-order change is complex and involves changes in role behaviour, work patterns and relationships, it is not easy to achieve.

The indication that progress towards authentic collaboration has been limited so far is therefore not surprising. The headteachers characterise current structures as bureaucratic (being rule-bound), with collaborative activity centred on specific, fragmented events (some of which would have taken place had there been no ICS initiative) or focused on individual children and their families. There seems little scope for collaborative working or collegiate decision-making, and limited opportunity to learn from collective experience.

People's actions are influenced by their interaction with others, and so the relationships headteachers have with one another and with other professional colleagues are critical. What emerges from the data in this study is that the relationship between the various agencies involved needs to be defined and linked more meaningfully to purposes and to improving professional practice. Collaboration and co-ordination are important features of Integrated Community Schools but the data suggest that neither the purposes of inter-agency working nor the features, processes and structures that might facilitate the collaboration required have not been thought through.

While the headteachers stressed the importance of collaborative relationships, this was expressed primarily in terms of the interest of the school and enhancing existing provision (in providing direct support for particularly vulnerable children and families or in developing or supporting specific curricular initiatives) without fundamental re-

thinking and recognition of any intention to work with other agencies to develop and change practice. Improved provision implied doing the same things better rather than doing different things and any sense of a need for interdependence did not emerge.

While the literature on change emphasises the benefits of collaboration and coordination, it also highlights the importance of ownership and commitment (Ball, 1987). The point about changed relationships and shared responsibilities is critical and relevant here also. Local and national Government control over policy and direction means that the conception and vision of collaboration which headteachers and others are expected to articulate are not their own, nor that of the school staff or the school community, but one which is centrally determined. All of the headteachers in this study referred to a lack of consultation when the initiative was introduced. This expectation to be compliant and to implement the vision of others is significant because it runs counter to notions of professionalism and contemporary thinking on leadership and perhaps helps explain the views expressed by the headteachers.

In education, delegated leadership and collaborative decision-making are strongly associated with commitment and one lesson to be drawn from this is that policy implementation should be oriented 'more towards the development of commitment (and capacity) and less towards compliance' (Leithwood, 1996, p.392). This points to a need for a more open and accessible approach to policy-making on the part of the Scottish Executive, with high involvement principles included within a systemic approach.

Without exception, the headteachers in this study talked of a lack of meaningful consultation. Compliance in the first stages of the roll-out was secured through additional funding but a more productive (and acceptable) Government approach to significant change would involve the Scottish Executive in defining its role in terms of involving and empowering others and creating the conditions which would support the emergence of a new kind of professionalism, with schools and education authorities being encouraged to develop their own 'bottom-up' initiatives to engage in partnership with 'top-down' initiatives.

Headteachers talked about the importance of developing trust among professionals from different agencies and this relates to Fullan's (1991) notion of 'interactive

professionalism', which moves beyond collaboration among individuals to involve institutional partnerships. But to get a better understanding of what makes for effective collaboration it is important to be clear about what its purposes are. Without engagement, involvement and discussion collaboration can have no meaning and changed structures such as the networks described in this study may do little more than improve a little on existing practice or simply become ends in themselves.

For collaboration to be effective in practice it would be important to spell out the reality behind the slogan and agree the components. This might mean, for example, being explicit about purposes and shared aims, agreed understandings about democratic and management accountability, openness and honesty, common accessible monitoring systems and data (where client confidentiality permits), developing a no-blame culture and a co-operative approach to problem-solving, and an emphasis on improving the service provided to individuals and families within the terms of a collaborative agreement. It would also be important to define specific roles and responsibilities. Given these features, the sense of trust and co-operation, which characterises meaningful relationships, might allow headteachers and other professionals to understand each other and work effectively together.

The structure of the education system in Scotland means that it is difficult to consider the nature of collaborative relationships and inter-agency working without also referring to the role of the education authority. Schools and education authorities in Scotland exist in a changing policy environment and must continually evolve their management and organisational systems and structures. The hierarchical nature of the system remains unchanged however. But although improvement processes may be dependent upon cultural change, they can also help create change. This study suggests that there is a policy leadership vacuum with no clear strategic leadership of the initiative. It may be helpful, therefore, to define and specify the authority role in terms of leadership rather than management. 'Management' has connotations of control and direction which, we suggest, would make the commitment of headteachers to genuine collaboration problematic, whereas 'leadership' can be defined in terms of communicating, facilitating and creating supportive working relationships.

As traditionally defined, leadership implies hierarchical divisions of power, accompanied by a mind-set that positional authority and leadership are inseparable (Crowther, 1997). A more appropriate view is that leadership is about building a collaborative culture, particularly at a time of social and political change (Jenkins, 1997; Whitaker, 1993).

While a collaborative approach to decision-making may be more appropriate and it would be sensible to conceive of the leadership role of the authority in these terms, the concept of leadership as the art of empowering others is also problematic. It is unlikely that increased consultation about how to implement decisions made elsewhere will be sufficient to sustain or strengthen the morale and enthusiasm of headteachers. To move beyond the rhetoric of collaboration towards genuine collaboration and empowerment may require a shift in the existing mind-set and a willingness to relinquish power at higher levels in the system, and acknowledging the need to involve headteachers and other professionals in meaningful discussion at a strategic level. This draws attention to the moral and value dimensions of decision-making, which involve 'continuous critical discourse and social action as a means of addressing social injustice and disadvantage within an organisation' (Crowther, 1997, p.13).

Not only is the policy environment constantly changing, so too is the role of the headteacher, and the Integrated Community School initiative provides further evidence of this. Ten years ago Vandenberghe (1995) noted that much conceptual work had been done on the role of the head in schools of the future, most of which emphasises the changing and multi-dimensional nature of headship.

Vandenberghe's notion of 'creative leadership' helps bring this analysis together. He described two sets of empirical studies, one relating to the internal activities of a headteacher, the other relating to how headship changes in response to the changing policy environment. In terms of internal leadership, creativity was defined as, 'the power to develop, within organisational members, the capacity to craft solutions to local identified concerns' (p.16). In the context of environmental leadership, creativity was considered to be 'the power to establish an acceptable balance between the (expectations of) environment and the school's redefinition of these expectations' (p.16).

Vandenberghe also argued that creativity implies a 'workable independence legitimated and based on a vision about education and the school as an organisation' (p.3).

Perhaps the sense of frustration that emerges in this study reflects a need to develop the kind of 'creative leadership' identified by Vandenberghe and move away from a reactive culture. Analysis of the data set suggests that the headteachers recognise that individual schools are limited in what they can do working independently to help improve learning, and improve social welfare and that some form of systemic approach is needed. They value coherence and wish to work collaboratively with colleagues, but this analysis suggests that it is important to refocus before an opportunity is missed and to develop the leadership and the kind of constructive networks that might be capable of dealing with the complexity of collaborative working.

As with most research of this nature this study points towards the need for more research in this area, particularly research grounded in the perspectives of professionals in other social services. However, what does seem clear is that authentic collaboration is problematic and not at all straightforward, and involves much more than fancy footwork and moving the collaborative furniture around.

References

- Allan, J., Mannion, G. & Duffield, J. (2004) Premature evaluation? Measuring the impact of New Community Schools. *Scottish Educational Review*, 36 (2), 145-158.
- Arblaster, L., Conway, J., Foreman, A, Hawtin, M. (1996) *Asking the impossible? Interagency collaboration to address the housing, health and social care needs of people able to live in ordinary housing*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Ball, S. J. (1987) *The Micropolitics of the School*. London: Methuen.
- Ball, S. (2001) Labour, learning and the economy: A 'policy sociology' perspective. In M. Fielding (Ed), *Taking education really seriously: Four years' hard labour*. London: Routledge / Falmer. Pp 45-56.
- Baron, S. (2001) New Scotland, New Labour, New Community Schools: New authoritarianism? In S. Riddell & L. Tett (Eds.), *Education, social justice and inter-agency working. Joined-up or fractured policy?* London: Routledge. Pp 87-104

- Bogdan, R. & Bilken, S.K. (1992) *Qualitative Research for Education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Boyd, W.L. & Crowson, R.L. (2001) Coordinated school-linked services: The US experience. In S. Riddell & L. Tett, (Eds.), *Education, Social Justice and Inter-agency Working. Joined-up or fractured policy?* London: Routledge. Pp58-69.
- Clegg, S. & McNulty, K. (2002) Partnership working in delivering social inclusion: Organisational and gender dynamic. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 17 (5), 587-60.
- Crowther, F. (1997) The William Walker Oration, 1996. Unsung heroes: The leaders in our classrooms *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(1), 5-17.
- Cuban, L. (1988) A fundamental puzzle of school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70(5), 341-344.
- Denzin, N, K. (1970) *The Research Act in Sociology*. London: Butterworth.
- Dey, I. (1993) *Qualitative Data Analysis: A user-friendly guide for social scientists*. London: Routledge.
- Dryfoos, J.G.(1994) *Full Service Schools A revolution in health and social services for children, youth and families*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge / Falmer.
- Firestone, W. (1993) Alternative arguments for generalising from research. *Educational Researcher*, 22(4), 16-23 (cited in Miles & Huberman, 1994).
- Fullan, M. (1991) *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. London: Cassell.
- Greenfield, T. & Ribbins, P. (Eds.) (1993) *Greenfield on Educational Administration: Towards a humane science*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Gregson, B.A., Cartlidge, A. & Bond, J.(1991) *Interprofessional Collaborations in Primary Health Care Organization*. London: Royal College of General Practitioners.
- Handy, C. & Aitken, R. (1986) *Understanding Schools as Organizations*. Harmondsworth: Pelican.
- HMIe (2000) *Improving Leadership in Scottish Schools*. Edinburgh: HMSO.
- HMIe (2004) *The Sums of its Parts: The development of Integrated Community Schools in Scotland*. Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Holstein, J. A. & Gubrium, J. F. (1997) Active interviewing. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, method and practice*. London: Sage.

- Houghton, V., McHugh, R. & Morgan, C. (Eds) (1975) *Management in Education: The management of organisations and individuals*. London: Ward Lock Educational/Open University Press.
- Jenkins, H. (1997) Leadership: a model of cultural change. In B. Fidler, S. Russel & T. Simkins (Eds.), *Choices for Self-managing Schools: Autonomy and accountability*. London: Paul Chapman. Pp197-209.
- Ledwith, F. (1999) Policy contradictions and collaboration in community mental health services in Britain. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 12(3), 236-248.
- Leithwood, K. (1996) Commitment - Building approaches to school restructuring: Lessons from a longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 11(3), 377-398.
- Levin, B. (1993) Collaborative research in and with organizations. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(4), 331-340.
- Levin, B. (1998) An epidemic of education policy: What can we learn from each other? *Comparative Education*, 34(2), 131-141.
- McCulloch, K., Tett, L. & Crowther, J. (2004) New Community Schools in Scotland: Issues for inter-professional collaboration. *Scottish Educational Review*, 36(2), 129-143.
- McLaughlin, H. (2004) Partnerships: Panacea or pretence? *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 18(2), 103-113.
- Milbourne, L., Macrae, S. & Maguire, M. (2003) Collaborative solutions or new policy problems: Exploring multi-agency partnerships in education and health work. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(1), 74-85.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, J. & Glassner, B. (1997) The 'inside' and the 'outside': Finding realities in interviews. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, method and practice*. London: Sage. Pp.97-112.
- Paterson, L. (2000) New Community Schools. *The Scotsman*, 18.04.00.
- Pirrie, A. (2000) *Multidisciplinary Teamworking: Beyond the barriers? A review of the issues*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Purkey, S. C. & Smith, M. S. (1983) Effective schools: A review. *Elementary School Journal*, 427-452.
- Riddell, S. & Tett, L. (Eds.) (2001) *Education, Social Justice and Interagency Working: Joined up or fractured policy?* London: Routledge / Falmer.

- Sammons, P., Power, S., Elliot, K., Robertson, P., Campbell, C. & Whitty, G. (2002) *New Community Schools in Scotland: An interim report on the New Community School pilot phase*. London: Institute of Education, University of London.
- Sammons, P., Power, S., Elliot, K., Robertson, P., Campbell, C. & Whitty, G. (2003) *New Community Schools in Scotland: Final report, national evaluation of the pilot phase*. London: Institute of Education, University of London.
- Sarason, S. (1990) *The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Scottish Office (1998) *New Community Schools: The prospectus*. Edinburgh: Scottish Office.
- Scottish Office (1999) *Social Inclusion Strategy for Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Office.
- Senge, P.M. (1996) The leader's new work: Building learning organizations. In K. Starkey (Ed.), *How Organizations Learn*. London: International Tomson Business Press.
- Silverman, D. (1985) *Qualitative Methodology and Sociology*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Silverman, D. (1993) *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. London: Sage.
- SOEID (1998) *The Standard for Headship in Scotland*. Glasgow: SQH Development Unit.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979) *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Stenhouse, L. (1978) Case studies and case records: Towards a contemporary history of education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 4(2), 21-39.
- Strauss, A. L. & Corbin, J. (1990) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tett, L., Crowther, J. & O'Hara, P. (2003) Collaborative partnerships in community education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(1), 37-51.
- Tomlinson, S. (2001) *Education in a Post-welfare Society*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Trowler, P. (2003) *Education Policy* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge/ Falmer.
- Vandenberghe, R. (1995) Creative management of a school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 33(2), 1-16.

- Webb, R. & Vulliamy, G. (2001) Joining up the solutions: The rhetoric and practice of inter-agency cooperation. *Children & Society*, 15, 315-332.
- Westoby, A. (1975) Education as a system. In L. Dobson, T. Gear, T. & A. Westoby (Eds.), *Management in Education: Some techniques and systems*. London: Ward Lock Educational/Open University Press.
- Whitaker, P. (1993) *Managing Change in Schools*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Whitty, G. (2002) *Making Sense of Education Policy*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Wilson, V. & Pirrie, A. (2000) *Multidisciplinary team-working: Indicators of good practice*. Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education.

**CHANGING ROLES, CHANGING BOUNDARIES,
CHANGING PROFESSIONAL IDENTITIES:
GUIDANCE AND PUPIL SUPPORT – A HOLISTIC VIEW**

**Leila Holm
University of Aberdeen**

Abstract

This paper draws on research undertaken into approaches to Guidance in 10 Scottish secondary schools. The research project was designed to be implemented in three stages: the first stage in 2001 was a pilot involving two schools; the second phase in 2003 involved a further eight; a third phase is planned in which changes in approaches to Guidance will be investigated at a suitable interval of time after the restructuring of promoted posts in Scotland following the publication of 'A Teaching Profession for the 21st century' (SEED, 2001). The data from the questionnaires and interviews provided a comprehensive picture of perceptions of guidance amongst pupils, teachers, parents, new community school workers, social workers, educational psychologists and careers advisers. The research found significant benefits when guidance was provided by staff whose remits were fully dedicated to guidance. The quality of pastoral care had improved, with much more of a team approach. Whole school approaches to guidance encouraged an inclusive ethos and a sense of belonging amongst pupils. Where whole school approaches were not well managed, there were signs of fragmentation and a diminution of quality of support. In schools in which more integrated and joined-up approaches to pupil support were being established, some of those involved were struggling to take on new ways of working and changing professional identities.

Introduction

At a time when those committed to promoting social inclusion are working hard to bring about integrated approaches to family and pupil support, it seems paradoxical that the system of guidance established in Scotland over 30 years ago would appear to be under threat. The system would seem, on the face of it, to have been a casualty of changes in the structure of promoted posts. This is not just about a change in nomenclature, with several local authorities and schools switching to the term pastoral care, but also about moves to share out roles and responsibilities through setting up whole school approaches to guidance and pupil support. What seems to have emerged since the publication of *A Teaching Profession for the 21st century* (SEED, 2001), is a diverse patchwork of provision across Scotland.

The impetus for change

There were indications in successive HMI reports, research conducted by Howieson and Semple in 1996, and further studies by them in 1998 and 2000, that guidance was in need of review. The system that was designed in the late '60s and early '70s to deliver pastoral care, curriculum and careers guidance and personal and social education, was by the mid-90s creaking at the seams. At annual Scottish Guidance Association conferences guidance teachers were reporting high levels of stress. No matter how hard they worked, they felt frustrated that they were not able to deliver the high quality service to which they were strongly committed.

The catalyst for major change was provided not only by the publication of *A Teaching Profession for the 21st century* (2001), but also the McConnell report, *Better Behaviour, Better Learning* (SEED, 2001) which advocated bringing together the various pupil support departments in schools. The McCrone (2000) report brought about the demise of Assistant Principal Teacher (APT) and Senior Teacher posts. Annex B of the McCrone report stated that pastoral care should be the remit of all teachers. A *Times Educational Supplement* editorial in 2001, commented:

We need a thorough-going review to refashion it (guidance) for the era of social inclusion. It may now be time to grasp the nettle of having full-time guidance teachers with a remit for social education, rather than the other way round.

In her 2002 research, Besley considered that an analysis of both the McCrone and McConnell Reports provided the policy rationale for the possibility of introducing full-time guidance teachers and/or school counsellors into Scottish schools, similar to the model used in some New Zealand schools. She suggested that guidance teachers could focus more on educational and vocational guidance and the teaching of Personal and Social Education, whereas school counsellors could provide a full-time, in-school counselling service focusing on personal and possibly vocational counselling, with perhaps the teaching of some PSE.

The new community schools movement added further momentum to the changes afoot in the system of pupil support.

The aim was to bring together education, health and social work and a range of other agencies, to provide a more integrated and holistic support service for children and their families. (HMIe, 2002a, p.9)

The long-term objective was to boost the social capital of children and young persons through closing the opportunities gap. It was recognised that schools had a major role to play through reducing disaffection and exclusion.

These various social, political and educational imperatives were regarded by many of those in management positions as an opportunity to shake up approaches to guidance and pupil support. In schools there were moves to bring together the departments of guidance and support for learning, and include those responsible for behaviour support. With calls for increased accountability, managers were seeking to ensure that systems were adding value and meeting the standard of support illustrated in the HMIe quality indicators (HMIe, 2002b). At grassroots level, some guidance teachers considered that this might be a real opportunity to be more pro-active, and shift away from a safety net approach. If those involved in family and pupil support could work together in ways that were genuinely collaborative, there might be a real chance to deliver effective guidance, pastoral care and pupil support for all, whilst responding to the particular needs of particular children at particular times. There was acknowledgement of the benefits that organising children's services as a single service, integrated system might bring, such as closer partnership with the home, ensuring access to services, improving welfare and child protection and joint-agency approaches.

Other guidance teachers were more cautious. Whilst recognising that the guidance system needed to change, within the general support for more joined-up working, some

concerns were being expressed about calls for the blurring of demarcation lines between support departments in schools and the sharing out of some roles and responsibilities to various support agencies.

The advent of new (now integrated) community schools was also viewed with some caution, given the awareness of differences between the working cultures, job conditions and codes of practice of health, education and social work. The challenge for managers was how to achieve and manage these changes.

Guidance research

Through finding out the views of key players and stakeholders, the aim of the guidance research was to ascertain which approaches to guidance and pupil support in secondary schools delivered a better quality of service and best promoted the philosophy and principles underpinning the policy of inclusion.

Method

In each of the 10 schools involved in the case studies, the following data-gathering strategies were employed:

All of the guidance staff were asked to keep logbooks for a week in which they recorded brief details of activities, incidents and feelings on a daily basis. The guidance teachers were also interviewed. Three classes were identified in each school - one from each of first, second and fifth year secondary, (S1, S2 and S5). These year groups were chosen because of the important role of guidance at these stages – the transition from primary to secondary school in S1, subject choice in S2 for Standard Grade study in S3 and 4, and the transition to the senior school in S5. A structured discussion, led by the researcher, was held with each class during PSE lessons on general matters related to pupils' expectations, needs and experiences. The pupils were also issued with a questionnaire to complete (to help in their small group discussions). In addition, two pupils from each of these classes were interviewed in depth about their experiences. The parents of the pupils in the classes identified above were sent a short questionnaire to ascertain their views on how the guidance system operates, their expectations of it and how well they feel it meets their needs and the needs of their children. One member of senior management was interviewed

to get background information relating to the guidance system, its aims and rationale. One subject teacher was interviewed to ascertain their experience and views of the guidance system. Either a Principal Teacher Support for Learning (PT Sfl) or a Behaviour Support teacher was interviewed to gain their perspective on liaison and working relationships. Similarly, an educational psychologist, careers adviser, social worker, and/or integrated school community workers were also interviewed to gain their views about integrated approaches and joined-up working.

Findings

Full-time guidance designation

In schools in which the guidance staff whose remits were fully designated to guidance and PSE, or had a minimal amount of subject teaching, the quality of guidance/pastoral care was of a higher standard. There was more of a consistent team approach and time for effective liaison with other support professionals. Pupil and parent access to guidance/pastoral care staff improved and partnership with parents and partner agencies was stronger. The burden on senior managers lessened and there were fewer behaviour referrals. The quality of PSE and curricular and careers guidance was higher when delivered by trained guidance/pastoral care teachers. The guidance teachers valued the opportunity to take more of a pro-active approach with time for regular one-to-one interviews and time to build up relationships with the pupils. In relation to their perceptions of guidance, pupils responded in the following terms:

There is a guidance teacher for each house and even if it isn't your guidance teacher they're still kind and helpful to you. (S1 pupil)

They are all really nice friendly people who you can talk to about anything bothering you. They are all willing to help wherever they can. (S5 pupil)

From the above comments it can be seen that guidance was able to perform as a service for all pupils and not just for those in crises or the most needy. In one school a Principal Teacher Guidance (PTG) commented that they had an open door policy. The family link was seen as an important plank in their guidance system. They linked families and the same guidance teachers as much as possible so that a relationship could be built up with

the parents. The guidance team contacted parents about more personal matters and the Year Heads made contact about disciplinary matters.

Guidance remits plus subject teaching

In all the schools in which guidance staff were still teaching a considerable number of their specialist subject classes, tension and dissatisfaction was evident. There was more of a discipline orientation, more emphasis on academic achievement and less on personal guidance. Proportionately more time was spent on administration with less time for proactive guidance and liaison with colleagues and support agencies. There was a discernible lack of a team approach. Colleagues, pupils and parents commented that the way issues were dealt with depended on the individual guidance teacher. One parent who noted that the level of guidance support was unsatisfactory commented that:

Guidance teachers who have a subject teaching requirement must have great difficulty balancing their guidance commitment and their obligations to department colleagues and classes. (Parent)

The guidance staff themselves expressed disappointment that the service given to the pupils was just not adequate.

I don't think you ever feel you are doing all that you could be. I think you are scraping the surface of all these things and maybe not doing any one particular aspect of it well. I think it's time and workload. You can't programme the children to have a crisis at a particular time. Sometimes it just seems that things all happen at once and you are just not available or you just don't remember anything that's going on and sometimes you actually let people down because they are just one more thing in your day. (Guidance teacher)

The pupils seemed aware that their guidance teachers were under pressure:

You see them about subject choice, if you're late and that, and if you're bad. If you're being bullied or if you have a problem... You can go for help with personal problems, or if you have some important questions... You can always make an appointment to see them... The Guidance teachers are there to help, but sometimes they just can't do enough... They're approachable and they speak to you about your achievements, but they're very busy. It would have to be something very serious to go at busy times like subject choices. If you're feeling unhappy you can tell them. You get to spend time

with them at course choice but there's no time for anything else. You would hesitate to go to them because you know how busy and stressed they are. (S2 pupil)

Benefits of whole school approaches

In schools in which whole school approaches to guidance had been established, including first level or first line guidance, a sense of belonging was promoted through the more regular and closer contact of smaller tutor group. All staff were encouraged to take a holistic approach and there was evidence of improved relationships between staff and pupils, pupils and pupils and staff and staff. An inclusive, caring and positive ethos was prevalent. Successful whole school approaches involved effective strategic management and strong commitment. Middle managers, usually Principal Teachers of Guidance, supported, resourced and co-ordinated first level guidance or form tutors, providing them with good quality resources for tutorials and PSE. There was effective communication and regular feedback. Staff development had been provided in advance of taking on the tutor role. In the schools in which best practice was evident, one period per week was given to tutors for preparation and pastoral care work. There were also rewards for tutors in the form of social events. It was found that in schools in which there was not a strong core guidance team, whole school or first level guidance had tended to founder.

In all schools, the findings were consistent in showing that the pupils valued having their guidance teacher for PSE lessons.

I think it is important because you get to know your guidance teacher very well. (S1 pupil)

...to help get through high school and life. (S2/3 pupil)

...because the teacher has to be one you can trust and relate to otherwise you cannot share any problems you have. (S2/3 pupil)

...because you can ask her questions that you can't ask a normal teacher. (S5 pupil)

Summary of the two main approaches to guidance in the study

Full-time guidance designation	Part-time guidance + subject teaching
Central role of guidance in school with strong emphasis on personal and social development	Strong emphasis on achievement
Views of guidance do not tend to depend on guidance teacher	Views of guidance tend to depend on guidance teacher
Pupils have grasp of guidance service	Pupils less able to articulate views of guidance but could comment on guidance teacher
Pupils see guidance staff as there for their support	Pupils see guidance staff as PSE teachers
Support orientation	Academic and discipline orientation
Guidance team + consistent approach	Individual guidance teachers – less of a team – lack of consistency
PSE as discussion about personal development	PSE as information-giving
Do not need subject for credibility or classroom contact with pupils	Want to keep part-time designation to guidance
Time not a big issue	Too little time to do job
Additional staffing needed but reduced burden on SMT	No extra staffing cost
Proportionately more time spent on PSE and liaison	Proportionately more time spent on administration
Whole school guidance more likely to flourish	Whole school guidance tended to fragment

Integrated approaches plus joined-up working

Most of the schools in the case studies were embracing moves to interdisciplinary and multi-agency working. However, some concerns were expressed by PTs Guidance and Support for Learning (SfL) that such moves might lead to the demise of specialist roles and thus the posts themselves. One PT SfL commented that she is not in favour of a generalist approach to pupil support. She did not think she could do it all – that is, support for learning, behaviour support, pastoral support, curriculum and careers guidance and Personal and Social Development. She felt happy with the system that operated at present, had very close working relationships with the Guidance staff and viewed herself as part of the Guidance team. She looked after pupils with records of need and one or two others who required extra support. There were other pupils who were a shared responsibility between herself and Guidance staff. The division of labour was that the PTGs provided the pastoral care and she provided support for learning with these pupils. She dealt with the parents as she believed that it was easier for them to talk with the PT SfL who was the familiar point of contact. She attended Guidance meetings and was part of all the various groups including welfare and multi-agency. Her opinion was that it was most helpful to have a Depute Head Teacher (DHT) with overall responsibility for pupil support. In her view they were moving towards an integrated service approach in school and there were no real barriers. She considered it all came down to the personalities. People had strengths in different areas and there was a good team mix in the school.

In another school a PTG stated that they were shifting to a multi-disciplinary Pupil Support Team. The general view was that they had a very good relationship with the Support for Learning department. Liaison had very much improved, a closer working relationship had been established recently and it was felt that they could depend on each other. It was generally considered that they had very good relationships with the support agencies, such as the Young People's Department and social work. One of the guidance teachers said that the social worker attached to the school regarded herself as part of the team. It was observed that although collaboration between school staff and support

agencies' staff was very well established, it felt like organised chaos, as there was so much to prioritise and juggle about:

One could never see the light at the end of the tunnel, and no matter where you turn a corner, there is another problem. (Guidance teacher)

She thought they were working very effectively with the Educational Psychologist. She commented:

I think it is improving (joint working) when you know what to ask for, what you can ask for and what could be available. Even if you can't get it you have gone down that avenue. (Guidance teacher)

Perceptions of an Educational Psychologist in another school

This Educational Psychologist considered that relationships with the guidance staff depended on the person. She has a good relationship with the person who was acting DHT as she had an overview of what was happening, and understood the system. She was of the view that some of the guidance staff did not understand the system so well and expected her to be at a meeting without prior consultation. Then when she was unable to attend they were not happy about it. She did not consider herself as part of the Guidance team and had a closer working relationship with the PT SFL. She believed that joint training helped greatly, such as the 'solution-focused brief therapy' course which one of her colleagues had been organising. She raised the issue of looking at what they could do together such as group work and proposed that this should be done from within the school rather than having an outside agency come in and run a group, then go off again. She thought it would be best to run this with school staff so that it became a learning experience for everyone, which could be repeated. She was of the view that they could use time more effectively and establish more systematic communication. She thought social work also became frustrated at the limitations of what they were all able to do, and believed there needed to be more understanding about each other's services.

New (now Integrated) Community Schools

Amongst Guidance staff in one school area mixed views were expressed about the benefits of the new community schools initiative:

The support the new community school (NCS) workers can give is invaluable, e.g. for vulnerable girls through group work. They give assertiveness training, work on self-esteem which is really good – this could be a super way forward.

Another Guidance teacher felt that the NCS social worker gave good advice and had helped prevent exclusions. On the downside, the general perception of the Guidance teachers was that the NCS initiative had increased their workload in terms of communication and co-ordination. They considered there was a need to sort out roles and responsibilities, to gain an understanding of each other's expertise, ways of working, what each could offer and codes of practice. It was remarked that this should have been done from the start. Some felt undermined and devalued when it was suggested that certain aspects of their work might be undertaken more effectively by those who could dedicate themselves to time-consuming individual and group support work. In another school area, one of the Guidance teachers commented that in the early stages of the pilot scheme, the initiative had allowed them to access more resources, but there had been too many people squabbling over funds. Another commented that they had acquired some new names for doing things, but really did not have anything new or any new procedures.

The NCS Co-ordinator in one area expressed the view that the impact of the NCS was to jump start inter-agency working:

Initially there was no sense of partnership and collaboration, but once relationships had been established and understanding of each other's roles and responsibilities reached, we worked well together. We broke down some barriers. We were able to get some projects up and running, and ensure that (integrated) support packages for individual pupils and their families worked.

She commented that rather than pupils having support packages where the school does a bit and someone else does another bit and maybe there is a third party doing something

else, now an integrated package is planned in the school. Everyone knows what is going on and who is doing what.

In another area, the NCS social work co-ordinator highlighted the effectiveness of the School Liaison Group (SLG). She observed that the social care worker had become very much part of the school set-up. They had adopted solution-focused ways of working and had had training from the educational psychologist in this approach. They started from where child was and looked at moving things forward. She stated that this approach was adopted by most of those working in the area, and considered it a very positive approach as everyone involved had ownership of the process and could contribute to the decision-making and problem-solving. The approach was quick and the action plans were included in the pupil's Individual Education Programme (IEP). She felt it was a very integrated way of working.

The NCS social work co-ordinator remarked that the secondary school Depute Head Teacher ran the SLG meeting, and commented that she could see the sense of this, as it needed to be someone who was aware of the school system and ethos. In future they were looking at blending more social work services into schools which had implications for 'Looked after Children'. The people who attended were the main players and this was a very strong aspect of the set-up. In future she was hoping that they would look at childcare reviews in this forum.

She considers that the SLG has led to improvement through relationship building. In her view the multi-disciplinary approach has been successful. It has taken people away from the confines of their specialist areas, they are no longer so bound by their territories and are much more open. They have become more child-centred and now seek to allocate the most appropriate professional to a particular case.

She was aware that not all teachers were committed to social inclusion and considered that they were bounced into it. It had given some teachers more work and had challenged teachers' thinking. She remarked:

They should have been part of the process right at the beginning – both primary and secondary, and this would have avoided feelings of having things imposed on them. (social work co-ordinator)

Time was not allocated to involve the teachers from the start of the pilot and she viewed this as regrettable.

Discussion

The findings of the research indicate that a number of key elements need to be present for more integrated, inter and multi-disciplinary approaches to succeed:

- regular meetings; shared commitment; sharing of values; sharing of information
- the issue of insecurities and shifting professional identities addressed
- the issue of confidentiality tackled
- attendance of key personnel
- solution-focused approach
- joint training
- building up of positive relationships

These factors are similar to those highlighted by Fullan and Hargreaves (1992, citing Little):

Joint work implies and creates stronger interdependence, shared responsibility, collective commitment and improvement, and greater readiness to participate in the difficult business of review and critique. (p.64)

Since phase two of the research in Guidance was conducted, the report of the National Review of Guidance has been published, namely: *Happy, Safe and Achieving Their Potential* (SEED, 2005). The review concluded that there was effective practice in most schools. They also concluded that a range of models had been shown to be effective and local circumstances and needs should inform development without the need for national prescription. The following 10 standards for personal support in schools have been established by the review group:

- learning skills to seek information and support
- access to information to make informed decisions and choices
- opportunities for citizenship and participation
- regular review of progress in learning and PSD
- help with transitions and plans for the future
- access to staff by children and parents
- co-ordination of support between agencies and schools, with the active involvement of pupils and parents
- confidentiality handled sensitively
- time and space for support including PSD
- needs identified quickly and responses planned and implemented smoothly

When the National Review of Guidance was published, some disappointment was expressed amongst some guidance teachers and managers that the Review Group had not come out with a recommendation for a national model for Guidance. Major issues such as time and workload had not been tackled. There was a general feeling that although best practice was illuminated in the report through illustrations of various systems and approaches to Guidance, the group had kept within the confines of the Guidance objectives detailed in the seminal document, *More than Feelings of Concern* (SCCC, 1986). This recommendation is rather different from the findings of the present study. As highlighted earlier, the evidence indicated that the most effective provision was delivered through a system whereby guidance teachers had full-time designated guidance and PSE remits or minimal subject contact.

Whole school Guidance approaches worked best when they were organised by strongly committed management in conjunction with a strong core Guidance or pastoral support team. This also appeared to be the case with regard to interdisciplinary and multi-agency approaches. Whole school or first-level Guidance approaches tended to break down when this was not the prevailing practice resulting in a diminution of the quality of pupil support and fragmentation of the service.

A recent personal communication (2006) with a headteacher in a school where the traditional Guidance role has been maintained, would appear to evidence this finding. He expressed concerns that some education authorities had scaled down or virtually eliminated the role of the PT Guidance teacher through a sharing out of roles and responsibilities. He considered that it would be counter-productive to remove the guidance teacher, that central person in the pupils' secondary school life – the known point of contact for parents who valued the reliability and stability of the contact with the guidance teacher. When commenting on the continuum of support provided through multi-agency working, he remarked that this stability of contact did not happen to the same extent with social workers due to staffing issues. He believed that when the core Guidance team was retained, it was more likely that integrated and multi-disciplinary approaches would succeed. Roles and responsibilities were more likely to be allocated in accordance with the effective deployment of skills and expertise to best meet the additional support needs of pupils and their families.

He gave an account of a successful multi-disciplinary initiative, the Bridging Support Programme. This was a programme of additional support for vulnerable P7 pupils when making the transition to secondary school. The Programme involved SfL and Guidance teachers, primary headteachers, community workers from the Community Learning and Development team and social workers. It was managed by the Depute Head Teacher of Pupil Support in the secondary school. Genuine collaboration had taken place, with a shared understanding of roles and responsibilities, and programme evaluations had shown that the pupils had integrated more smoothly and with fewer social problems. The success of this joint venture resonates with the following statement by Colenso in Payne (2000):

Three strands constantly intertwine in teams and teaming: commonality of objective or purpose; belonging and being part of something successful; synergy – achieving more collectively than can be achieved by individuals acting outside a team environment. (p.7)

The headteacher observed that over recent years the trend had been to employ more and more specialists such as home-link workers, school social workers, health promotion workers, school counsellors. From his perspective this was working well, with those in leadership roles getting better at managing the Joint Assessment Team (multi-agency) meetings.

His considered view that there was a need for the specialist to support the children who have complex, multiple difficulties. He believed that Guidance worked well for 95% of the pupils and their parents, therefore claims that the Guidance system was not working were unfair. In the opinion of this particular headteacher, the replacement in some local authorities of a team of promoted Guidance teachers by whole school approaches (first line or first-level Guidance) was pragmatic and resulted from the McCrone agreement and job sizing.

Phase three of the Guidance research

When the third phase of the research is conducted it will be interesting to explore the effectiveness of new models of pupil support such as the following whole school approach which was presented at a national Guidance forum in 2004:

Pastoral care has been placed at the heart of the approach. There is a values-based pupil-centred approach. All staff share a responsibility for pupil support, albeit at different levels. There is a core support team with a flexible approach, the distinctions between Guidance, support for learning and behaviour support having been removed, with pastoral, learning and behaviour support looked after by the same person. All the indications are that this approach is working with both academic attainment and all round achievement improving.

Have moves to whole school and more integrated approaches to pupil support been beneficial in the longer term? Have the issues surrounding changing roles and responsibilities been resolved? As argued above, those involved in Guidance and pupil support have certainly, at this stage, found these changes unsettling in terms of their

professional identities. There are clearly many issues to be worked through if improved outcomes are to be achieved in terms of pupil support and inclusion through more integrated and joined-up ways of working. The issue of ethical considerations arising from interprofessional working resonates with the view of Wall, cited by Paton (2006, personal communication):

Professionals need to agree standards of conduct within which they are able to work knowing that providing they do not infringe these standards they are protected from accusations of wrong-doing. Clients/patients need to understand what these standards are so they can understand what to expect.

Paton makes the important point that when teachers and professional colleagues from other disciplines are dealing with children and families it is important to establish the boundaries of professional practice.

Working collaboratively and developing a culture of collegiality are clearly essential to pupil support and the promotion of inclusion in the context of managing change, but it will take time to engender such working cultures. As Allan (2004) states:

Collaboration with other professionals is a complex knot of relationships which has to be learned and worked at. (p.16)

Conclusion

In terms of systems and approaches to pastoral care and pupil support in secondary schools, there has to be an acknowledgement that variations across the country with regard to family circumstances and the additional needs of pupils require flexible and locally based frameworks of support. Nevertheless the Guidance research showed that the pupils in secondary school benefited from the support and guidance of a teacher who was a constant point of contact, someone who knew them well and took a holistic approach to their all round development and welfare. One parent commented as follows:

Our son has a RON and SEN. The Guidance teacher has been a key link in the school in pulling the multi-agency team along with LS staff and has chaired and minimised multi-agency reviews. The support has been excellent. (parent)

The following comment from a pupil in S2 sums up succinctly the views that were typical of most of the pupils involved in the Guidance research:

The Guidance teacher is the one who knows you best and is a very good help with my problems and education. (S2 pupil)

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge the team of lecturers and researchers who supported Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Guidance research project. They are: Jennifer Tuson, Fran Payne, Margaret Gooday and Sandra Paterson.

References

- Allan, J. (2004) Working together to support inclusion. *Education in the North*, 12, 14-20.
- Besley, A. C. (2002) Into the 21st century: The McCrone and McConnell Reports – Opening the possibility for introducing full-time school counsellors into Scottish schools. *Scottish Educational Review*, 34 (1) 61-75.
- Crawford, M., Edwards, E. & Kydd, L. (Eds.) (1998) *Taking Issue: Guidance and counselling in learning*. London: Routledge/Open University Press.
- Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1992). *What's Worth fighting for in your School?* Bristol: Open University Press.
- General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) (1998) *Making the difference: A GTC report on the professional needs of guidance teachers*. Edinburgh: GTCS.
- HM Inspectorate of Education (2002a) *Count Us In: Achieving Inclusion in Scottish Schools*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.
- HM Inspectorate of Education (2002b) *How Good Is Our School? Self-Evaluation Using Quality Indicators*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Education Department.

- Holm, L., Knights, C., Williams M. & Tuson J. (2001) *A pilot investigation in guidance in two secondary schools*. Dundee & Aberdeen: Northern College.
- Howieson, C & Semple, S (1996) *Guidance In Secondary Schools*. Edinburgh: Centre for Education Sociology, University of Edinburgh
- Howieson, C. & Semple, S. (1998) The teacher's experience of guidance. In R. Edwards, R. Harrison & A. Tait (Eds.), *Telling Tales: Perspective on guidance and counselling in learning* (pp.55-67). London: Routledge.
- Howieson, C. & Semple, S., (2000) The evaluation of guidance: Listening to pupils' views. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 28(3), 373-388.
- Law, S. & Glover, D. (2000) *Educational Leadership and Learning*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- MacBeath, J. (Ed.) (1998) *Effective School Leadership: Responding to change*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Paton, G. (2006) Personal communication.
- Payne, M. (2000). *Teamwork in Multiprofessional Care*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Scottish Central Committee on Guidance (1986) *More than Feelings of Concern: Guidance in Scottish secondary schools*. Dundee: SCCC.
- Scottish Consultative Committee on the Curriculum (SCCC) (1997) *Managing Guidance Arrangements for Higher Still*. Edinburgh: Higher Still Development Unit.
- Scottish Education Department (SED) (1968) *Guidance in Scottish Secondary Schools*. Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Scottish Education Department (SED) (1976) *Guidance in Scottish secondary schools. A progress report by HM Inspectors of Schools*. Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Scottish Executive Education Department (2000) *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century (The McCrone Report)*. Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Professional Conditions of Service for Teachers. Edinburgh: HMSO
- Scottish Executive Education Department (2001) *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century – agreement reached following recommendations made in the McCrone Report*. Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Scottish Executive Education Department (2001) *Better Behaviour, Better Learning*. Report of the Discipline Task Group. Edinburgh: HMSO.

Scottish Executive Education Department (2005) *Happy, Safe and Achieving their Potential: A standard for children and young people in Scottish schools*.
Edinburgh: SCCC.

Times Educational Supplement Scotland (TESS) (2001) Guidance loses its way. 15 June, 2001.