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USER GUIDE
APPENDIX : THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

ESRC ‘SCHOOL GOVERNOR PROJECT’
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE WITH CHAIR OF GB/SB

Volunteering
1. Why have you become a school governor/school board member? (explore whether ‘volunteer’ or ‘conscript’)
2. What other forms of ‘volunteering’ are you engaged in? (explore participation in other areas of life: public; work; leisure; social etc)
3. Do you have a sense of being an active citizen?
4. What ‘kind’ of school governor/sb are you? (parent or co-opted) (Does it matter what kind of governor you are; who you represent?)
5. How long have you been a governor/sbm? (explore changes in the nature of GB/SBs during that time)

Structure
6. What is the composition of the governing body/ SB (numbers; types of governor)
7. Is the GB/SB representative of the school population? (which communities are (and are not) represented; explore gender balance)
8. Are there vacancies; and what kind of turnover has there been in GB/SB membership?
9. Have there been elections? (Describe events/turnouts)
10. How is the governing body/sb organised? (explore committees/sub cttees)
11. How often do you meet?

Focus (explore policy, practice, performance)
12. Describe recent agendas- what have been the key issues/items (who provides agendas? Can anyone put items on the agenda?)
13. What issues is the GB/SB typically preoccupied with? (review discussion/decision-making of
   • School improvement/development plan;
   • policy development of reform of learning&teaching; curriculum development; pupil achievement)
   • Target setting,
   • Performance monitoring and standards setting;
   • Budget setting;
14. How is the GB/SB involved in influencing/setting school policy?
15. Explore influences on decision-making

**Communication**
16. What is the nature of the communication within the GB/SB
   - is there discussion or just listening? (what issues evoke discussion?)
   - is there questioning? Is there argument? (what, when, how)
   - is there voting?

17. Is there any recognition or process of accountability?
   - do you feel accountable? To whom? How is it done?

**Relationships**
18. What relationship does the GB/SB have with the school?
   (explore whether there are formal contacts: visits; attachments;
19. How does the GB/SB monitor the progress of its policies?
20. How is the relationship to the community organised?
   (explore relations to community groups/institutions etc
   *social capital: ‘how connected you are’*)
21. What knowledge do school governors/sb bring to the GB (explore knowledge transfer)
22. How is the relation to the LA/LEA organised?
   (explore relation to local (governor) associations)

**Role and function of Governing Bodies/School Boards**
23. What is the role/function of the governing body?
24. What is the nature of the relationship to the Head?
25. What is the Heads role in the GB/SB?

**The role of the Chair**
26. How did you become chair?
27. How long have you been chair?
28. How have you changed your practice over time (as you have become more experienced/confident?)
29. What is the role of the chair?
30. What is your relationship with the head?
31. How do you communicate with her/him? (formally informally etc)
   (explore extent of questioning)

**Futures**
32. What is the future role/function of GB/SBs
33. Should volunteers have these responsibilities?
ESRC 'SCHOOL GOVERNOR PROJECT'
INTERVIEW OF HEADTEACHER
(Asking as many of the same questions as the Chair for purposes of triangulation)

Structure
1. What is the composition of the governing body/SB
   (numbers, types of governor)
2. Is the GB/SB representative of the school population?
   (which communities are (and are not) represented; explore gender balance)
3. Are there vacancies; and what kind of turnover has there been in GB/SB membership?
4. Have there been elections? (Describe events/turnouts)
5. How is the governing body/sb organised?
   (explore committees/sub committees)
6. How often do you meet?

Focus  (explore policy, practice, performance)
7. Describe recent agendas- what have been the key issues/items
   (who provides agendas? Can anyone put items on the agenda?)
8. Which issues do you bring to the GB/SB which do you undertake yourself?
9. What issues is the GB/SB typically preoccupied with?
   (review discussion/decision-making of
     • School improvement/development plan;
     • policy development of reform of learning&teaching; curriculum
devvelopment; pupil achievement)
     • Target setting,
     • Performance monitoring and standards setting;
     • Budget setting;
10. How is the GB/SB involved in influencing/setting school policy?
11. Explore influences on decision-making

Communication
12. What is the nature of the communication within the GB/SB
   - is there discussion or just listening? (what issues evoke discussion?)
   - is there questioning?     Is there argument? (what, when , how)
   - is there voting?
13. Is there any recognition or process of accountability?
   - do you feel accountable? To whom? How is it done?

Relationships
14. What relationship does the GB/SB have with the school?
(explore whether there are formal contacts: visits; attachments; involvement in the school development planning process/working parties)

15. How is the relationship to the community organised? *(especially important)*
   (explore relations to community groups/institutions etc)
   *(social capital: ‘how connected you are’)*

16. What knowledge do school governors/sbm bring to the GB (explore knowledge transfer)

17. How is the relation to the LA/LEA organised?
   (explore relation to local (governor) associations)

**Role and function of Governing Bodies/School Boards**

18. What is the role/function of the governing body?

19. What patterns of accountability exist?

20. How is the GB/SB performing

**The role of the Head in the GB/SB**

21. are you a member of the GB/SB

22. How long have you been a member

23. what is your experience of being both a head and a governor

24. What is the role of the head-as-governor in the GB/SB

25. What issues do you bring to the GB/SB
   (probe role of head as gatekeeper of issues)

26. Does Head trust GB/SB; do they trust him/her to bring issues which are important

27. What is your attitude towards/relationship with the chair?
28. How have chairs styles/ GB/SB changed over time during your headship
29. How do you communicate with her/him? (formally informally etc)
   (explore extent of questioning)

**Futures**

30. What is the future role/function of GB/SBs

31. Should volunteers have these responsibilities?
ESRC School Governance Project
NATIONAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Phase One Interviews with key officials and ministers 'on opportunities for volunteer participation in national policy-making structures and the implications for the governor of the changing nature of local active citizenship'.

1. Summarise and explain the scope of the study:
   - governors as volunteers citizens
   - opportunities and the practice of participation
   - the influence of governors on education policy at school, local and national level

2. Ask interviewee to describe their brief in this connection

3. Structures (Mechanisms for influencing policy)
   What are the formal and informal structures which provide opportunities for school governors to influence and impact upon government policy? (Representative groups. Formal partnerships. Informal contacts and networks. Who? How often? How?)

4. Focus (Subject of influence)
   What have been the recent agendas?
   What issues are governors typically concerned about?
   What is the nature of the governor influence on policy and how is that evident? (Give examples of policy development and change. Do governors make a difference?)

5. Participation (Practice of influence)
   Who/what are the key influences? Representative groups? Direct consultation? Key 'expert' actors?
   What typically is the nature of participation – is it a constructive dialogue?
   Does representation work?
   Is there real engagement and challenge?

6. Working with volunteers (Nature of volunteer influence)
   What are the key issues/problems/barriers when working with governors as volunteers/volunteer groups in policy formation and development? (Knowledge and skills? Availability and sustainability of representation? Modes of communication? Compare with other stakeholders in education.)

   What (if any) is specific/special/different about the voluntary aspect of the governors role? Is this an importance aspect of their influence on education policy? If so how is this manifest?

   Do you regard their voluntary participation as citizenship and if so in what form?

7. The Future
   Are governors as volunteer citizens asked to do too much? What will be the future role? Much debate about the current roles and responsibilities – do they have too much or too little influence? (Haskins Report etc.)
APPENDIX : THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The University of Birmingham
Queen's University, Belfast
Glasgow Caledonian University

The School Governance Project
Part of the ESRC Democracy and Participation Research Programme

Thank you for taking part in this survey of school governors in Lewisham. Your responses will be treated in strictest confidence. Unless otherwise advised please tick one box only for each question.

If you are a governor in more than one school please complete one questionnaire only for the school at which you have served longest.

PART 1 VOLUNTEERING

1. What type of school is this? Please tick the boxes which apply to you

- Community
- Foundation
- Voluntary aided
- Voluntary controlled
- First
- Primary
- Middle
- Secondary
- Special

2. In this school, which type of governor are you?

- Parent
- Teacher
- Non-teaching staff member
- Co-opted
- Foundation
- Partnership
- LEA
- Sponsor
- Head ex officio

3. If you had to choose, select ONE of the following as the single most important reason why you became a governor of this school.

- To support my child
- To support this school
- To give something back to the community
- For professional development reasons

4a. Are you currently a governor in more than one school? Yes ☐ No ☐
4b. If yes please state how many schools in total

Number □

5a. Is there a local association of school governors in your area?

Yes □ No □

5b. If yes, are you an active member?

Yes □ No □

6. Are you involved in any of the following voluntary groups/associations? Please tick all appropriate boxes

Leisure/recreation □ Charitable body/s □ Professional body/s □
Local politics □ Community action group □ Religious group/s □

7. Do you bring any of the following skills and/or expertise to your governor duties? Please tick all appropriate boxes

□ Financial management □ Corporate management,
□ Human resource management □ Knowledge of education system
□ Community work □ Experience in the voluntary sector

8. How many hours have you spent on governor training in the last year?

1-5 □ 6-10 □ 11-15 □ 16-20 □ 21+ □

Your views on volunteering

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by placing a tick in the appropriate box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
9. I will stand again as a governor
10. Recruiting governors has been difficult
11. Retaining governors is difficult
12. Induction training should be compulsory for governors
13. Information provided for governors is about right
14. Support from the local authority for governors is about right
15. Governors should be unpaid volunteers

PART II PARTICIPATION

If you are a governor at more than one school please reply only for the school where you have served longest
16. How many hours do you spend on governor duties each term?

- Under 10 hours
- 11-20 hours
- 21-30 hours
- 31-40 hours
- 41-50 hours
- Over 50 hours

17. How regularly do you attend meetings of the governing body?

- All meetings
- Most meetings
- Occasional meetings

18. Do you hold any of the following positions of responsibility? Please tick all that are appropriate.

- Chair of the governing body
- Vice Chair
- Chair of sub-committee
- Governor with special responsibility e.g. literacy, numeracy, performance review, special needs.

19. As a governor, do you work with teachers in any of the following situations within the school? Please tick all that apply.

- Attending staff meetings
- Attending teachers’ working groups e.g. curriculum and pastoral
- Pairing with an individual teacher e.g. special needs co-ordinator
- Attending teaching staff development activities
- Working with pupils in classrooms e.g. paired reading schemes

20. (For Chairs of Governing bodies) I communicate with the Headteacher:

- More than once a week
- Only once a week
- Less than once a week

Your views on participation
Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by placing a tick in the appropriate box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. My volume of work is reasonable</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The complexity of my work is reasonable</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. I share the workload in my governing body
24. My responsibilities as a governor are reasonable
25. I believe that governors and teachers work in partnership in my school
26. The Head and the Chair do most of the work

PART III  GOVERNANCE

27. Please choose what you believe to be THE ONE MOST IMPORTANT function of the governing body. Please tick one box only

Support and advice to the head
Holding the school to account
Efficient resource management
Representation of the views of all groups with an interest in the school
Ensuring that the school is responsive to the community
Deciding on the future of the school

28. To which ONE of these groups should the governing body be most accountable? Please tick one box only

The DfEE
The local authority
The parents
The pupils
The community

Your views on governance
Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by placing a tick in the appropriate box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. The powers given to governing bodies are reasonable</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Our governing body is helping to improve the quality of this school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Our governing body asks challenging questions of the school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Our governing body regularly monitors the performance of the school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Our governing body reviews its own performance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Schools should be run by the Head and the teachers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The local authority should have greater responsibilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. Mostly, in this school, the governors rubber-stamp the decisions of the Head and senior management team

37. Our governing body manages its business effectively

PART IV SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRACY

38. How regularly do you speak at governor meetings?

Most meetings  □ Occasionally  □ Rarely  □

Your views on the democratic nature of your governing body
Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by placing a tick in the appropriate box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. Our governing body reflects the social and ethnic mix of the school community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Our governing body is good at keeping parents informed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Governors are encouraged to ask questions at meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Our governing body is a forum for discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Governors are consulted about agendas for meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. School policies are always fully debated in the governing body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART V ABOUT YOU

45. How long have you served as a governor?

1 year or less  □  6 to 10 years  □  11 years or more  □

46. In which of the following categories is your occupation? Please refer to your existing or last job

Not in paid employment AND not seeking paid employment □ Skilled, manual employment □
Managerial/administrative employment □ Semi-skilled employment □
Professional employment □ Unskilled employment □
Skilled, non-manual employment

47. If you are currently employed, how do you work?
(Please refer to your main occupation and tick all appropriate boxes)

- Full-time paid employment
- Part-time paid employment
- Self-employed
- Public sector
- Private sector
- Voluntary sector

48. If you are not in paid employment at present, are you:

- Studying
- Seeking work
- Retired
- Caring for a family

49. Please indicate your HIGHEST educational qualification. Please tick one box only

- GCSE, GCE O-Level, CSE, Senior Certificate, Leaving Certificate or equivalent at school leaving age
- GCE A-Level, Highers, Advanced Senior, GNVQ or vocational equivalent
- First Degree or higher degree in higher education
- Other professional qualifications or equivalent in post-experience development

50. Are you

- Male
- Female

51. What age are you?

- Under 30 years old
- 31-50 years old
- 51-65 years old
- Over 65 years old

52. How would you describe your ethnic origin?

- White
- Mixed heritage
- Black
- Chinese
- Asian
- Other

53. Please indicate your current level of income

- Less than £15,000 per year
- Between £15,000 and £29,000 per year
- Between £30,000 and £49,000 per year
- Over £50,000 per year

54. Did you vote in the most recent local government elections?

- Yes
- No
Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey. Please return it in the pre-paid envelope provided as soon as possible within two weeks from the date you received it. In case of any query please contact Ms Julie Foster or Mrs Liz Potts, The Research Office, School of Education, The University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, B15 2TT on Tel nos: 0121 414 4402 or 3422 respectively.
The School Governance Project
Part of the ESRC Democracy and Participation Research Programme

Thank you for taking part in this survey of school governors in. Your responses will be treated in strictest confidence. Unless otherwise advised please tick one box only for each question.

If you are a governor in more than one school please complete one questionnaire only for the school at which you have served longest.

PART 1 VOLUNTEERING

1. What type of school is this? Please tick the boxes which apply to you

Community  □  First  □
Foundation  □  Primary  □
Voluntary aided  □  Middle  □
Voluntary controlled □  Secondary  □
              □  Special  □

2. In this school, which type of governor are you?

Parent   □  Partnership  □
Teacher □  LEA  □
Non-teaching staff member □  Sponsor  □
Co-opted □  Head ex officio  □
Foundation □

3. If you had to choose, select ONE of the following as the single most important reason why you became a governor of this school.

□  To support my child
□  To support this school
□  To give something back to the community
□  For professional development reasons

4a. Are you currently a governor in more than one school?  Yes  □  No  □

4b. If yes please state how many schools in total  Number  □

5a. Is there a local association of school governors in your area?  Yes □  No □

5b. If yes, are you an active member?  Yes □  No □
6. Are you involved in any of the following voluntary groups/associations? Please tick all appropriate boxes

- Leisure/recreation  □
- Charitable body/s  □
- Professional body/s  □
- Local politics  □
- Community action group  □
- Religious group/s  □

7. Do you bring any of the following skills and/or expertise to your governor duties? Please tick all appropriate boxes

- Financial management  □
- Corporate management, □
- Human resource management  □
- Knowledge of education system  □
- Community work  □
- Experience in the voluntary sector  □

8. How many hours have you spent on governor training in the last year?

- 1-5  □
- 6-10  □
- 11-15  □
- 16-20  □
- 21+  □

Your views on volunteering

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by placing a tick in the appropriate box

9. I will stand again as a governor

   - Strongly Agree  □
   - Agree  □
   - Don’t Know  □
   - Disagree □
   - Strongly Disagree □

10. Recruiting governors has been difficult

   - Strongly Agree  □
   - Agree  □
   - Don’t Know  □
   - Disagree □
   - Strongly Disagree □

11. Retaining governors is difficult

   - Strongly Agree  □
   - Agree  □
   - Don’t Know  □
   - Disagree □
   - Strongly Disagree □

12. Induction training should be compulsory for governors

   - Strongly Agree  □
   - Agree  □
   - Don’t Know  □
   - Disagree □
   - Strongly Disagree □

13. Information provided for governors is about right

   - Strongly Agree  □
   - Agree  □
   - Don’t Know  □
   - Disagree □
   - Strongly Disagree □

14. Support from the local authority for governors is about right

   - Strongly Agree  □
   - Agree  □
   - Don’t Know  □
   - Disagree □
   - Strongly Disagree □

15. Governors should be unpaid volunteers

   - Strongly Agree  □
   - Agree  □
   - Don’t Know  □
   - Disagree □
   - Strongly Disagree □

PART II  PARTICIPATION

If you are a governor at more than one school please reply only for the school where you have served longest

16. How many hours do you spend on governor duties each term?

   - Under 10 hours  □
   - 31-40 hours  □
   - 11-20 hours □
   - 41-50 hours □
   - 21-30 hours □
   - Over 50 hours □

17. How regularly do you attend meetings of the governing body?

   - All meetings □
   - Most meetings □
   - Occasional meetings □
18. Do you hold any of the following positions of responsibility? *Please tick all that are appropriate*

- [x] Chair of the governing body
- [ ] Vice Chair
- [ ] Chair of sub-committee
- [ ] Governor with special responsibility e.g. literacy, numeracy, performance review, special needs.

19. As a governor, do you work with teachers in any of the following situations within the school? *Please tick all that apply.*

- [x] Attending staff meetings
- [x] Attending teachers’ working groups e.g. curriculum and pastoral
- [x] Pairing with an individual teacher e.g. special needs co-ordinator
- [x] Attending teaching staff development activities
- [x] Working with pupils in classrooms e.g. paired reading schemes

20. *(For Chairs of Governing bodies)* I communicate with the Headteacher:

- [ ] More than once a week
- [ ] Only once a week
- [x] Less than once a week

**Your views on participation**

*Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by placing a tick in the appropriate box*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. My volume of work is reasonable</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The complexity of my work is reasonable</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I share the workload in my governing body</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My responsibilities as a governor are reasonable</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I believe that governors and teachers work in partnership in my school</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The Head and the Chair do most of the work</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III  GOVERNANCE

27. Please choose what you believe to be THE ONE MOST IMPORTANT function of the governing body.  Please tick one box only

- Support and advice to the head
- Holding the school to account
- Efficient resource management
- Representation of the views of all groups with an interest in the school
- Ensuring that the school is responsive to the community
- Deciding on the future of the school

28. To which ONE of these groups should the governing body be most accountable?  Please tick one box only

- The DfEE
- The pupils
- The local authority
- The community
- The parents

Your views on governance

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by placing a tick in the appropriate box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. The powers given to governing bodies are reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Our governing body is helping to improve the quality of this school</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Our governing body asks challenging questions of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Our governing body regularly monitors the performance of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Our governing body reviews its own performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Schools should be run by the Head and the teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The local authority should have greater responsibilities in governing schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Mostly, in this school, the governors rubber-stamp the decisions of the Head and senior management team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Our governing body manages its business effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART IV SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRACY

38. How regularly do you speak at governor meetings?

Most meetings □ Occasionally □ Rarely □

Your views on the democratic nature of your governing body

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement by placing a tick in the appropriate box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. Our governing body reflects the social and ethnic mix of the school community</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Our governing body is good at keeping parents informed</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Governors are encouraged to ask questions at meetings</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Our governing body is a forum for discussion</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Governors are consulted about agendas for meetings</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. School policies are always fully debated in the governing body</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART V ABOUT YOU

45. How long have you served as a governor?

1 year or less □ 6 to 10 years □
2 to 5 years □ ears or more □

46. In which of the following categories is your occupation? Please refer to your existing or last job

Not in paid employment AND not seeking paid employment □ Skilled, manual employment □
Managerial/administrative employment □ Semi-skilled employment □
Professional employment □ Unskilled employment □
Skilled, non-manual employment □ Unemployed □

47. If you are currently employed, how do you work?

(Please refer to your main occupation and tick all appropriate boxes)

Full-time paid employment □ Part-time paid employment □ Self-employed □
Public sector □ Private sector □ Voluntary sector □
48. If you are not in paid employment at present, are you:

Studying    ☐    Seeking work    ☐
Retired     ☐    Caring for a family ☐

49. Please indicate your HIGHEST educational qualification. Please tick one box only

GCSE, GCE O-Level, CSE, Senior Certificate, Leaving Certificate or equivalent at school leaving age  ☐
GCE A-Level, Highers, Advanced Senior, GNVQ or vocational equivalent  ☐
First Degree or higher degree in higher education  ☐
Other professional qualifications or equivalent in post-experience development  ☐

50. Are you

Male  ☐    Female  ☐

51. What age are you?

Under 30 years old  ☐    31-50 years old  ☐
51-65 years old  ☐    over 65 years old  ☐

52. How would you describe your ethnic origin?

White  ☐    Mixed heritage  ☐
Black  ☐    Chinese  ☐
Asian  ☐    Other  ☐

53. Please indicate your current level of income

Less than £15,000 per year  ☐    Between £15,000 and £29,000 per year ☐
Between £30,000 and £49,000 per year  ☐    Over £50,000 per year  ☐

54. Did you vote in the most recent local government elections?

Yes  ☐    No  ☐

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey. Please return it in the pre-paid envelope provided as soon as possible within two weeks from the date you received it. In case of any query please contact Ms Julie Foster or Mrs Liz Potts, The Research Office, School of Education, The University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, B15 2TT on Tel nos: 0121 414 4402 or 3422 respectively.
E.S.R.C.: SCHOOL GOVERNANCE PROJECT

CODING FRAME
for
N. Ireland
Scotland
English borough
English county
Wales

NB. NOTES FOR DATA INPUT

1. ALL ITEMS CODED AS: 99 (Non response)
   999 (not applicable)
   9999 (refusal to answer)
   0000 (unclear as to whether non response or not applicable)

MUST BE CODED TO 'MISSING'

2. IN ANY QUESTION WHICH REQUIRES A SINGLE TICK, BUT THE RESPONDENT HAS TICKED MORE THAN 1 BOX, CODE AS 0000 (THEN CODE TO 'MISSING').

Column 1
School Name, or code number [FROM ENVELOPE]
(which do we wish to use? Whichever is easiest to access? IF CODE NUMBER, KEEP RECORD OF CODES)

PART 1: VOLUNTEERING
Question 1: What type of school is this?

2 columns needed
1 for each column of boxes

COLUMN 1
- If all boxes blank in first column 99
- Community 1
- Foundation 2
- Voluntary aided 3
- Voluntary controlled 4
- Designated Welsh Medium 5
- Denominational (Scotland) 6
- Non-denominational (St) 7
- Controlled Integrated (Bfst)  8
- Controlled (Other) (B)  9
- Voluntary Grammar (B)  10
- GM Integrated (B)  11
-Irish Medium (B)  12

**Column 2**
- If all boxes blank in second column  99
- First  1
- Primary  2
---Middle  3
- Secondary  4
- Grammar  5
- Special  6

**Question 2: Which type of governor are you?**

1 column needed

- Non-response  99
- Parent  1
- Teacher  2
- Non-teaching staff member  3
- Co-opted  4
- Foundation  5
- Partnership  6
- LEA nominee  7
- Sponsor  8
- Head ex-officio  9
- Church Representative (St.)  10
- Trustee (B)  11
- Transferor (B)  12
- ELB nominee (B)  13
- Dept. of Ed. Nominee (B)  14
- Other  15

**Question 3: Single most important reason for being a governor**

1 column

- Non-response  99
- Support child  1
- Support school  2
- Give back to community  3
- Profess. devel. reasons  4

**Question 4a: Governor in more than one school?**

1 column
- Non-response
- Yes
- No

Question 4b: If yes, how many schools?
1 column

- If answered 'yes' to Q4a, enter the number given in box
- Non-response (i.e. ANSWERED ‘YES’ TO Q.4a)
- If answered 'no' to Q.4a (i.e. NON-APPLICABLE)
- Did not answer either question (i.e. REFUSAL TO ANSWER)

Question 5a: Local association of governors?
1 Column
- Non-response
- Yes
- No

Question 5b: If yes, are you an active member?
1 column
- If answered 'yes' to Q5a,
- Yes
- No
- Non-response (i.e. ANSWERED ‘YES’ TO Q.5a)
- If answered 'no' to Q.4a (i.e. NON-APPLICABLE)
- Did not answer either question (i.e. REFUSAL TO ANSWER)

Question 6: Involved in any of following groups?
6 columns (1 for each box)
For each box, IN THE FOLLOWING ORDER: leisure, charitable, professional, politics, community action, religious
-if ticked, 1
-if not ticked, 0

Question 7: Your skills/expertise?
6 columns (1 for each box)

COLUMNS IN THE FOLLOWING ORDER:
- financial,
- corporate,
- human resource,
- knowledge of ed. system,
- community,
- exp. in vol. sector

Code as Question 6

Question 8: How many training hours last year?
1 column

- Non-response 99
- 1-5 1
- 6-10 2
- 11-15 3
- 16-20 4
- 21+ 5

YOUR VIEWS ON VOLUNTEERING
Q. 9. 'I will stand again as a governor/school board member'
1 column

- Non-response 99
(i.e. no box ticked in the row)
- S agree 1
- Agree 2
- Don't know 3
- Disagree 4
- S disagree 5

Q. 10. 'Recruiting governors/SBMs has been difficult'
1 column: Code as the question above.
Q. 11. 'Retaining governors/SBMs is difficult'
1 column: code as question above

Q. 12. 'Induction training should be compulsory for all governors/SBMs'
1 column: code as question above

Q. 13. 'Information provided for governors/ SBMs is about right'
1 column

Code all responses as question above

Q. 14. 'Support from the local authority for governors is about right'
1 column

Code all responses as first question above.

Q. 15. 'Governors/SBMs should be unpaid volunteers'
1 column

Code all responses as question above

**PART II: PARTICIPATION**

Q. 16: how many hours on governor duties?
1 column

- Non-response 99
- Under 10 hrs 1
- 11-20 2
- 21-30 3
- 31-40 4
- 41-50 5
- Over 50 6

Q. 17: How regularly attend meetings?
1 column

- Non-response 99
- All meetings 1
- Most
- Occasional

Q.18: Positions of responsibility?

4 columns

IF NO ITEMS AT ALL TICKED, CODE ALL COLUMNS AS 0000

 Otherwise,
  1st column
   - Chair, If 'yes'
     If unticked

  2nd column
   - Vice Chair, If 'yes'
     If unticked

  3rd column
   - Chair of Sub committee, If 'yes'
     If unticked,

  4th column
   (FOR RESPONSES FROM Scotland, CODE THE 4th COLUMN AS 999 [i.e. NOT APPLICABLE]
   - Special resp., If 'yes'
     If unticked

Q.19: Work with teachers?

5 columns

IF NO ITEMS AT ALL TICKED, CODE ALL COLUMNS AS 0000

 Otherwise,
  1st column
   - Staff meetings, if yes
     If unticked

  2nd column
   - Teacher working groups, if yes
     If unticked

  3rd column
   - Individual teacher, if yes
     If unticked

  4th column
   - Development activities, if yes
     If unticked
5th column
- Working with pupils, if yes 1
  If unticked 0

Q.20: (Chairs only). Communicate with Head Teacher?

1 column

If response to Q.18 showed that respondent is chair of governing body/school board, AND no box is ticked in this Q., code as 99
(non response)

If respondent is Chair, code as
- More than once a week 1
- Only once a week 2
- Less than ... 3

IF NO ITEMS AT ALL TICKED, AND RESPONDENT IS NOT CHAIR, CODE AS 0000

YOUR VIEWS ON PARTICIPATION
Q.21 - 26 (inclusive)

1 column for each (6 columns in total)

21. 'Volume of work is reasonable'
22. 'Complexity of work is reasonable'
23. 'Share the workload'
24. 'Responsibilities are reasonable'
25. 'Governors and teacher partnership'
26. 'Head and Chair do most work'

- If no box in a row is ticked 99
- Strongly agree 1
- Agree 2
- Disagree 3
- Strongly Disagree 4
PART III: GOVERNANCE

Q.27: One most important function of Governors/SBM

1 column

- Non-response 99
- Support head 1
- Holding school to account 2
- Efficient resource .... 3
- Representation ..... 4
- Ensuring the school ..... 5
- Deciding on ...... 6

Q.28: Most accountable to ..?

1 column

- Non-response 99
- DfES OR DE (NI) OR Scot. Ex. 1
- local authority 2
- parents 3
- pupils 4
- community 5
- National Assembly for Wales 6

YOUR VIEWS ON GOVERNANCE
Q.29 - 37 (INCLUSIVE).

1 column each (i.e. 9 columns in total)

29. Gov./SBM powers are reasonable
30. Helps to improve quality of school
31. Asks challenging questions
32. Reviews school performance
33. Reviews own performance
34. Schools run by Head and teachers
35. Local authorities greater responsibilities
36. Governors rubber stamp Head's decisions
37. Manages business effectively
For each column:
- Non-response 99
- strongly agree 1
- agree 2
- disagree 3
- strongly disagree 4

Q. 38: Speak at governor meetings?

1 column

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-response</th>
<th>99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>most meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 39 - 44 (inclusive)

1 column each (i.e. 6 columns in total)

39. Reflects social and ethnic mix
40. Good at informing parents
41. Encouraged to ask questions
42. Forum for discussion
43. Consulted about agendas
44. Policies fully debated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-response</th>
<th>99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART V: ABOUT YOU

Q. 45: length of governor service?

1 column

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-response</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 yrs.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ yrs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 46: Category of occupation?

1 column

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-response</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not in pd. employment ...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managerial ...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional ...</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skilled, non-manual ...</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skilled, manual ...</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semi-skilled ...</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unskilled</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.47 If employed, how do you work? (2 aspects)

2 columns: 1 for top row of boxes (full-time, part-time, self employed)
1 for bottom row of boxes (public sector, private, voluntary)

- If respondent has ticked ONE BOX FROM EACH ROW

**First column**
- full-time, paid ....... 1
- part-time, paid ....... 2
- self-employed 3

**Second column**
- public sector 1
- private sector 2
- voluntary sector 3

- Non response
(i.e. IF HAS TICKED ONLY 1 BOX)
- if has answered Q48
(i.e. NOT APPLICABLE)

- If no boxes ticked at all
in either Q.47 or Q.48
(i.e. REFUSAL TO ANSWER)

- if has answered Q.47, AND Q.48
(i.e. SHOULD NOT HAVE ANSWERED Q.47)
OR
- has ticked more than one box in each row

Q.48: If not employed, what do you do?
1 column

-IF HAS LEFT Q47 BLANK
- studying 1
- retired 2
- seeking work 3
- caring for family 4

- If has answered Q47
(i.e. Q.48 IS NOT APPLICABLE)

- If no boxes ticked at all
in EITHER Q.47 OR Q.48
(i.e. REFUSAL TO ANSWER)

- if has answered Q.47, AND Q.48
(i.e. SHOULD NOT HAVE ANSWERED Q.48)
OR
- has ticked more than 1 box in Q48
Q.49: Highest educational qualification?

1 column

- non response 99
- GCSE, GCE O level ........ 1
- GCE A level ........ 2
- First degree ...... 3
- other qualify. ........ 4

Q.50: Sex?

1 column

- non response 99
- male 1
- female 2

Q.51: Age?

1 column

- non response 99
- under 30 1
- 31-50 2
- 51 - 65 3
- over 65 4

Q.52: Ethnic origin?

1 column

- non response 99
- white 1
- black 2
- asian 3
- mixed heritage 4
- chinese 5
- other 6
Q.53: Income level?

1 column
- non response 99
- less than £15,000 1
- £15K - £29K 2
- £30K - £49K 3
- Over £50K 4

Q.54: Vote at local elections?

1 column
- non response 99
- yes 1
- no 0

N.B.
BECAUSE OF MODIFICATIONS TO WALES QUESTIONNAIRE (SOME EXTRA QUESTIONS AND SOME RE-ORDERING OF QUESTIONS), RESPONSES FROM WALES WILL HAVE TO BE CODED ACCORDING TO THE QUESTION WORDING, RATHER THAN ACCORDING TO QUESTION NUMBER.

THIS WILL MAKE THE CODING SLOWER, AND WILL MEAN THAT CHECKING OF DATA FOR RELIABILITY AFTER INPUT WILL NEED TO BE VERY THOROUGH.
The participation of volunteers citizens in school governance

400,000 people volunteer to be school governors in the United Kingdom. Their role has increased with greater devolution of decision-making to schools since 1986 and additional legal responsibilities from government. Governors in England, Wales and Northern Ireland set the strategic direction of their schools, with responsibility for the curriculum and budget. In Scotland, they act more as advisers and a link with parents. Researchers sought to examine how successful this experiment in democratic volunteer participation had been, and whether governance had made a difference to the performance of schools?

Key findings

National differences: English and Northern Irish governors must set targets and monitor the school’s performance. School improvement is part of their role in Scotland and Wales, too. However, in Wales, ‘lifelong learning’ and citizenship are given greater prominence than ‘economic regeneration’, which has greater policy emphasis in England. Exam results are no longer nationally published outside England.

Who becomes a governor? Most governors are white, middle aged, middle class, middle income, public or community workers, but with local variations. Few are active as citizens in other spheres. Governors generally see themselves contributing to their communities, rather than achieving personal gain. 54% said they took on the role to ‘support the school’, 29% to ‘give something back to the community’, while 13% saw it as a way of ‘supporting their [own] child.’

A demanding role? Only a minority of governors felt the burdens were ‘onerous’. But there were differences between governing bodies in the extent to which the head teacher and chair of governors were perceived to do most of the work.

What sort of governing body? Four models of governance were observed in different schools. The ‘deliberative forum’ allows parents to inquire about progress, but they don’t feel able to question the head’s authority. The ‘consultative sounding board’ involves the head bringing policies for governors’ approval and consent – new input comes from the professionals. The ‘executive board’ operates as a partnership, where the board scrutinises policies, rules and resources to support the head and teachers in the school’s development. The ‘governing body’ takes overarching responsibility for the conduct and direction of the school, where governors are willing to propose actions with which the head may disagree.

Has governance helped schools to improve? Changes in governance have helped failing schools to recover. Reconstituted governing bodies set standards and used their networks to lever decisions and resources from the local education authority. Governors can also ensure accountability, offer guidance and support to professionals, and scrutinise direction, policy and practice. But for
some pupils to achieve, there must be a greater connection to the communities where they live. Governors are often better at linking to the official sphere than they are to the families and neighbourhoods which their schools serve.

About the study

The study was conducted by Professor Stewart Ranson and Dr Jane Martin (School of Education, University of Birmingham); Dr Margaret Arnott (lecturer in politics, Glasgow Caledonian University); and Penny McKeown (Graduate School of Education, Queen’s University Belfast). A survey was sent to all governors at 20 schools across the UK. This was followed by stakeholder interviews, meeting observation and the study of appropriate documents. The research was part of the ESRC Democracy and Participation Programme.

Further details

The full report is available at www.esrc.ac.uk
For more on the ESRC’s Democracy and Participation Programme, visit www.essex.ac.uk/democracy.
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Education, schools, governors, governance, volunteering, citizenship
THE SUMMARY

1. **Objectives**: The research undertook UK comparative analysis to assess the extent to which the experiment of school governors as volunteer citizens has enhanced democratic participation and whether school governance made a difference to policy, practice and performance of public institutions (schools, authorities and governments). We asked whether active citizenship contributed to effective governance and hypothesised that the social capital of community active schools would establish the agreements that underlie institutional effectiveness.

2. **Has volunteer participation been successful?** Volunteering has been a considerable though not complete success. Governing bodies and school boards are composed of a (large) core of committed and long serving members while others are more detached and transient in their commitment. Respondents to the survey suggested that they found the volume of work and responsibilities reasonable and report that they would volunteer again. Though a considerable number believe that the chair and head do a considerable share of the work, and concerns remain about recruiting new members. The under representation of women, ethnic minorities and disadvantaged classes is of continuing concern.

3. The largest democratic volunteer force has nevertheless survived and is beginning to flourish. Volunteering may enlarge the perspective of these citizens, helping them to progress from particular to general interests in civil society. It has created a generation of participants in civil society, independent of though connected to the polity. Our sample suggests, though, that the making of this volunteer force has been sustained by a generation of those who were socialised into the public sphere either through the polity or employment in professional public service.

4. **Plurality in the structuration of governance**: Very different forms of school governance have developed within as well as between the national regions of the UK. We have developed a typology of *forums, consultative and executive boards and bodies* to capture the different conceptions of practice (clarifying the power relationship of governors to professionals). The dimension forms a continuum of increasing authority and corporateness of the governing body and school board. Though some variation can obtain within nations, *forums* typified practice in Scotland, *boards* typified practice in N. Ireland and Wales and governing *bodies* were more in evidence in England.

5. **Has governance been a vehicle for school improvement?** Our findings propose that governance fulfils a constitutive role in the formation of schools as effective public institutions: first in the infrastructure of effective institutional practice, and second in establishing the social and cultural conditions for effective learning. The study shows the role which governing bodies and school boards can play in reinforcing the quality of institutional leadership and practice: enabling strategy, providing scrutiny of direction, policy and practice, offering guidance and support, and ensuring accountability. These qualities secure the authority and trust of schools as public institutions. By helping to improve the working of the institution the governing body and school board will make more effective the environment of learning and teaching and thus the possibility of enhanced standards of educational achievement. Better governance generates processes which lead to better results.
6. A number of schools identified the potential of governance to make a further contribution to school improvement. While acknowledging the role of ‘a targets’ regime in improvement they came to regard this approach as limited. Further achievement would require a pedagogy of motivation and the encouragement of parents to participate in the life and governance of the school. The schools acknowledged that they were detached from their disadvantaged estates and ‘schemes’, that their governance arrangements were particularly unrepresentative of these parent communities, and that this failure to connect with the cultures of children and their communities was directly related to disenchantment and underachievement in school. We argue this configuring of learning and living is a constitutive task for the governance of the school, rather than of specialist knowledge alone. Public administration traditionally focuses upon the distributive and regulatory functions that define roles, responsibilities and resource allocation. A socio-cultural approach is also needed to grasp how institutions by embodying particular bodies of knowledge and cultural capital at the expense of others, also recognise and motivate some communities at the expense of others. Governance can itself learn how its activities can be more inclusive of the communities it is intended to serve and re-present.

7. Does social capital work to support the agreements that underlie achieving schools? All the schools sought to strengthen their institutions by drawing upon social capital in their communities. They did so in ways that reflected their conception of school governance and their local and cultural structuration of governance. Yet there is a common thread in the social capital narrative: social class. Schools sought to add to their forum, board or body volunteers who possessed the cultural capital of class advantage whose knowledge, influence and advocacy would connect the school into the key networks of the professional and public service world on which the school depended for resources and support. Schools added ‘cosmopolitans’ to complement the ‘locals’.

8. Social capital in this way delivered the public goods of authority and trust. This process created strong schools, institutions which enhanced the public sphere. Social capital generated civic capital. Yet our analysis proposes that while this ‘bridging’ with the official world of the public sphere enhanced institution building and therefore achievement, the failure of the schools to reach out to their excluded estates continues to frustrate and undermine achievement. They have, however, come to understand that they cannot be effective institutions until they are also civic institutions, developing the social and cultural conditions for learning, as well as the organisational qualities of strategic leadership, scrutiny and accountability.

9. Conclusion: This study has suggested that while although school governors and school boards had adopted (modernising) perspectives of monitoring schools to improve performance they have nevertheless developed conceptions of governance which are independent of ‘the state’ and reflect local cultural traditions of governing education. In this sense governors have become active citizens. Our concluding analysis, however, proposes that school governance in many respects remains significantly unrepresentative of some of its significant parent constituencies. As such citizen participation in school governance has yet to be realised in many communities.
10. The cultural traditions of education across the UK have all tended to reproduce the tradition of the school as a space of professional regulation. This study of school governance and school boards concludes that although participation has developed to strengthen institutions in the official world of the public sphere, it remains incomplete. Arguably, schools will not become effective learning communities until they become truly cosmopolitan learning communities, and they will only realise that vision when democratic governance is strengthened at the level of school and community as well as the local authority.
THE REPORT
The participation of volunteer citizens in school governance.

I Objectives
1. The research assessed the extent to which the experiment of school governors as volunteer citizens has enhanced democratic participation and public accountability, and whether it has made a difference to policy, practice and performance of public institutions (schools, authorities and governments). The existence of distinctive education systems in the UK offered the opportunity to engage in comparative analysis of volunteer citizenship and school governance. Until July 1999 policy formation took place within the context of a unitary state. Since then legislative devolution (Northern Ireland and Scotland) and executive devolution (Wales) have increased the potential for policy variation across the UK. The research aimed to explore through comparative UK analysis the extent to which different traditions of social and cultural capital of volunteer citizens translated into institutional capability of school governing bodies/school boards.

2. The particular objectives were to examine whether:
   • democratic volunteer participation had been successful?
   • governance made a difference to institutional performance?

Investigating these questions would allow assessment of the extent to which active citizenship contributes to the effective governance of public institutions, the creation of learning communities and a just civil society. The research explored the role of social capital and cultural variation in school governance, hypothesising that the social capital of community active schools would establish the agreements that underlie institutional effectiveness.¹

II Methods
1. One local authority (two in England) was chosen in each nation of the UK selected for the emergent development of civic active characteristics (partnership, participation, performance review). A survey was administered to all school governors/board members in these authorities.² Four schools were identified to us by in each authority: two community-active and two non community active (see Figure 1). Interviews were obtained with all the appropriate stakeholders in school governance in each school and appropriate documents collected.³ In a second phase of case work schools were selected for their developing qualities of school governance and its connectedness or not to the community and, in addition to interviewing, governing body and school board meetings were observed. The identified schools were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>N. Ireland</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Upborough</td>
<td>Midshire</td>
<td>Smithstown</td>
<td>Rampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandpiper (p)</td>
<td>Rockwood (s)</td>
<td>St Kilian’s (p)</td>
<td>Sycamore (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Josephs (p)</td>
<td>Cavendish (s)</td>
<td>Tatton (p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seagull High(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Meadows (p)</td>
<td>Summerfld (p)</td>
<td>St Niamh’s (s)</td>
<td>Yellowham (p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Skipworth (s)</td>
<td>Brocksley (s)</td>
<td>Ballyfree (p)</td>
<td>Raven High (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ptarmigan (p)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(nb: p = primary school; s = secondary. Schools in bold are second stage case studies.
As described later in the report, this initial labelling of schools was modified in the light of our research)
2. Most comparative studies of nations focus upon the individual nation. A methodology that compares nations across the same conceptual characteristics is, argues Green (2002), an improvement. Our study has sought to develop an approach to comparative study that both respects the unique characteristics of national cultural difference and develops comparative analysis and explanation of patterns of relationships within and between nations.

III Results

Democratic renewal and modernisation: policy contradictions and the state

1. The creation of over 400,000 volunteer citizens between 1986-88, in England and Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland, to occupy reformed school governing bodies and school boards across the UK, has been the largest democratic experiment in voluntary public participation. These public spaces of ‘intermediary association’ exemplify the potential for reconstituting civil society in its local and cultural variety. Yet the state has also perceived school governance as a space to regulate universal improvement of educational standards and thus steer the modernisation of a key public service. Would volunteers in school governance become ‘conscripts’ of the state or citizens responding to local needs? (Deem et al, 1995) Has citizenship in this space expressed imposed duty or cultural diversity?

2. School governance has granted different forms and remits across the UK. The 1998 School Standards and Framework Act defined governing bodies in England and Wales as possessing ‘overarching responsibility for the conduct of schools’ with duties to: set the schools strategic direction; secure accountability; and to support and challenge the school as its ‘critical friend’, by monitoring and evaluating its progress. In Northern Ireland, the 1986 and 1989 Orders identified a range of financial, curricular and staffing responsibilities for governing bodies, similar to those of English governors under the 1988 Act. In Scotland, however, the school board was given more limited responsibilities to advise the head and to communicate with parents.

3. Policy deliberation about the constituting of governance has continued, principally in England and Scotland. In N. Ireland and Wales minor changes have been sought and introduced. In Scotland, however, there has been a national debate about how to increase parental involvement in education and whether to extend school boards by incorporating parent teacher associations (Banks review, 2002). While parent pressure groups (SPTC and SSBA) have largely shaped a contested debate, agreement remains to be achieved. Within Whitehall contrasting tensions surrounded whether to reduce the power of governing bodies. The Cabinet Office proposed that governing bodies might be a source of bureaucracy and constraint on school leadership while overburdening lay volunteers with excessive responsibilities (Haskins report, 2001). The DfEE, as it then was, committed to the importance of school governance and a stakeholder model of representation, responded with a Consultative paper on a reduction in the number of governors on the governing body and their responsibilities. The Education Act 2002 now enables deregulation and flexibility in the construction of governing bodies. The national governor organisations in England were instrumental in retaining the stakeholder model of governance while the National Assembly for Wales influenced the legislation to enable the ‘federation’ of currently small governing bodies in rural or inner city areas, re-establishing ‘grouped’ governing bodies.

4. The political agenda of modernisation and improving standards of achievement has helped to secure the significance of school governance. Yet this common policy has also been culturally specific in its implementation across the UK. In England and N. Ireland governors
are required to set targets and monitor the school’s performance, including that of the headteacher. While School boards in Scotland have been strengthened to assume statutory responsibility for school improvement, and governing bodies in Wales also emphasise improvement, nevertheless the conception of achievement is radically different. In Wales’ *The Learning Country* and in Scotland’s *How Good is our School* governors are encouraged to support very different conceptions of educational purpose, in life long learning for citizenship, as against the Whitehall skills agenda for economic regeneration. These nations, moreover, reject the performativity view of accountability (Ranson, 2003) as published exam results and league tables, of which there is also a wider critique across the UK.

5. The ‘hollowing out’ of the state (Rhodes, 1996) is thus culturally differentiated. Yet across the UK there is a common review of the purpose and practice of learning in search of a pedagogy of motivation that seeks to fill a policy vacuum ‘outside in’ or ‘bottom up’. Whether boards and governing bodies perceive themselves as carriers of this movement for change has also varied culturally. How has volunteering and school governance worked?

**Have citizens volunteered and participated?**

6. *The Volunteers:* The respondents to the survey, as well as the field work, suggest that volunteers are generally white, middle aged, middle class, middle income, public/community service workers. Only a small proportion of respondents indicated they were active as citizens in other spheres of civic life.

7. **Local profiles of volunteers:** There are distinctive differences of respondent profiles between local authorities. Volunteers in Smithstown were more likely to serve in the secondary sector, either as representatives of the authority or church nominees. They were more likely to be men (56%) over the age of 50 (54%), many retired. A higher proportion of volunteers worked in the private sector and were in the higher income brackets (36%). Inverburn respondents (community service workers) were parents (including 15% who are teachers) and included a higher proportion of younger female professionals working in the voluntary and public sectors, with A level equivalent as well as professional qualifications and at the lower end of salary grades. Rampton respondents (working families/mothers) were likely to be middle aged, parent governors serving in the primary sector, on low incomes (34% earning less than £15k), working part-time (31%) and in manual occupations (18%). Upborough respondents (public service professional middle classes) comprised a higher than average proportion of women and Local education authority nominees as well as teacher/non teacher representatives. There was a more youthful profile of volunteers in managerial/professional, higher income positions in the public and private sectors. Midshire volunteers had an older profile (43% over age 50) of members who work in managerial/professional positions often in the private sector (31%), with professional equivalent qualifications.

8. **Reasons for volunteering:** Our questions explored the extent to which members saw participation as an opportunity to pursue their own interests (‘support my child’, 13%), or recognised more general responsibilities (‘support the school’, 54%; ‘give something back to the community, 29%). Commitment to the school was highest in Inverburn (67%), while an orientation to the community was highest in Upborough (35%) and Smithstown. Interview data suggest that many board members have been ‘encouraged’ by school heads/principals to volunteer in the first instance, but also suggest that volunteering can have an educative effect as members progress from initial preoccupation with their own child to growing understanding.
of and commitment to the needs of the institution and the wider community. Often, on ceasing to be parent board members, they transfer to other categories of nominated membership.

9. **Extent of participation:** core and peripheral volunteers: The data suggest the boards are composed of a (large) core of committed and long serving members, while others are more detached and transient in their commitment. 42% had more than six years tenure (19 per cent of these for over 10 years). The most stable core was in Smithstown (26% over ten years), while in Upborough, with 19% with less than one year’s experience, there was a degree of short term turnover. The case work reinforces this picture of differential participation. Boards have a large core group of members who attend meetings regularly, give extensive hours to the board’s work (33% more than 21 hours a term) and who take responsibilities of chairing committees. Typically, chairs, vice-chairs and chairs of sub-committees were male.

10. **Coping with the demands of participation:** Those who believe that the burdens are onerous are relatively small: that the volume of work (15% of respondents), the workload complexity (18%), the responsibilities (17%) and powers (19%) are all unreasonable. Yet members disagreed about the distribution of the burden: on the one hand believing that the workloads are shared (88%; though in Inverburn, 26% disagree), yet on the other hand 59% agreeing that the head and chair do most of the work (65%, Smithstown and Rampton). Nevertheless, there was little support for strengthening the powers of heads or authorities at the expense of boards.

11. **Sustainability of volunteering:** The data are complex, suggesting serious concerns about recruiting new members (67% of respondents) and in retaining existing members (45%). These concerns were highest in Upborough and lowest in Smithstown and Rampton. On the other hand the commitment amongst present volunteers to continuing as board members remained buoyant, 71% reporting they will volunteer again. (This commitment was highest in Smithstown, 77%, and most uncertain in Inverburn, 54%). The traditional principle of (unpaid) volunteering, moreover, also remained strong at 67% (92% in Inverburn) although the greatest reservations existed in Upborough and interestingly amongst women (highest in Rampton). Nevertheless, the level of 30% doubters about continuing to volunteer reinforces the narrative of a vulnerable tail.

12. **Concluding discussion of volunteering:** Volunteering has been a considerable though not complete success. The under representation of women, ethnic minorities and disadvantaged classes is of continuing concern. The largest democratic volunteer force has survived and is beginning to flourish. It has been a fifteen year period of social change, illustrating Braudel’s ‘long duree’. Our various sources of data suggest that volunteering may enlarge the perspective of these citizens, helping them to progress from particular to general interests in civil society. It has created a generation of participants in civil society, independent of though connected to the polity. Our sample suggests, however, that the making of this volunteer force has been sustained by a generation of those who were socialised into the public sphere either through the polity or employment in professional public service.

**Plurality in the structuration of governance**

13. Very different forms of structuration of governance have developed within as well as between the national regions of the UK. We have developed a typology of **forums, consultations, boards and bodies** to capture the different conceptions of function, structure and practice of school governance across the UK. (Especially significant in the classification is the extent to which the members believe they are part of and act as a corporate entity).
(a) Governance as a deliberative forum: (Yellowhammer Primary; Tatton) this model is formally constitutive of school governance in Scotland, but it is also witnessed in the practice of some schools in other parts of the UK. Here governance constitutes largely a gathering of parents at which discussions of the school are determined and led by the headteacher as professional leader. Parents will not feel they can question the authority of the head though they may inquire about aspects of the schools progress. In Tatton, in Rampton, an inspection identified the governing body as weak and the head’s ambition has been to tutor its members in the practice of governance. While he is making progress practice emphasises deliberation of policy and development in the school. At Yellowhammer, in Inverburn, no more than six members attend and the meetings are held in the school’s staff room with a relatively informal format to avoid intimidating parents. The conversations were relatively unstructured with agendas typically focusing on how parents can contribute to improve their children’s learning. Over time there has been change. A new board has begun to develop an emphasis on accountability. It has formalised meetings, for example allocating responsibility for items to be discussed at the meetings, requiring the head to circulate a written report with other agenda information in advance of the meetings, and asking more questions.

(b) Governance as a consultative sounding board: (Seagull High; Rockswood; Brook; St Joseph’s). Here the board defines its role as providing a sounding board for the strategies and policies provided by the principal professional. The Head brings policies to the board for their consent and authorisation. At Rockswood, the meetings are held in the formal setting of the library, are led by the head with the Chair formalising the decisions arrived at after discussion. Seagull High holds its board meetings in the conference room. An ‘established’ seating arrangement prevails.

(c) Governance as an executive board: (Cavendish; Meadows; Brocksley). In these schools a partnership has developed between the governors and the school and, in particular, between the head and the chair with the former leading ‘primus inter pares’. The board will define its overall role as legal responsibility and accountability for the school together with a strong commitment to assist in the strategic development of the school. The Board defines its role as scrutinising policies, rules and resources to ensure that a coherent administrative and financial infrastructure of support is provided for the professional activities of the head and his or her staff and the continuing development of the school. There is a strong emphasis in this model on efficient stewardship of the school’s resources, though this may entail providing support for strategic decisions about securing capital for development of the school, or legitimating budget redistribution for new staffing. Businessmen, strong in social capital, are heavily represented amongst volunteers and are likely to be elected chair of the board. There is likely to be a strong structure of sub committees with considerable delegation of responsibility to take decisions that will typically be ratified, or ‘given an edge’ by the full board.

(d) Governance as a governing body: (Sycamore; Skipworth; Summerfield) In these schools the governing body takes overarching responsibility for the conduct and direction of the school. The head will be a strong professional leader but a member rather than leader of the governing body that acts as a corporate entity. The agenda and the meeting will be led by the Chair. The language of the head will communicate a different relationship: ‘would the governors like to consider such and such’ rather than ‘I strongly propose the policy should be.’ The strategy of the school will be set by the governing body, for example, Skipworth governors deciding, against the heads advice, that improvement depended upon placing the school at the centre of the community and seeking a PFI and grants to enable regeneration.
Has governance been a vehicle for school improvement?

14. Characteristics of school improvement typically emphasise professional leadership and practice to the exclusion of lay participation. A research literature (cf. Scanlon et al., 1998) and official studies have begun to recognise the contribution of school governance to improving school performance. Our study reinforces this work, developing a framework to analyse ‘the value chain’ of improvement (Cara and Ranson, 1998) that governance can generate.

15. Our research findings propose that governance fulfils a fundamentally constitutive role in the formation of schools as effective public institutions: first in constituting the infrastructure of effective institutional practice and, secondly, in constituting the social-cultural conditions for effective learning communities.

Figure 2: The value chain of governance and improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>Recognization/</td>
<td>Inclusion/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Diversity/</td>
<td>motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge; Cultural capital</td>
<td>Scrutiny/questions</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, review</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy/targets</td>
<td>Policy analysis</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource/knowledg generation</td>
<td>Development plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>Co-configuration</td>
<td>Authority;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>Communicative Action</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Governance as constituting the infrastructure of good institutional practice
(a) From failure to improvement: governance as scrutiny: The cases included four schools which had been failing (Skipworth; Summerfield, Tatton and Brook). In each case neglected failure – of professional leadership, lay governance, and authority stewardship - was revealed by external inspection. Local authorities then intervened to superimpose experienced professional leaders who with local advice began to reconstruct governing bodies with the ‘social capital’ of experienced, class advantaged volunteers, from the public services but also local commerce. These reconstituted governing bodies began to fulfil functions that were vital to the recovery of each institution and are indispensable to any effective public service. Practice was brought under scrutiny: questions began to be asked. The new chair of Brook regretted his silence under ‘the old hole in a corner’ regime of head and councillor chair: ‘I knew things were not right but nobody was asking questions to inquire’. When asked what role governors play in supporting schools their reply invariably referred to the significance of questions in scrutinising practice. Questions reach behind what is said in search of understanding, and beyond what is said to alternative possibilities (Gadamer, 1975). The new governors imposed regimes of standard setting, targetting and monitoring, and they used their networks (social capital) to lever decisions and resources from the Authority. At Skipworth, for example, governors used their influence to reduce the standard number of pupils thus preventing the LEA using the school for casual admissions, and to ensure the budget allocation accurately reflected pupil mobility. In each case governance made a profound contribution to regenerating the schools (see Appendix 5). As governing bodies Summerfield and Skipworth
developed a more vigorous strategic role of leadership improvement. As forums and consultative boards, at Tatton and Brook, governors and headteachers together worked to fulfil these functions of governance.

(b) From improvement to achievement: governance as development/direction: (Sycamore, Cavendish, Seagull High). At Cavendish: the board exert considerable influence through budgetary and staffing decisions. The head and the board sought to lobby against the Burns proposals to restructure post-primary education to encourage all parents to respond individually to the consultation. In a further initiative the Board has played a leading role in enabling and legitimating the strategic initiative to develop the whole campus that includes a primary and secondary modern school. It has led the initiative to win a major capital investment through PPP. The Board is central to codifying and embodying the ethos of the school. Seagull High: The head mobilises the role of the board to legitimate decisions; to develop networks with local church; to persuade other parents about changes to approach to learning and teaching, to engage with parents through the church; Support of board in struggle with archdiocese in RE teaching etc. The head uses the board to (a) lobby on behalf of the school especially for resources from the authority (b) to claim authority/legitimacy for the developments/initiatives in the wider community – teaching of RE, introduction of school uniform, health and safety; though the PPP to rebuild, rather than refurbish, the school has been led by the head, he uses the board to mobilise support with parents, with the Authority, and at public meetings of the parents forum. The chair refers to growing partnership and frank and open dialogue.

17. What these cases point to is the role which governing bodies and school boards can play in reinforcing the quality of institutional leadership and practice: enabling strategy, providing scrutiny of direction, policy and practice, offering guidance and support, and ensuring accountability. These qualities secure the authority and trust of schools as public institutions. By helping to improve the working of the institution the governing body will make more effective the environment of learning and teaching and thus the possibility of enhanced standards of educational achievement. Better governance establishes processes which generate better results.

![Figure 3: Layers of Improvement practice and types of governance](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limits of Practice</th>
<th>Types of Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forum</td>
<td>Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrutiny</td>
<td>Scrutiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying the typology of governance to this process of institutional improvement suggests that there are limits to the institutional development of schools which different forms of governance can play.

18. Governance constitutes the social and cultural conditions of learning
A number of schools have identified the potential of governance to make a further contribution to school improvement. While they acknowledge the role in improvement of the dominant ‘performativity regime’ of external targets and monitoring (Summerfield receiving a letter form the Secretary of State for its success) nevertheless they have come to regard this approach as fundamentally limited, unlikely to extend or sustain the improvement they are making.
In figure 4, all the five schools in the improving column have made progress, some considerable progress. Some of them now judge that further improvement will only be realised by developing strategies that are more like to motivate pupils and sustain their interest in learning. This requires, they assert, different approaches not only to learning and teaching but also to encouraging parental participation in the life of the school as well as on the school board or governing body. Yet Tatton has to succeed in embedding itself as a community primary, even though recognising that as a vital goal, while Yellowhammer, Meadows, Skipworth and Summerfield all remain detached from their disadvantaged estates’ schemes’ and their governing boards and bodies are unrepresentative of these excluded class disadvantaged and black and ethnic minority communities. Failure to recognise and value the excluded estates is acknowledged as central to underachievement in school. Two African Caribbean parent governors in Upborough – one at Skipworth, another at Meadows – argue that their governors bodies are unrepresentative of the black communities with serious consequences for the process of learning. These parents describe the failure of their schools to connect with the cultures of children and their communities and associate their children’s disenchantment with school to this failure.

Our data suggest achievement in the end is engendered and sustained by motivation and this derives from: recognising and valuing pupils, and connecting learning and teaching to the webs of meaning in their lifeworlds while drawing them towards the public worlds of living and working. Schools mediate between worlds. It presupposes a cultural change for many schools to transform their approach to learning and teaching as well as to including parent communities in the life and work of the school. Skipworth is learning that they cannot sustain ‘educational’ improvement within the school independently of the communities within which they are embedded. They recognise the inescapable interconnection of school and community regeneration that requires inter-agency collaboration at every level.

We argue this configuring of learning and living is a constitutive task for the governance of the school, rather than of specialist knowledge alone. Public administration traditionally focuses upon the distributive and regulatory functions that define roles, responsibilities and resource allocation. A socio-cultural approach is also needed to grasp how institutions by embodying particular bodies of knowledge and cultural capital at the expense of others, also recognise and motivate some communities at the expense of others. Governance can itself learn how its activities can be more inclusive of the communities it is intended to serve and represent.

Does social capital work to support the agreements that underlie achieving schools?

All the schools sought to strengthen their institutions by drawing upon social capital in their communities. They drew in significant others who would become supporters of and advocates for the school. They did so in ways that reflected their conception of school governance and the regimes of local structuration of governance in which they were located.
Tatton and Yellowhammer invited mothers to support the work of the school, while Seagull High encouraged board members who would strengthen ties with the church and diocese as the local community. Schools that have developed an executive model of the board have nominated or encouraged to participate business men and women, accountants, executives in the public services as well as the private sector. At Cavendish the head and chair ‘hand-pick’ volunteers for their professional specialisms as well as their capacity to share and reinforce the ethos of the school. Schools draw in the cultural capital of specialist expertise to support their capacity to plan what is regarded inescapably in the era of devolved management (everywhere except Scotland) as in large part a business. Meadows and Cavendish have a personnel specialist to chair a staffing committee, an accountant to chair the finance committee and a former adviser to chair the curriculum committee. In the more political environments of New Labour Upborough, and Old Labour Rampton, governing bodies seek volunteers who can strengthen their ties in the party networks and hierarchies.

23. There is variety therefore in membership that reflects local social and cultural structuration of governance. Yet there is a common thread in the social capital narrative: social class. Schools sought to add to their forum, board or body volunteers who possessed the cultural capital of class advantage whose knowledge, influence and advocacy would connect the school into the key networks of the professional and public service world on which the school depended for resources and support. Schools added ‘cosmopolitans’ to complement the ‘locals’ (Gouldner). The participation of senior executives in the public and private sectors and influential public service professionals ensured that Skipworth had its standard admission numbers adjusted to prevent casual admissions, and its budget corrected to reflect the serious mobility factor, while Cavendish used influential members of the board to acquire crucial statistics from the Assembly Education Committee to use in its campaign against the Burns Report. Possessing a university lecturer and lawyer on the forum, helped Tatton through its inspection, while members of Seagull High provide important links to the Archdiocese. Schools used their social (class) capital in this way to gain access to privileged networks and resources, together with political support.

24. Social capital delivered the public goods of authority and trust. In so doing they created strong schools, institutions which enhanced the public sphere. Social capital generated civic capital. The dominant methodologically individualistic paradigm of social capital (Putnam) needs rounding out to acknowledge the significance of collective goods, which though produced by individuals are not reducible to them. When individuals strengthen a governing body, that corporate entity strengthens a public institution, the collective (civic) capital of which sustains civil society. (cf. Evers, Fine etc)

25. Figure 4, however, suggests while all schools in this study have been enhanced by class capital to become, in varying degrees, more effective institutions in the public sphere a number have failed to connect in significant ways with their disadvantaged parent communities. They have ‘bridged’ to the official world of the public sphere, but not to their own excluded estates and schemes. Some of these schools now acknowledge that until they become community active to reach out to the excluded their improvement is likely to remain blocked. They understand that they will not become effective institutions until they become civic institutions, developing the social and cultural conditions for learning as well as the organisational qualities of strategic leadership, scrutiny and accountability. Their strategic challenge is to connect their pedagogy to the life-world of the disadvantaged. We need to conceptualise this bridging to the excluded, to communities of difference as civic capital. If
social capital tends to be class capital, bridging provides the civic capital to include and mediate between worlds in the public sphere. It is a responsibility for governance.

*Cultural classification: constraints and opportunities in the remaking of community governance*

26. This study has suggested that while although school governors had adopted (modernising) perspectives of monitoring schools to improve performance they have nevertheless developed conceptions of governance which are independent of ‘the state’ and reflect local cultural traditions of governing education. In this sense governors have become active citizens. Our concluding analysis, however, proposes that school governance in many respects remains significantly unrepresentative of some of its significant parent constituencies. As such citizen participation in school governance has yet to be realised in many communities.

27. Across the UK policy development is unfolding which recognises the significance of renewing learning, of generating a pedagogy of motivation to kindle interest amongst the bored and disaffected. Policy documents in each nation reveal a shared understanding that renewing learning depends upon connecting learning in school with learning in family and community. This movement for change demonstrates cross-nation policy learning: the *new community school* initiative in Scotland influenced the *schools plus: building learning communities* in England. The collegiate college scheme developing in England influenced the Burns Report in N. Ireland. The National Assembly for Wales’ *The Learning Country*, with its emphasis on partnership with communities as the foundation for lifelong learning has been widely influential.

28. Whether a wider school community partnership of school governance with and for the community develops in the different nations of the UK will reflect cultural and political traditions. The valuing of community and its connection with the school has strong cultural roots in Scotland and Wales. Yet the tradition of democratic governance has, historically, focused upon the local authority, with the professional policy community giving the lead in the school and its wider relationships. In N. Ireland with its history, until recently, of an administered public sphere, school governance has been professionally led though with a stronger tradition, than in Scotland, of lay participation. In England, an emphasis upon community participation has had an intermittent influence since Plowden in the 1960’s, encouraged recently with policy steer on *neighbourhood renewal*, and *social inclusion*.

29. The cultural traditions of education across the UK have all tended to reproduce the tradition the school as a space of professional regulation. This study of school governance concludes that although participation has developed to strengthen institutions in the official world of the public sphere, it remains incomplete. We would argue that schools will not become effective learning communities until they become truly cosmopolitan learning communities, and they will only realise that vision when democratic governance is strengthened at the level of school and community as well as the local authority.

IV Activities
- Professor Ranson, key note paper to Institute for School and College Governors (ISCG) annual conference, September, 2002
• Dr. Martin national New Local Government Network and Improvement and Development Agency conference *Governing Education for Community Regeneration*, London, Cavendish Conference Centre, June, 2002

• Dr. Martin and Professor Ranson networks with the New Local Government Network and ISCG;

• Presentations to ESRC conferences in Birmingham (01); Manchester, (March 02) and Essex, January (03)

V Outputs


Ranson, S. Arnott, M, McKeown, P and Martin, J. ‘School governance and the constitutive conditions of improvement’, (to be submitted to *British Journal of Educational Research*).

Arnott, M., McKeown, P and Ranson, S ‘Comparing school and local governance across the UK’ (to be submitted for special edition of *local Government Studies* December 03)

McKeown, P., Arnott, M and Ranson, S. ‘Adding value: social capital and school governance across the UK’, (to be submitted to *Journal of Education Policy*).

VI Impacts

1. National policy

• Dr. Martin’s membership of Ofsted working party to prepare guidance on school governance for the new inspection framework.

• The programme of research has attracted further funding from the National Assembly for Wales (£50k) and significant sponsorship from the Department for Education in Northern Ireland (DENI).

• Professor Ranson’s lecture to ESRC Conference in January 03 attracted interest from the Cabinet Office (Ruth Ingamells) and David Miliband, Minister of State for Schools at the DfEs.

2. Practitioner world

• Dr. Martin’s has presented to a number of local authority governor associations and contributed to the IdeA improving education services model.

• The Institute for School and College Governors has responded to Professor Ranson’s keynote address by seeking sponsorship from DfEs to support training and development of governing bodies to enable them to establish partnerships between school and community.

• Mrs McKeown has been working with the Governor Support Officer of the Education and Library Board in the reconsideration of the governor support programme.
VII Future Research Priorities

- Research is needed to further analyse how schools in contexts of disadvantage can develop the cultural change necessary to introduce a pedagogy of motivation and to involve excluded communities in the life and governance of schools. Professor Ranson has applied for an ESRC Professorial fellowship to further develop research and writing on this ‘pedagogy of governance’.

- Dr. Arnott and Mrs McKeown will be further developing analysis of the methodology of comparative research in the governance of education.
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