

A Comparative Analysis of the Education Policy Shift to School Type Diversification and Corporatization in England and the United States of America: Implications for Educational Leader Preparation Programs

This manuscript has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and endorsed by the International Council of Professors of Educational Leadership (ICPEL) as a significant contribution to the scholarship and practice of school administration and K-12 education.



Valerie A. Storey
University of Central Florida

The purposes of this paper were to undertake a comparative analysis of policy shifts in England and the United States of America relating to school type diversification and corporatization, and the implications for educational leader preparation programs. Whilst the school delivery landscape seems to be one of turbulence, over the last four decades there has been a consistent drive in both countries for school-type diversification due to bi-partisan consensus regarding the appropriateness of neoliberal solutions to the problem of raising educational standards. This study involves an intellectual mapping of education provision in England and the United States of America, drawing on a range of primary and secondary data sources, including policy speeches, and for the latter, scholars' interpretations of these. The documents were located initially through keyword searches of databases, archival material and legislation, and subsequently through following up references.

Keywords: educational leadership preparation program, education policy, neoliberalism, school choice, school types, structural reform.

“It is a question of whether we can grasp the real nature of our society, or whether we persist in social and educational patterns based on a limited ruling class, a middle professional class, a large operative class, cemented by forces that cannot be challenged and will not be changed. The privileges and barriers, of an inherited kind, will in any case go down. It is only a question of whether we replace them by the free play of the market, or by a public education designed to express and create the values of an educated democracy and a common culture.”
(Williams, 1961 p.155)

Is it possible to implement a democratic educational system in a competitive market place that incorporates productive choice for all? Neoliberal and neoconservative policy makers in England and the United States of America (USA) would argue a definitive yes and that the route to achieving this outcome requires a change in how we understand public education and how public school systems are organized. This shifts public control over public resources out of the hands of the state and into the hands of the private sector (Saltman, 2009; Whitehurst, 2017); redefining the government’s role in public education by transitioning from state-created, traditional school districts to a model that embraces diversification of school providers (Smarick, 2017). In this model, school reform is driven by corporate partnerships rather than democratic representation, and by diffusion rather than bureaucratic centralization. Examples of diversified reforms include academies and free schools (England), charter schools and virtual schools (USA), and, by extension, independent operators and organizations.

Legislatures in both England and the United States have championed school diversity. Neoconservatives are attracted to the concepts of choice, competition, and deregulation whilst neoliberals, see the opportunity to help disadvantaged students get a quality education that the traditional system has failed to provide (Barber, 2016; Richmond, 2017).

In response to school diversification there emerges a need to ensure that educational leadership preparation program design allows pre-service administrators to develop the necessary knowledge and skills ((Darling-Hammond, 2017; LaFrance & Beck, 2014) to lead effectively in a turbulent landscape. This is challenging as the speed of change in policy outruns the speed of program change in higher education. In a recent study, LaFrance and Beck (2014) found that educational leadership preparation programs create experiences that are largely parallel to traditional experiences. The implications being that if higher education cannot address today’s school leadership professional developmental needs, then other private organizations will soon fill the gap.

The paper’s analysis is comparative, considering the similarities and differences between the policy approaches and their trajectories, the underlying factors that determine these and what is known about their consequences for educational leadership preparation. It reveals a number of issues and tensions relating to both diversification, and corporatization, which then raise questions regarding the training and professional development of future educational leaders.

Changing Landscape of Educational Delivery

The paper first examines current literature on school reform and diversification in the USA.

United States of America

Policy Contexts

The American education system is hierarchical in structure, being organized on three governmental levels—federal, state, and local school district (Ornstein et al., 2016). The federal and state governments share primary responsibility and political power over public education, with the states exercising most of the control. Except for Hawaii, states delegate power to local school boards (often bound by county, city or township) that exercise control over a school district (Darling-Hammond, 2017).

Since the 1960s, states and school districts have sponsored alternatives to traditional neighborhood K-12 schools e.g. magnet schools, themed schools (arts, law, or health professions), language-immersion schools, and networks of innovative school models, such as the Internationals Network for Public Schools, the New Tech Network, and California’s Linked Learning Academies. In the early 1980s, cities such as New York, San Francisco, and Cambridge, pioneered a choice system (Darling-Hammond, 2017), which led to a steady rise in the corporatization of public schools.

Federal Policy

To facilitate the implementation of federal educational policies, the United States Department of Education, as the primary federal educational agency, assumes the responsibilities of overseeing federal policy implementation; administering grant funds; contracting with state departments of education, school districts, and colleges; engaging in educational innovation and research; and providing leadership, consultative, and clearing house services to education (Ornstein et al., 2016).

Over the last six decades, the federal government has enacted three legislative acts, which have gradually increased both their involvement and influence in education reform using top-down approaches (Fullan, 1993). First, the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA, 1965) directed states to focus on raising achievement and reducing the achievement gap (Powell, 1965). Second, *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB, 2001) held states and local school districts accountable for students meeting high academic standards in reading and math, as measured by annual performance tests developed by each state (NCLB, 2009). Schools that failed to improve student performance and meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) four years in a row faced possible penalties, including a decrease or elimination of federal funding, being forced to close or convert to charter schools, or being forced to undergo a change in administration (NCLB, 2009; Ornstein et al., 2016). Additionally, *Race to the Top* (RTTT) was established through a competitive grant program, and required states to create educational innovation through the development of plans aligned with federal policy priorities. Each state submitting a proposal was ranked and awarded according to their ranking of educational innovation grounded in the school change initiative. Grants were awarded each year in phases over a 4-year period from 2009-2013 with \$4.35 billion total dollars being spent in education (Kolbe, 2012). Third, *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA, 2015), which replaced NCLB, grants increased flexibility to states regarding testing, and funding for low performing schools, as well as emphasis on preparing students for success in college and careers.

Table 1

United States: Education Impacted in Federal Policy

Date Event	Policy	Impact
1965	Elementary & Secondary Education Act	<p>Provided federal funding to strengthen the capacity of state departments of education and local education agencies</p> <p>Forbade the establishment of a national curriculum</p> <p>Provided federal funding to assist low-income students</p>
2001	No Child Left Behind (NCLB)	<p>Expanded the federal role in public education through further emphasis on annual testing, annual academic progress, report cards, and teacher qualifications, as well as significant changes in funding</p> <p>Fostered privatization by investing billions of public dollars in the charter school movement</p> <p>Required high-stakes testing, accountability, and remediation measures that shift resources away from public school control and into control by test and textbook publishing corporations and for-profit remediation companies.</p>
2009	American Recovery & Reinvestment Act	Earmarked 100 billion federal dollars for education 4 billion of these federal dollars earmarked for the competitive grant program
2009	Race to the Top (RttT)	Promoted state adoptions of content standards and assessments through a competitive grant application.
2015	Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)	Supports teachers' and principals' professional development to improve instruction and instructional leadership

States

Each state has primary legal responsibilities that are delegated from the federal government to support and maintain public schools within its borders. These responsibilities mainly include enacting legislation, determining state school taxes and financial aid to local school districts, setting minimum standards for training, recruiting personnel, providing curriculum guidelines, and establishing assessment requirements (Ornstein et al., 2016). To facilitate state governance of

public education, state governments have created state boards of education and state departments of education. The state board of education serves an advisory function to the state legislature and develops rules to implement the education statutes. The state department of education, operating under the state board of education, primarily emphasizes collecting data and disseminating statistics on the status of education within the state, and oversees implementation of state and federal laws and statutes (Ornstein et al., 2016).

School Districts and Traditional K-12 School Model

In the traditional 20th century district model, about 14,000 local school districts provide direct services and govern schools in the United States. Each district has a central office that consists of the local school board, school superintendent, and central office staff (including deputy superintendents, associate superintendents, assistant superintendents, directors, department heads, coordinators and supervisors). Local school boards are legal extensions of state government, and are delegated by the state to assume significant decision-making authority. Local school boards have three primary responsibilities: (1) ensure that state laws, regulations, and rules are followed; (2) establish policies that are not covered by state statutes, including establishing schools, raising and expending public funds, and establishing policy and rules to govern the schools; and (3) employ a superintendent to assist day-to-day operations in the school district and school (Ornstein et al., 2016). In this traditional model, the district exclusively provides education services within its geographical boundaries to geographically assigned student zones (Whitehurst, 2017; Smarick, 2017).

K-12 Diversification

School Vouchers and Tax Credit Scholarships

Vouchers provide public money to eligible families to spend on private school tuition. Tax-credit scholarship programs provide tax credits to businesses and individuals who donate money to organizations that grant need based scholarships for use at private schools.

Milton Friedman (1955) developed the first concrete policy proposal for school vouchers. Friedman argued that government should be the funder of K–12 education but need not be its provider, and that this system of school choice, would provide a fairer, more effective, and more efficient education to schoolchildren than the assignment of students to neighborhood public schools (Chubb & Moe, 1990). Currently, vouchers give parents all or a portion of the public funding set aside for their child’s education to choose private schools that best fit their learning needs. State funds typically expended by a school district are allocated to families in the form of a voucher to pay partial or full tuition at a private school, including religious and non-religious options.

The first urban school voucher program in the United States was launched in 1990 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. It enrolled just 341 students in seven participating private schools (all of them secular, by law) but grew steadily, especially after religious schools were allowed to participate in 1998. The Milwaukee program currently enrolls almost 28,000 students in 121 private schools (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2017). Though taxpayer-funded private school choice programs represent the smallest source of alternatives to assigned public schools in terms of current enrollments, they represent the most rapidly growing form of school

choice (Glenn & Gininger, 2012).

Like direct government voucher payments to families, tax credits divert money from public schools in support of private schools. But vouchers come from the public budget. They are visible and therefore contestable and debatable. Tax credits divert money from public treasuries before the funds even get there. Tuition tax credit programs operate in 17 states. Florida and Arizona have the largest programs followed by Indiana, Louisiana, and Georgia (Prothero, 2017).

1. Traditional Public Schools

Traditional public schools educate 90 per cent of schoolchildren in America. They operate at the state level through departments of education, and locally by school districts and publicly elected or appointed school boards. Approximately 15,000 different school districts operate in the United States. Students generally go to the public school in the district in which they live.

2. Magnet Schools

Magnet schools have a focused theme and aligned curricula in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM), Fine and Performing Arts, International Baccalaureate, International Studies, MicroSociety, Career and Technical Education (CTE), World Languages (immersion and non-immersion) and many others (Magnet Schools of America, 2017).

Magnet schools typically use an approach to learning that is inquiry or performance/project based. They use state, district, or Common Core standards in all subject areas; however, they are taught within the overall theme of the school. Most magnet schools do not have entrance criteria, but often use a random computer-based lottery system for admission. There are also “Talented & Gifted” magnet schools that may utilize student assessment data and teacher or parent recommendations for selection (Magnet Schools of America, 2017).

3. Charter Schools

In the 1980s, Albert Shanker, teachers’ union leader, proposed a new approach to K-12 schooling, which focused on “chartering” schools to enable innovative policies, and pedagogical approaches to be trialed and implemented. Minnesota passed the first charter law in 1991; by 2013, 42 states had enacted similar legislation. Federal incentives began during the George W. Bush administration, were increased in the Obama years, and were augmented by substantial investments from philanthropies like the Broad, Gates, and Walton foundations (Darling-Hammond, 2017).

Charter schools choose their own management structure: 67 percent of all charter schools are independently run as non-profit, single site schools; 20 percent are run by non-profit organizations that run more than one charter school; and for-profit companies run just under 13 percent. For-profit charter schools have to meet financial oversight regulations, just like any company the government contracts with to provide a service (Alliance for Public Charter Schools, 2017).

Approximately three million students enroll in about 7,000 charter schools in more than 40 states (EdChoice, 2016). In 17 cities, at least 30 percent of public school students are now enrolled in charters (National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, 2017). National enrollment in charter schools has grown by about 10 percent annually for the past decade, and student participation in private school choice programs doubled between 2011 and 2016 (Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice, 2016). In 2017, about 5 percent of the K–12 populations can be found in charter schools with increasing evidence of for-profit education-management companies running the schools.

3.a. Teacher-Powered Schools Initiative

Established in the 1970s this is a growing movement due to an increasing focus on student centered personalized instructional programs and an emphasis on distributed leadership. Approximately, 115 teacher-powered or teacher-led schools are operating in 18 states. The goal of the Teacher-Powered Schools Initiative, a program of the nonprofits Education Evolving and the Center for Teaching Quality is that in 30 years, every teacher in the country will have the option to work in a teacher-led school (Teacher-Powered Schools, 2017).

4. Virtual Schools

Virtual schooling was initiated in the mid-1990s and has experienced continued growth (LaFrance & Beck, 2014). Reid et al. (2009) defined a virtual school as one that offers alternative solutions to educating K-12 students who may not be well served otherwise, whereas Salsberry (2010) described it as one, which typically offers learning experiences via the Internet. Cavanaugh (2010) observed that virtual schools have grown up over the past 15 years in different policy and budget ecosystems, but most of them can be classified into six major categories: (1) state run virtual schools; (2) multi-district virtual schools; (3) single-district virtual schools; (4) consortium programs; (5) university programs; and (6) private and parochial virtual schools. Some virtual schools are fully online; others are fully online with restrictions. Virtual education for elementary and secondary students has grown into a \$507 million market and continues to grow at an estimated annual pace of 30 % (Stedrak et al., 2012). Funding for virtual schools vary depending on the state. Some are funded directly by the state, while others may be funded by local school districts.

5. Private Schools

Attendance at private schools has been declining for the last 15 years, particularly for elementary and middle school students despite the introduction of school choice programs enabling families to use government funds or private funds (e.g., tax credits) to attend privately operated schools (Whitehurst, 2017). There are 33,619 private schools in the United States, serving 5.4 million PK-12 students. Private schools account for 25 percent of the nation's schools and enroll 10 percent of all PK-12 students. Most private schools are small (fewer than 300 students) and religiously affiliated (Council for American Private Education [CAPE], 2017).

6. Home Schooling

Homeschooling is growing in popularity as an alternative to attending a district school, although it is growing at a slower rate when compared to the growth rate of charter schools and voucher programs (Wolf & Egalite, 2016). Estimates suggest that the number of homeschooled students have increased from 850,000 or 1.8 percent of the K-12 populations in 2001 to 1.75 million or 3.6 percent of all students in 2013, a doubling of the rate of homeschooling over a 12-year period (Wolf & Egalite, 2016).

Table 2

United States: School type and role

School Type	School Role
Traditional Public Schools	Public schools funded by the government that students are assigned to based on district zoning regulations
Magnet Schools	Public schools that have a particular focus, students may have to take a test to qualify or parents can request they attend
Charter Schools	Public schools that parents can request their child attend
Virtual Schools	Schools that are conducted via the internet
Private School	Can be religious, academic, or otherwise, parents need to pay a tuition for their child to attend
Home School	Parents are the teachers

England**Policy Environment**

In the first half of the 20th century, the education system in England was highly selective, consisting of public state-funded, faith and other charitable schools (Higginson, 1974; Mortimore, 2013). At age eleven, students entered a tripartite system, sorted through high stakes tests, predominantly into grammar, secondary modern, and technical schools (Courtney, 2016; Haydn, 2004; Crook, 2002). In the second half of the twentieth century, English secondary schools underwent a period of radical change, introducing comprehensive schools, in an attempt to develop a more equitable system (Courtney, 2016).

The 1988 *Education Reform Act* (ERA) introduced the marketization of schooling, local management of schools (LMS), and reduced role for the local authority/school district. Responsibility for budgetary control was partially removed from democratically elected local authorities and handed to school head teachers and governing bodies (Ball, 1990; Hill, 1997; Hill, Lewis, Maisuria, Yarker, & Hill, 2016).

Despite these school reforms, an observable correlation between wealth and educational outcomes remained. The Schools White Paper, *The Importance of Teaching* (Department for Education [DfE], 2010) again attempted to address the issue by “creat(ing) a school system which is more effectively self-improving” (DfE, 2010, para 7.4). The proposed system further bypassed local authorities with funding for proposed academies and free schools emanating directly from the (national) Education Funding Agency (Hill, Lewis, Maisuria, Yarker, & Hill, 2016).

Table 3

England: Education Impacted in Government Policy

Date Event	Policy	Impact
------------	--------	--------

1988	Education Reform Act	<p>Introduced choice for parents</p> <p>Introduced City Technology Colleges (CTCs)</p> <p>Introduced Local Management of Schools (LMS). Schools allowed to be taken out of the direct financial control of local authorities. Financial control handed to the headteacher and governors of a school</p> <p>Introduced of Grant-maintained schools (GMS).</p> <p>Primary and secondary schools allowed to remove themselves fully from their local authority and would be completely funded by central government</p> <p>Secondary schools given limited selection powers at the age of 11</p>
1996	Nursery Education and Grant Maintained Schools Act	Introduced unsuccessful voucher scheme for nursery education (later withdrawn by Labour), and allowed governors of GM schools to borrow money
1997	Education (Schools) Act	Endorsed much of the 1988 Education Reform Act and its successors, in relation both to parental choice and to competition between schools
1997	White Paper <i>Excellence in Schools</i>	Encouraged secondary schools to become specialist schools which would be allowed to select a small proportion of their pupils on the basis of 'perceived aptitudes'
1998	School Standards and Framework Act	<p>Incorporated all aspects of the 1997 White Paper</p> <p>Allowed maintained secondary schools to select by aptitude</p> <p>Empowered local authorities and the secretary of state to intervene in schools judged to be failing. Schools would be given two years to improve or they would be closed or have radical management changes imposed on them</p> <p>Created a new framework for schools (to be implemented from 2000) with community schools replacing county schools and foundation schools</p>

replacing grant maintained schools. Voluntary schools (mostly the church schools) would stay the same.

2001	White Paper <i>Schools - achieving success</i>	<p>Reduced role of local authority. 85% of a school's budget directly controlled by the headteacher.</p> <p>Increased involvement of the private sector in state provision</p> <p>Enabled private, religious and voluntary organizations to support the management of both failing and successful schools</p> <p>Required greater diversity in secondary education, with more specialist schools and city academies attracting private sponsorship</p> <p>Compulsory use of Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) where schools or local authorities were failing, and encouragement of the use of PPPs by successful schools</p> <p>Allowed successful primary schools to opt out of the National Curriculum and develop curriculum innovations</p>
2002	Education Act	Proposals of the White Paper incorporated in the Act
2006	Education and Inspections Act	<p>Encouraged Primary and secondary schools to become independent state schools (trust schools) backed by private sponsors - businesses, charities, faith groups, universities or parent and community organizations</p> <p>Failing schools would be given a year to improve before a competition for new providers was held. It would then be reopened as an academy or a trust school with a private sponsor. Parents would be given the right to set up new schools, to close 'failing' ones and to dismiss head teachers</p> <p>Encouraged good schools to expand or link up with neighboring schools in federations</p>

Successful schools would be able to apply for new responsibilities such as teacher training
Local authorities would lose most of their powers and would become 'parents' champions' rather than education providers

2010	The Academies Act	Rapid expansion of academies Removed local authorities' power to veto a school becoming an academy Dispensed with parents' and teachers' legal right to oppose such plans; and allowed schools categorized as 'outstanding' to 'fast-track' the process of becoming academies
2011	Education Act	Diminished the role of local authorities, further expansion of academies Increased schools' powers relating to pupil behavior and exclusions Secretary of State has greater power to make land available for free schools

Ref: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/acts/>

Department for Education

The Department for Education (DfE) is a ministerial department responsible for 18 umbrella agencies covering children's services and education, including higher and further education policy, apprenticeships and wider skills in England (GOV.UK. 2017). Local government authorities are responsible for implementing policy for a comprehensive system in which the majority of students of all abilities and aptitudes are taught together. Since 1998, there have been seven types of maintained (state funded) schools in England: (1) Academy schools; (2) Community schools; (3) Free schools; (4) Foundation schools; (5) Voluntary Aided schools; (6) Voluntary Controlled schools; and (7) State Boarding schools.

School Districts and Traditional K-12 School Model

In the traditional model, local education authorities (LEAs) provided the majority of support services for schools in their locality. Local management of schools (LMS, 1988), allowed headteachers and their governing bodies to remove themselves from the financial control of local authorities, and introduced grant maintained schools, decentralized through being funded directly by central government, bypassing local authorities (Hansen & Vignoles, 2005).

K-12 Diversification

1. State Schools

There are four main types of state schools funded or maintained by local authorities: (1) Community schools; (2) Foundation and Trust schools; (3) Voluntary-aided schools; and (4) Voluntary-controlled schools. These schools must follow the national curriculum and national teacher pay and conditions.

1.a. Community Schools

Community schools are controlled and run by the local authority, which employ the school staff, own the land and buildings, and set the entrance criteria (such as catchment area) that decide which children are eligible for a place. State secondaries (high schools) can have a specific **specialism** in: the arts, math and computing, business and enterprise, music, engineering, science, humanities, sports, languages, and technology.

1.b. Foundation and Trust Schools

Foundation schools are different from state-run schools in that an elected governing body runs them, independent of the local authority. The governing body not only employs the staff and sets the criteria for admission, but it can also own the land the school is on as well as its buildings, although often it is owned by a charity (or charitable foundation).

Trust schools have evolved from Foundation schools, in that they are a type of Foundation school that has decided to develop a partnership, known as a charitable trust, with an outside body. Often that body is either an educational charity or a business, according to Directgov (2017), and it owns both the building and the land used by the school.

1.c. Voluntary-Aided (VA) Schools

The majority of Voluntary-aided (VA) schools are faith schools. A foundation or trust (usually a religious organization) inputs a small proportion of the capital costs for the school and forms a majority on the schools governing body. The governing body employs the staff and sets admissions criteria. The land and buildings are usually owned by the religious organization.

1.d. Voluntary-Controlled (VC) Schools

Voluntary-controlled school (VC) schools are like Voluntary-aided (VA) schools, but are run by the local authority that employs the staff and sets the admission policy. The foundation or trust (usually a religious organization) owns the land and buildings, and usually forms a quarter of the governing body. Specific exemptions from Section 85 of the Equality Act 2010 enables VC faith schools to use faith criteria in prioritizing students for admission to the schools.

2. Academies

The first academies were established by the 1997-2010 New Labour Government to replace poorly performing urban secondary comprehensives (Adonis, 2012). While there are different types of academies, they all have the same status in law. Academies are publically funded, independent schools, held accountable through a legally binding ‘funding agreement’. Some academies have sponsors or trusts such as businesses, universities, other schools, faith groups or voluntary groups, which employ the teachers and are responsible for improving the performance of the academy.

In 2010, the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government expanded the role of academies in the Academy Program. Flexibility of policy has enabled the academy model to become the template for a range of sub-types. These include (1) Studio Schools; (2) Free Schools; (2i) University Technical Colleges (UTCs); and (2ii) City Technology Colleges (CTC). Academies have statutory freedoms concerning the national curriculum, student admissions,

school hours, term dates, and teacher's pay, conditions and qualifications (GOV.UK., 2016b). Contract law governs these freedoms; each contract is between an academy trust, following a business model, and the DfE.

The Academies Commission (2013) distinguish between what it terms Mark I, Mark II and Mark III sponsored academies. The former, created between 2002-2006, sought sponsors from the private sector, who contributed up to £2 million of the school's capital costs. Mark II academies were permitted to seek sponsors from establishments such as universities, who would not be liable for capital costs, but whose funding agreements were controlled more tightly. In Mark III sponsored academies, from 2010, funding agreements were loosened.

DfE figures indicate that there were 4580 academies in England in March 2015, 1859 of which were secondaries representing around 56 percent of all secondary schools. Academisation has been less popular among primaries, where the total was 2476 or around 15 percent of all of England's primary schools. Academies, have essentially replaced the role of Foundation schools

2.a. Studio Schools

Studio Schools, according to the Studio Trust who oversee Studio Schools, are grounded in extensive research and best practice from the UK and around the world (Studio Trust, 2017a). They are funded by the taxpayer but not controlled by a local authority. They have to be sponsored by existing schools, colleges, and community groups (existing schools cannot convert to become a Studio School). They serve 14 to 19 year olds, unlike the traditional comprehensive school, which serves 11 to 19 years old, and tend to be small (300 pupils). As an academy, Studio Schools have the option to (1) select 10% of their students by reference to a specific aptitude; (2) operate longer school days; and (3) operate an all year calendar to replicate a business model. The first Studio Schools (2010) were approved by the then Labour Government, and the program subsequently expanded under the Coalition Government. Studio Schools are required to reflect their local community, and align with local labour markets. Grounding the Key Stage 4 National Curriculum subjects i.e. English, Mathematics, and two Science subjects (GOV.UK., 2016) is project-based learning; work with real world partners and clients; personal coaches to support students identify and meet personal academic and vocational targets; and strong links into key industries.

Key employability and life skills also underpin the curriculum through the CREATE skills framework i.e. Communication, Relating to people, Enterprise, Applied skills, Thinking skills and Emotional intelligence (Studio Schools Trust, 2017b). Students complete work placements for four hours a week with partner employer at the age of 14 years, and this increases to two days a week after age 16. Many students are paid for this work.

Currently, of the 47 Studio Schools originally established, 33 remain open, and 6 new studio schools are in the pipeline to open (Schools Week, 2016). Seventy five percent of Studio School closures were those established by Further Education (Community) Colleges between 2010 and 2015. These closures are primarily due to four factors: (1) recruitment difficulties; (2) inconsistency of specialism attractiveness e.g. business enterprise or construction are less popular than science or the creative industries; (3) change in formula funding which resulted in a reduction of funds due to the loss of small schools premium; and (4) growing a school where success is not perceived as being dependent on traditional exam success.

2.b. Faith Academies

Faith academies can be either (1) sponsored by a faith; or (2) be an existing church school converting to an academy. Unlike faith schools, which have to follow the national curriculum, faith academies do not have to teach the national curriculum and they also have their own

admissions processes. There are Islamic, Roman Catholic, and Church of England faith sponsored or co-sponsored academies (GOV.UK.,2016a).

3. Free Schools

Free schools are funded by the government rather than by the local authority, and consequently have more internal control (GOV.UK., 2016a). They can (1) set their own pay and conditions for teachers; (2) have the flexibility to change the length of the school day and school terms (semesters); and (3) do not have to follow the national curriculum. Free schools take students of all abilities and are prohibited from using academic selection processes. They can be run on a not-for-profit basis and can be set up by groups like: charities, universities, independent schools, community and faith groups, parents, and businesses.

In March, 2017, the Government established LocatED, a public company, to acquire land and buildings across the country to help the Government build 500 new free schools by 2020 and create 600,000 new school places by 2021 (Nash, 2017). More than nine in ten free schools have been approved in areas where a need for more school places has already been identified. Local communities deciding they wanted more choice have created the remainder. This represents a considerable and rapid shift in England towards an education system in which the majority of schools are independent of local control.

3.a. University Technical Colleges (UTC)

University technical colleges specialize in subjects such as engineering and construction - and teach these subjects along with business skills and using IT. Students study academic subjects as well as practical subjects leading to technical qualifications. The university and employers, who also provide work experience for students, design the curriculum. University technical colleges are sponsored by: universities, employers, and further education (community) colleges.

3.b. City Technology Colleges (CTC)

City technology colleges are owned and funded by companies as well as central government (not the local council). They have a particular emphasis on technological and practical skills.

4. Grammar schools

Grammar schools are state secondary schools that select their students on the basis of academic ability. Potential students take an examination at age 11, known as the "11-plus". There are approximately 163 grammar schools in England, out of some 3,000 state secondaries. In the May, 2017 budget, the government assigned 320 million pounds for expansion of the government's free school program, with schools free to offer selective education. New selective schools will be allowed to open and existing schools will be able to become grammars.

5. Independent schools

Schools that charge fees to attend, rather than being funded by the government, and can make a profit. They are governed and operated by the school itself. They are lightly regulated by government and inspected by a range of bodies. They are funded by fees, gifts and endowments and are governed by an independently elected board of governors.

6. State Boarding schools

There are approximately forty State boarding schools in England, which provide state-funded education but charge fees for boarding. Local councils run some state boarding schools, and some are run as academies or free schools. State boarding schools give priority to children who have a particular need to board and will assess children's suitability for boarding.

Table 4

England: School type and role

School Type	School Role
State Schools Community Schools	A state-funded school, in which local authority employs the school's staff, is responsible for the school's admissions and owns the school's estate.
Foundation Schools	Funded by the local authority, but are run by the school governing body who employ the school staff and has primary responsibility for admissions. The school land and buildings are owned by the governing body or a charitable foundation. Many Foundation schools were formerly Grant Maintained schools
Trust Schools	Publicly funded by government rather than local council but receive extra support from a charitable trust such as a local business, community group or educational charity. An individual school or a group of schools (such as schools that are in the same area, spread across the country or share a specialism) can choose to work with a trust
Voluntary Aided (VA) Schools	VA schools linked to a variety of organizations. They can be faith schools (often the Church of England or the Roman Catholic Church), or non-denominational schools, such as those linked to London Livery Companies. The charitable foundation contributes towards the capital costs of the school (typically 10%), and appoints a majority of the school governors. The governing body employs the staff and has primary responsibility for admissions
Voluntary Controlled (VC) Schools	Almost always church schools, with the lands and buildings often owned by a charitable foundation. LEA employs the schools' staff and has primary responsibility for admissions. State funded schools, which select their students on the basis of academic ability. Grammar schools can also be maintained schools.
Academy Schools	Publicly funded by government rather than local council. Established 1997-2010. Some academies have sponsors or trusts. Since 2010, flexibility of policy has enabled the academy model to become the template for a range of sub-types. These include (1) Studio schools; (2) Free schools; (2i) University Technical Colleges (UTCs); and (2ii) City Technology Colleges (CTC)

<i>Academy-Studio Schools</i>	Publicly funded by government rather than local council. The Studio Schools Trust oversees Studio Schools. They serve 14 to 19 year olds; tend to be small (300 pupils)
<i>Academy-Faith Sponsored</i>	Publicly funded by government rather than local council. Islam, Church of England, Roman Catholic sponsor, co-sponsor or a key partner in academies located in areas of considerable deprivation
<i>Academy-Converter-Faith Based</i>	Publicly funded by government rather than local council. Outstanding schools and schools ranked good with outstanding features can become academies.
Free Schools	Publicly funded by government rather than local council. They can set their own pay and conditions for teachers; have the flexibility to change the length of the school day, and school terms (semesters); and do not have to follow the national curriculum. Free schools take students of all abilities and are prohibited from using academic selection processes. They can be run on a not-for-profit basis and can be set up by groups like: charities, universities, independent schools, community and faith groups, parents, and businesses.
<i>Free Schools - University Technical Colleges (UTC)</i>	Specialize in subjects like engineering and construction - and teach these subjects along with business skills and using IT. Students study academic subjects as well as practical subjects leading to technical qualifications. The university and employers, who provide work experience for students, design the curriculum. University technical colleges are sponsored by: universities, employers, and further education (community) colleges
<i>Free Schools- City Technology Colleges (CTC)</i>	Emphasis on technological and practical skills
Grammar Schools	Charge fees to attend, rather than being funded by the government, and can make a profit. Governed and operated by the school itself. Lightly regulated by government and inspected by a range of bodies. Independent schools vary from those set up by foundations in the middle ages to those founded by new companies and charities. They are funded by fees, gifts and endowments and are governed by an independently elected board of governors.
Independent Schools	Provide free education but charge fees for boarding. Local councils run some state boarding schools, and some are run

State Boarding Schools	as academies or free schools. State boarding schools give priority to children who have a particular need to board.
	Provide state-funded education but charge fees for boarding.

Response of Leadership Preparation to School Corporatization and Diversification

Current structural diversification policies being implemented in both England and the United States enable the enactment of interests other than education through transferring responsibility for education and related assets away from public and towards corporatized or religious actors and institutions. This education reform policy is based on market ideology and the assumption that diversifying school models improve the education system.

At present, the United States lacks a federal policy governing leadership and teacher preparation (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2003). A review of the literature indicates that while a national conversation about the adoption of standards for educational leadership and the accreditation of leadership preparation programs is ongoing, states continue to make their own decisions relating to leadership preparation. Many states have chosen to adopt the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium Standards or a state modified version of these standards (Darling-Hammond, 2017). Replaced by the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL, 2015).

The changes that have been made since 2010 have occurred so quickly that relatively little empirical research into impact of the diverse educational landscape on the preparation and support of future school leaders currently exists. Future school leaders are likely to find themselves lost amongst a myriad of education delivery models, morally floundering between the efficiency of a business approach and the equity of an education approach. Analyzing a complex budget sheet will go hand in hand with analyzing complex research data. As the locus of control for schools transitions from school districts/local authorities to (1) corporate; (2) religious institutional; and (3) public entities (Courtney, 2016) so the need for innovative educational leadership programs becomes imperative.

School Leadership Context in England

In 2011, the previously required National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH), originally introduced in England in 1997, was abandoned as a compulsory headship criterion. In theory, this means that a headteacher in England, as in Florida for example, could be appointed to a school leadership position without any teaching qualification. Arguably, a move, which seriously affects the status of school leaders (Association of School and College Leaders [ASCL, 2015]). Furthermore, the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) established in 2000 merged with the Teaching Agency in 2012 to become the National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL), an executive agency under Department for Education (NCTL, 2017). In effect, the government has withdrawn from the arena of school leadership preparation by making the NPQH optional. As a consequence the Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL), the National Governors' Association (NGA) and the National Association of Headteachers (NAHT) worked with the Teaching Schools Council, to create the Foundation for Leadership in Education (FLE) promoting leadership training, standards and qualifications that practitioners have identified as

essential (National Association of Headteachers [NAHT], 2015). The FLE is run by a board of trustees, and is currently chaired by Sir Michael Barber. Previously, Barber had held the position of Chief Education Adviser of the education company, Pearson; served as Head of the Prime Minister's Delivery Unit from 2001 to 2005; and as Chief Adviser to the Education Secretary on school standards from 1997 to 2001.

Barber characterized the English school system as having devolved responsibility and clear accountability (ASCL, 2016). Many headteachers are now in 'system' leadership roles (ASCL, 2015), either in federations or, most frequently in multi-academy trusts (MATs). Some who formerly held posts designated as headteachers are now chief executives accountable for the operation of more than one school. Consequently, school leaders now have a very different job description, responsibilities and accountabilities requiring a whole new skill-set from that needed to lead a single school (ASCL, 2015). School leaders working across several schools need a much wider understanding of the issues, relationships and micro-politics of working in such a context. Finally, the boundaries between the primary and secondary phases have become much more blurred with many schools covering the entire age range from three to nineteen (ASCL, 2015)

Future school leader preparation programs will need to be active and dynamic. Innovative programs, partnerships, inclusion of non-university based leadership providers and delivery structures, as well as other contributing factors that impact effective preparation, will need to be explored (Sanzo, 2016).

Conclusion

In both England and the United States the landscape of education provision has undergone enormous change and diversification. There has been a roll back of the federal footprint and a growing movement to introduce market forces into education systems in the belief that a twin pronged approach of greater parental choice and better school accountability, will improve the productivity and efficiency of its schools. At a local level this presents as the academy and free schools in England and the charter school, virtual school and vouchers in the United States. Arguably, the United States (as has already occurred in England) no longer has a school system. Instead there exists an increasingly fragmented local landscape of schooling with different patterns emerging in different parts of the country' (Simkins, 2014). Is this a forward move? It is worth bearing in mind that in England, the 1902 Education Act created a single school system out of an isolated and unconnected system comprising of 2,568 school boards and 14,238 voluntary bodies providing elementary schools, and an unknown number of schools (around 600) with charitable foundations providing secondary education. All of which became accountable to local elected councils (1902, Education Act). This coherent system is now being disbanded in order to introduce a disparate system viewed as a failure over a century ago.

Yet, despite a fragmented school system in England the focus of many school leaders is on systems rather than instructional leadership as in the United States, due to the fact that small schools are finding the need to become larger federations in order to access resources and human capital.

Based on the outcome of this comparative analysis, the author recommends that in order to remain relevant, higher education institutions in the United States intending to continue delivering educational leadership preparation programs, proactively engage with professional associations and practitioners in revising their programs to ensure that leaders: (1) reflect the diversified, and corporatized landscape that they serve; (2) demonstrate the professional knowledge and capacity

required to ensure the delivery of high quality instruction in a safe, trusting, and collaborative school culture; and (3) hold professional colleagues accountable to the highest levels of instruction and student engagement.

References

- Academies Act (2010) (c. 32). Retrieved from www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/32/pdfs/ukpga_20100032_en.pdf
- Adonis, A. (2012). *Education, education, education: Reforming England's schools*. London: Biteback Publishing.
- Association of School and College Leaders (2015). The new normal. Retrieved from <https://www.ascl.org.uk//index.cfm?originalUrl=help-and-advice/help-and-advice.the-new-normal.html>
- Ball, S. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 215–228.
- Barth, P., Hull, J., Andrie, R. (2012). Searching for the reality of virtual schools at a glance. *Center for Public Education*, National School Boards Association. Retrieved from <http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/Main-Menu/Organizing-a-school/Searching-for-the-reality-of-virtual-schools-at-a-glance/Searching-for-the-reality-of-virtual-schools-full-report.pdf>
- Bentley, G., Bailey, D., & Shutt, J. (2010). From RDAs to LEPs: A new localism? Case examples of West Midlands and Yorkshire, *Local Economy*, 25(7), 535–557.
- Cavanaugh, C. (2010). The evolving online landscape. *School Administrator*, 67(4), 22–25.
- Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics, markets and America's schools*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Church of England (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.churchofengland.org/education/church-schools-academies.aspx>
- Commission, Academies (2013). *Unleashing greatness: Getting the best from an academised system*. London: Pearson Think Tank/RSA.
- Council for American Private Education (CAPE) (2017). *Facts and Studies*. Retrieved from <http://www.capenet.org/facts.html>
- Crook, D. (2002). Local authorities and comprehensivisation in England and Wales, 1944–1974. *Oxford Review of Education*, 28, 247–260.
- Courtney, S.J. (2015). Mapping school types in England. *Oxford Review of Education*, 41(6), 799-818, DOI: 10.1080/03054985.2015.1121141
- Department for Education (DfE) (2010). *The importance of teaching*. London, United Kingdom: Department for Education.
- Dewey, J. (1907). *The School and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- EdChoice (2016). Fast facts on school choice. Retrieved from <http://www.edchoice.org/our-resources/fast-facts>.
- Education Act, 1902. *Education in England*. Retrieved from <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/acts/1902-education-act.html>
- Friedman, M. (1955). The role of government in education. In economics and the public Interest. Robert A. Solo (Ed). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Glenn, M., & Gininger, M. (2012). *School choice now: The year of school choice: School Choice yearbook 2011-12*. Washington, DC: Alliance for School Choice. Retrieved from

- https://issuucom/afc.yearbooks/docs/school_choice_yearbook_2011-12
- Hansen, K., & Vignoles, A. (2005). *The United Kingdom education system in a comparative context*. In S. Machin & A. Vignoles (Eds.). *What's the good of education?* pp13-35. Princeton: University Press. ISBN 0691117349
- GOV.UK (2016a.). Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/10-facts-you-need-to-know-about-academies>.
- GOV.UK. (2016b.). Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statutory-guidance-schools>.
- Glendinning C., Powell, M., & Rummery, K. (Eds.). (2002). *Partnerships, new labour and the governance of welfare*. London, United Kingdom: The Policy Press.
- Haydn, T. (2004). The strange death of the comprehensive school in England and Wales, 1965–2002. *Research Papers in Education*, 19, 415–432.
- Henig, J. (2013). *The end of exceptionalism in American education: The changing politics of school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Higginson, J. H. (1974). Dame schools. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 22, 166–181.
- Higher Education Statistics Agency. (2015). *UK performance indicators in higher education 2013/14* [online]. Cheltenham: Higher Education Statistics Agency. Retrieved from <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/pr214>.
- Hill, D. (1997). Equality in primary schooling: The policy context of the reforms. In M. Cole, D. Hill and S. Shan (eds.), *Promoting equality in primary schools*. pp. 15-47. London: Cassell.
- Jopling, M., & Hadfield, M. (2015). From fragmentation to multiplexity: Decentralization, localism and support for school collaboration in England and Wales. *Journal for Educational Research Online* 7 (1), 49–67.
- Kolbe, T. (2012). And they're off: Tracking federal race to the top investments from the starting gate. *Educational Policy*, 185-210.
- Magnet Schools of America. (2017). Retrieved from <http://www.magnet.edu/about/what-are-magnet-schools>
- Mintrom, M. (2001). Educational governance and democratic practice. *Educational Policy* 15 (5): 615-643.
- Mortimore, P. (2013). *Education under siege: Why there is a better alternative*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Nash (2017) LocatED. Retrieved from <http://located.co.uk/located-britains-biggest-property-start-up-is-open-for-business/>
- National Association of Headteachers. (2015). *Leaders are doing it for themselves*. Retrieved from <http://www.naht.org.uk/welcome/news-and-media/blogs/susan-young/leaders-are-doing-it-for-themselves/>
- National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2017). Retrieved from <http://www.publiccharters.org/get-the-facts/public-charter-schools/faqs/>
- NCTL Framework Document*. Retrieved from GOV.UK.
- Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice (2016). The ABCs of school choice: The comprehensive guide to every private school choice program in America. Retrieved from www.edchoice.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/2016-ABCs
- Ornstein, A., Levine, D. U., Gutek, G., & Vocke, D. (2016). *Foundations of education*. Toronto, Ontario: Nelson Education.

- Powell, A. C. (1965). *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*. Washington, D.C.: Committee on Education and Labor.
- Prothero, A. (2017, August 23). Public support for charter schools plummets, poll finds. *Education Week*.
- Reid, K., Aqvi, Y., & Putney, L. (2009). Evaluation of an evolving virtual school. *Educational Media International*, 46(4), 281–294.
- Richmond, G. (April 5, 2017). Why I’m worried about the future of Charter Schools. *Education Week*.
- Salsberry, T. (2010). K-12 virtual schools, accreditation, and leadership: what are the issues? *Educational Considerations*, 37(2), 14–17.
- Saltman, K. J. (2009). Putting the public back in public schooling: public schools beyond the corporate model. *Journal for Social Justice* 3(1), 9-39.
- Saltman, K. J. (2000). *Collateral damage: corporatizing public schools—a threat to democracy*. Washington, DC: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Salokangas, M., & Chapman, C. (2014). Exploring governance in two chains of academy schools: A comparative case study. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42, 372–386.
- Sanzo, K. (2016). An analysis of the 2013 program evaluation proposals for the school leadership preparation program. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership* 11(11) 1-16.
- Simkins, T. (2014). School restructuring in England: New school configurations and new challenges. *Management in Education*, 29, 4–8.
- Smarick, A. (2017). *Analyzing an educational revolution: Using Thomas Kuhn’s “paradigm shift” to consider the implications for democracy of changes in us public schooling*. American Enterprise Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Analyzing-an-Educational-Revolution.pdf>.
- Stedrak, L., Ortagus, J., & Wood, R. (2012). The funding of virtual schools in public elementary and secondary education. *Educational Considerations*, 39(2), 44–54.
- Studio Schools Trust (2017a). Retrieved from <http://studioschoolstrust.org/node/150>
- Studio Schools Trust (2017b). Retrieved from <https://studioschoolstrust.org/studio-schools/the-need-studio-schools>
- Studio Schools Trust (2016). Studio Schools satisfaction survey. Retrieved from <http://studioschoolstrust.org/node/158>
- Studio Schools Trust (2016) Studio Schools: Taking stock five years on (2016). Retrieved from <http://studioschoolstrust.org/node/1310>
- Teacher-Powered Schools (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.teacherpowered.org/>
- Townsend, D. (1998). *The impact of reforms on the operations of Alberta’s public education system: A comparison of the perception of superintendents, principals, and teachers*. A study presented for Alberta Teachers Association, Edmonton: Lethbridge University.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2009). *Race to the Top program executive summary*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development.

- 147 (2010). *A blueprint for reform: The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/publicationtoc.html>
- Whitehurst, G. R. (2017). *Education choice and competition index 2016: Summary and commentary*. Brookings: Center on Children and Families.
- Williams, R. (1961) *The long revolution* London: Chatto and Windus.
- Wis. Dept. of Public Instruction. (2017). Milwaukee parental choice program (MPCP): MPCP Facts and Figures for 2016-17. Retrieved from https://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/sms/Choice/Data_and_Reports/2016-17/2016-17_MPCP_2017_HC_FTE_by_School_and_grade_with_all_Pupils.pdf
- Wolf, P.J., & Egalite, A. J. (2016). *Pursuing innovation: How can educational choice transform K–12 education in the U.S.?* Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice.
- Wolfe, D. (2013). Schools: The legal structures, the accidents of history and the legacies of timing and circumstance. *Education Law Journal*, 2, 100–113.