

Sarah Oved\*

## THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE IN PROMOTING A REVISED MODEL OF TEACHERS' IN-SERVICE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT – THE CASE OF ISRAEL

### ROLA DYREKTORA W PROMOWANIU ZMODYFIKOWANEGO MODELU DOSKONALENIA ZAWODOWEGO NAUCZYCIELI – PRZYPADEK IZRAELA

**ABSTRACT:** A 2008 report by Avney Rosh, the Israeli National Institute of School Leadership, to the Ministry of Education (MOE), outlined and redefined the principal's role as a pedagogical leader. Among the expected outcomes from school principals at the start of their career is the professional development of the school staff. This paper will introduce a model of in-service professional development applied in the Israeli Education system: The Pedagogical Flexibility in Teachers' Professional Development. This model has been applied and administered in Israeli schools by school principals recently. In addition, this paper will illuminate the two state reforms operating in the Israeli education system, which constitute one of the contexts in which principals work. It will be argued that among the plethora tasks school principals are in charge of, this task is less prioritised. Furthermore, it will be argued that implementing the model in the contexts in which Israeli schools operate, the education reforms and school practices limit the principal's potential to maximise the benefits of this model, despite its significance to promote school outcomes.

**KEYWORDS:** professional development, education reforms, Israel, principals' practices.

**ABSTRAKT:** Raport Avney Rosh, Izraelskiego Narodowego Instytutu Kierowania Szkołą, dla Ministerstwa Edukacji z 2008 r., nakreślił i na nowo zdefiniował rolę dyrektora jako lidera pedagogicznego. Wśród rezultatów oczekiwanych od dyrektorów szkół na początku ich kariery znalazł się rozwój zawodowy kadry szkolnej. W niniejszym artykule przedstawiono model doskonalenia zawodowego w izraelskim systemie edukacji: elastyczność pedagogiczna w rozwoju zawodowym nauczycieli. Model ten został ostatnio zastosowany i jest realizowany w izraelskich szkołach przez ich dyrektorów. Niniejszy artykuł naświetla ponadto dwie reformy państwowe przeprowadzane w izraelskim systemie edukacji, tworzące jeden z kontekstów pracy dyrektorów. Przedstawiony został pogląd, że pośród wielu zadań, za które odpowiedzialni są dyrektorzy szkół, to zadanie ma niższy priorytet. Co więcej, zaprezentowano argument, że przy wdrożeniu modelu w kontekstach, w których funkcjonują izraelskie szkoły, reformy edukacji i praktyki szkolne ograniczają potencjał dyrektora do maksymalizowania korzyści płynących z tego modelu – i to pomimo jego znaczenia dla wspomagania rezultatów osiągniętych przez szkołę.

**SŁOWA KLUCZOWE:** rozwój zawodowy, reformy edukacji, praktyki izraelskich dyrektorów.

---

\* Sarah Oved, M.A. – PhD student (Education) at the Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland; principal of "Ort Psagot", high school and college, Karmiel, Israel; e-mail: saryar4@gmail.com; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6950-1300>.

## Introduction

Schools operate in contexts, coping with a variety of stakeholders, among which are the Ministry of Education (MOE), teachers' unions, parents, local municipalities and the media; all of whom attempt to impose their power in order to influence school practices. Factors like school size, socio-economic level, number of teachers, teachers' age and tenure as well as even personal traits and personal background inevitably affect school performance. School principals are expected to navigate their organisations and lead them to success through change processes, following their state education policy.

The role of principals and their effect on school outcomes have been discussed in depth in the field of educational administration and leadership in the last half a century. In their comprehensive review of literature concerning successful school leadership, Leithwood et al. (2008) found that almost all successful leaders perform a similar set of leadership qualities and practices, viewing their role as central in helping improve teachers' performance. A decade later, Leithwood et al. (2019) gained new insights about successful school leadership. Based on updated empirical literature, the authors reiterated their claim about the set of practices used by successful leaders. Their revised claim mentions a larger number of effective practices used by leaders. Whereas in 2008, Leithwood et al. discussed a small handful of personal traits that explained a high proportion of the variation in leadership effectiveness, they now suggest the concept of 'personal leadership resources', which encompasses a set of cognitive, social and psychological resources. The researchers conclude that "school leadership matters greatly in securing better organisational and learner outcomes" (p. 12). Murphy et al. (2007) argue that the type of leadership seen in high performing schools is "leadership for learning". The authors conceptualise that leadership behaviors are influenced by four factors: the previous experience of the leader, the knowledge base of the leader, the leader's personal traits he brings to the job and the set of values and beliefs that help define a leader.

Bush (2016) emphasises the significant impact of leadership on school outcomes and titles the reality school principals are now facing in England (and which is valid in Israel too) 'the paradox of simultaneous centralisation and decentralisation'. It appears that school principals still have to juggle between education policies and their implementation in their organisations which operate in different contexts that affect their performance. Similarly, Hallinger (2018) illuminates the significance of school leaders' professional experience. As he puts it, updated literature in the field of educational leadership and management should serve school principals as guidelines to be integrated into their craft knowledge (Hallinger 2018, p. 19). This is to suggest that existing research should be read with the understanding of the importance of practical

knowledge. Nonetheless, to date, the gap between research and practice has not been bridged. Thus, school principals who work in different contexts and cultures, struggle to implement new educational policies.

Fullan (2009) discusses large-scale reforms that intend to change the systems as a whole (p. 102) and contends that system reforms are now evident, gradually becoming professional, utilising the growing body of knowledge that already exists. Capacity building is a theme that repeats itself as a key element predicting success or failure of a system reform (Fullan 2009). The question is then, how and what builds school capacity? Fullan contends that a key element determining the success of system reforms is transparency about strategy and ascertaining that expected results must be clear at all levels of the system: teacher leaders, principals, district administrators, and governments (2009, p. 110).

The Pedagogical Flexibility Model in the Professional Development (PD) of teachers is a job-embedded paradigm, which corresponds with the latest theories of PD and has been administered as part of two large-scale state reforms that operate in Israel. This paper will report on the implementation of this revised model of teachers' in-service PD by Israeli school principals in the context of two state reforms. It will reflect on existing literature, official data and practical knowledge. It will argue that to date, in the contexts in which Israeli school principals function, this promising model of PD has not maximised its potential, for a variety of reasons to be discussed here-on.

## **The Education System in Israel**

The Israeli education system is a public centralised system which is steered, financed and controlled by the government, through the MOE (Oplatka 2016). The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2015, p. 250) reports that the expenditure on educational institutions in Israel as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP) is above the OECD average, with a higher share of private funding than the OECD average. The 2016 education policy outlook of Israel reported that compared to the OECD average of 36% the central government of Israel took 50% of all decisions in lower secondary schools (Geva et al. 2016). Compared to the OECD data, Israeli schools have less autonomy over resource allocation (Geva et al. 2016). Arlestig et al. (2016) consider the Israeli school system among other educational systems which demonstrate a clear national administrative and control structure, like those of Austria, Germany, China, France and Switzerland. Bush (2003) adds that the education system of Israel demonstrates the bureaucratic model of education, which demands maximum efficiency.

Schools in Israel are streamed in three main sectors. Official 2018 national data published by the MOE indicate that 79.7% of schools (3,960) belong to the Jewish, Hebrew speaking sector. Among the Jewish sector, there are sub-educational systems: secular, religious and ultra-orthodox (Oplatka 2016). 15% of schools (744), belong to the Arab, Arabic speaking sector, while about 15% of schools (267) belong to the Druze, Bedouin and Cherkess communities, Arabic speaking minorities (MOE 2019). All Israeli education sectors are structured similarly but differ from each other in terms of cultural and religious orientation. All schools undergo the same reforms, matriculation exams, national core curriculum and labour relations (Oplatka 2016). Attending the education system is legally compulsory in Israel starting from the age of five when kids go to pre-school kindergarten to the age of eighteen when graduates finish upper secondary studies.

### **National State Reforms in Israel: Ofek Hadash and Oz La'tmura and a Model of PD**

Two national reforms are now implemented in the education system in Israel. The reforms titled "Ofek hadash" (New Horizon) and "Oz La'tmura" (Courage to Change) have been promoted by the MOE in cooperation with teachers' unions. The reforms address the teachers' workweek and pay. In addition, both reforms target teachers' professional development and assessment, which are expected to be managed and directed by the school principal under the direct supervision of the district authorities.

Ofek Hadash (2007) operates in primary and lower secondary schools, whereas Oz La'tmura (2011) operates in upper-secondary schools. It is worth mentioning that each of the reforms was introduced and presented with the support of a different teacher union. The official MOE (2019) website states that the aim of initiating the Ofek Hadash reform was to attract the best teachers by increasing the teachers' salaries and status and promoting educational achievements via personalisation in education. Similarly, regarding Oz La'tmura the MOE website states that the aim of initiating the reform was to promote achievements at the levels of the student, the teacher as well as the school and to empower teachers and improve their status. It reports a significant pedagogical change in upper secondary schools, in the administration of schools and in the conditions of employing teachers.

Geva et al. (2016, p. 13) summarise the similar objectives of both reforms and their school practices:

- **School improvement:** teachers' workweeks were lengthened to allow for work with small groups of pupils. Teachers' salaries were increased. A special training program for principals was established.

- **Evaluation and assessment:** new guidelines for assessing teachers and school principals. School-based assessment coordinators were introduced to establish a school culture of assessment.
- **Governance:** schools increased autonomy over resource allocation in hiring teachers, granting tenure, promoting or starting the process of dismissing teachers.

Generally, the reforms aim at reducing the gaps in performance among students of the sub-groups in the heterogeneous education system in order to promote the transition of graduates to the labour market (Geva et al. 2016). Teachers are required to maintain continuous professional development (CPD) spanning their career, beyond the initial phase of their pre-service training. CPD requirements in Israel for Ofek Hadash teachers are at least 30 hours per annum and for Oz La'tmura teachers it is maximum (accumulated) of 112 hours per annum.

### **Adult learning, PD programs and the principal's role**

According to Avney Rosha, the Israeli National Institute of School Leadership, one of the expected outcomes from school leaders is *Staff leadership, management, and professional development* (Avney Rosha 2008). Thus, principals are responsible for developing and planning their staffs' professional development in order to advance students' achievements. To develop an effective PD program, principals must take into consideration the core principles of andragogy.

Conner (1997) overviews adult learning theory which assumes that (adult) learning is about: "any increase in knowledge, memorizing information, acquiring knowledge for practical purposes, abstracting meaning from what we do, processes that allow us understand." Papastamatis et al. (2009) contend that adult learning is different from children's learning, as they have different needs and different characteristics as learners. Hence, teaching adults should include active learning and learner's reflection. Space and time for learner's reflection are required. Moore (2010) asserts that for adult learning to yield sustainable results it should include components of critical thinking and involve the learner's process of decision-making. In Moore's view adult learning is a complex process with a variety of variables affecting the learning process. The role of teachers of adults is to provide their learners with the knowledge they need and desire (p. 4).

Donaldson (2011) claims that currently career long education of teachers is often haphazard and too fragmented. Donaldson argues that the aim of PD is ultimately to enhance professionalism and students' outcomes (2011, p. 108). Schwille et al. (2007) argue that on the continuum of teacher learning, PD has been for most part an add-on to practice. Review of extensive literature in the field of teachers' PD delineates clearly that researchers nowadays agree on the importance of (effective) PD programs as a means

of school change and improvement. Since the turn of the millennium, researchers have been calling for “a new model” or “a new paradigm” of PD that school leaders should plan, design and include in any school improvement program (see Villegas-Reimers 2003; Cole 2004; Darling-Hammond & Richardson 2009; Darling-Hammond et al. 2017; Donaldson 2011; Castagnoli & Nigel 2004; Kim & Lee 2019). Villegas-Reimers (2003) defines PD of teachers as a life-long process that is about “the development of a person in his or her professional role” (p. 11). Creemers et al. (2012) add that PD is essential for enhancing teacher’s content knowledge and teaching practices. Thus, it should combine content and pedagogy. Based on a review of 30 years of research in PD of teachers Shpreling (2019) concludes that PD programs have not always proved to be effective. Hence, to avoid Cole’s (2004) somewhat provocative warning about PD as “a great way to avoid change”, it is significant to agree on a definition of effective PD. Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) say that effective PD involves teachers as both learners and teachers. Darling-Hammond and Richardson (2009) elaborate on this definition: ‘The most useful professional development emphasise active teaching, assessment, observation and reflection rather than abstract discussion’ (p. 1). Schwille et al. (2007) add that effective PD programs should be on-going, job-embedded programs which are related to school, constitute shared learning of teachers, include self-instruction and active learning with a focus on content. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) pinpoint that effective PD results in teacher’s change of teaching practices that promote the students required competencies of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Aldahmash et al. (2019) examined 204 articles from 2012-2016 to identify the fields of interest in continuous PD programs of science teachers and found growing emphasis on in-school long term training programs with pedagogical content knowledge.

The million-dollar question remains how to administer and implement a good PD program that can yield the best outcomes for a specific school which functions in a specific context.

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) (2015) outlined professional standards for educational leaders focusing the direction at promoting students’ achievements. The NPBEA stresses that effective educational leaders are expected to manage, direct and promote their staff’s PD, guided by the understanding of professional and adult learning and development (p. 14). In addition, the NPBEA asserts that effective educational leaders are assumed to foster a professional community of teachers, to design and implement job-embedded PD programs, which allow collaborative learning (NPBEA 2015, p. 15).

Schwille et al. (2007) say that the literature indicates that it is known what the effective and ineffective practices of PD are, but how to actually implement the effective practices is yet unclear and has not been agreed upon (p. 111). Papastamatis et al. (2009)

argue that it is fairly common that change imposed upon professionals does not work, whereas change that emerges from the individual, does. It should be consistent with the staffs' needs. Guskey (2002) contends that PD programs are meant to bring about three areas of sustainable change: teacher's classroom practices, teacher's attitudes and beliefs and learner outcomes. In Guskey's view, teachers' attitudes and beliefs can change only after they recognise a change in the student learning outcomes. Thus, Guskey concludes (2002) that PD leaders should take into consideration that teachers' change is a long process that takes time and it is not a uniform process. In this long process teachers' support is highly important. As part of the process, teachers should regularly receive feedback on students learning progress.

Castagnoli and Nigel (2004) interviewed school principals and other staff members, in a number of schools in England, about their staff development practices in order to develop a model of effective staff development for other schools. The aim was to identify the strengths of each school in order to develop a model of effective staff development for other schools. The findings indicated that in each of the successful schools the principal presented a clear vision supported by appropriate structures and processes regarding the learning processes in their school. Castagnoli and Nigel (2004) identified the need to prioritise staff development also in the form of a school improvement program. In their view, school leaders must attend to finding the right people and nurturing them in addition to appointing a PD coordinator which is crucial for success. Kim and Lee (2019) mention the limited evidence showing increased teachers' participation in PD as the result of principal leadership. Their study of the role of the principal's instructional leadership on teacher's participation in PD programs in three Asian countries (Japan, South Korea and Singapore) pinpoints the significance of school principals in enhancing teachers learning through PD programs. Kim and Lee (2019) refer to the principal's direct/indirect role in providing teachers with the right resources and setting for PD. Darling-Hammond and Richardson (2009) claim that school support is a crucial factor in such PD program success and can serve as a modelling for teachers as to how classroom learning should be. Bredeson (2000) pinpoints the importance of the principal's role in teacher PD. In Bredeson's view, it is the principal's responsibility to develop a collaborative learning community and create opportunities for life-long learning at school. It is concluded that highly effective principals make efforts to develop higher levels of autonomy among their teachers.

Ultimately, it is in the hands of the principal, who is the one that knows best how to implement and apply programmes at school. Updated literature, thus, should serve as the theoretical background according to which principals administer their school PD programmes based on their practical knowledge.

**Professional Development (PD) of teachers in Israel in light of the two reforms:**

Avidav-Ungar et al. (2013) view the two state reforms as a breakthrough on the way to developing a policy of PD. For the first time in Israel, education reforms address teachers, recognizing them as the agents of change, stressing the required life-long learning of teachers paying attention to their tenure and level of expertise. The two reforms are perceived as a means to creating an innovative school pedagogy and to shaping a culture of shared learning, turning the school educational community into a professional learning community. The products of the schoolteachers PD should comply with the organisational, pedagogical and methodological needs of the school. Both reforms define the school principal as the person accountable for the PD program in school. In cooperation with each staff member, the principal is expected to plan and design a continuous PD program to all staff members, following the guidelines of the reforms and in accordance with each teacher's professional stage.

In 2013, in an attempt to promote students' achievements and prepare school graduates to the changing needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the MOE initiated a pedagogical programme called "Meaningful Learning" that is based on three main components: value, involvement and relevance to the learner. To implement this programme and allow the necessary conditions for its success, the MOE developed a framework called 'pedagogical flexibility'. Based on theoretical grounds, the philosophy behind the pedagogical flexibility assumed that when schools function with more autonomy, choose their preferred methods and priorities and act independently in pedagogical issues, they improve their outcomes and promote meaningful learning. Thus, the conception of pedagogical flexibility marks a shift from a strategy of centralisation in governing the education system to decentralisation, allowing the school more freedom to attend to their local needs (see Tracey & Florian 2016). Six realms were defined for work, among which is the professional development of schoolteachers (MOE 2013). In line with the expected outcomes from school principals (Avney Rosha 2008) and the two national state reforms, it is the principal's role to plan and design the professional development of teachers within the model of pedagogical flexibility. It is postulated that this model of professional development will turn the school into a learning community, allow diversity among both teachers and students and deepen the sense of accountability and self-efficacy among both principals, teachers and teams. In the heart of this model lie three main notions: continuous professional development is a life-long process, there exists a variety of learning models for the different learning styles of teachers, school autonomy is essential for promoting school vision and outcomes (MOE 2018). Thus, the principles guiding the implementation of this model of PD are:

- Adaptation to the school's needs
- Adaptation to teachers' needs

- Principal-teacher collaboration in developing the PD program
- Sharing schoolteachers' leadership in developing the school's PD program
- Connection between learning and practice
- Flexibility in learning styles, learning spaces and learning frameworks.

It is assumed that the flexibility will be achieved preferably through a systematic programme that is characterised by modularity, uniqueness and adjustment to the different stages of the teacher's career (MOE 2013; Margolin et al. 2018).

The principal's responsibility for implementing the pedagogical flexibility model of school PD takes place all year long as the principal conducts the annual assessment processes of teachers and it progresses through May, when the MOE disseminates the guidelines for writing the next year's school work plan to all school principals. This way the principal is assumed to be able to incorporate the school's needs with teacher's personal needs of professional development and interest. By June the principal is required to submit the school's next year PD program, after having discussed it with each of the staff members and in light of the school work plan.

Margolin et al. (2018) submitted a summative report of a three-year case study that examined state education policy regarding the pedagogical flexibility model of PD vis-a-vis its implementation. The report, submitted to the administration of PD in the MOE, indicated a number of hindering factors that affected the implementation of the programme. The report's recommendations to policy makers at the MOE pointed to the need to delineate a systemic rationale that considers life-long learning of educators as a critical factor, no less than the students' learning. As for the pedagogical flexibility model of PD, researchers recommended to consider it a core principle at the foundation of any PD programme, **not** as a programme on its own. The research indicated that schools did establish a framework that allows for the development of a professional learning community based on internal forces and under their responsibility. However, the perception of most participants regarding the essence of learning processes and their qualities has not changed in general. Principals viewed the new paradigm as a framework for PD, a budget resource that facilitates staff development towards the establishment of a shared pedagogical school language. Yet, none of the principals reported the pedagogical flexibility as a conception. Most importantly, the report indicated clear gaps and clashes between the theoretical grounds and foundations of the new paradigm and the traditional, practical required organisational procedures. One such example is the gap between the life-long self-directed learning rationale of the model vis-à-vis the teachers' needs to accumulate 30/60 hours of in-service learning annually as a prerequisite to progress and pay.

## Discussion

Israeli high school principals have to cope with an awkward reality of having two large-scale education reforms, Ofek Hadash and Oz La'tmura, that operate in their schools simultaneously. Teachers at the same school belong to different reforms, with different terms of employment (e.g. length of work week), different career development terms but under the management of the same principal, which hinders the principal's ability to promote educational changes in their organisations. From the principal's practical point of view, the reforms hardly affected school pedagogy, regularities, or the organisation as a whole. The reforms which target teachers and teaching, were imposed on the system without adequate school preparation or 'capacity building' (a term adopted from Fullan 2009), in a way, ignoring school's most valuable resource, the teachers. Hence, the core pedagogical changes are left to the principal's personality, educational agenda and beliefs, or what Leithwood et al. termed as a "heroic model of school leadership" (2008, p. 32) and updated recently to the concept of personal leadership resources (Leithwood et al. 2019).

It is worth emphasising that despite a shift from the centralisation to the decentralisation of schools' internal affairs, the reforms have not changed principals' authority and autonomy radically; school principals are still not completely autonomous in recruiting or dismissing teachers or even rewarding them. Not only this but also, the two reforms, each supported by a different teachers' unions, dictate and thus actually inhibit the possibilities of the principal to act according to the school needs. For all these reasons principals find themselves continuously challenged to become entrepreneurs, seeking organisational and pedagogical solutions to meet expectations and perform continuous improvement in school outcomes. In this spirit, Yemini et al. (2015) contend that the Israeli school system has traditionally been centralised but in the last two decades decentralisation processes have been taking place. The authors view school principals who initiate and lead substantial change in their schools as entrepreneurs. Yemini et al. (2015) identify the contradictory pressures that school principals have to deal with due to contemporary decentralisation policies; to perform well and meet governmental standards and policies along with the expectations to become proactive leaders who advance initiatives and change processes that reflect their own interest and their school's specific needs. Centralisation-Decentralisation processes are categorised by Hallinger (2018) as institutional contexts for school leadership. The researcher discusses the effect of the institutional context on the principal's practices, adding that since 2000, global education reforms have changed the principal's role definition and behavior. According to Hallinger, among the "widely shared contexts" (2018, p. 18) which influence school leaders' practices, there are variations that result from the interaction between the

individual and the context. In line with Hallinger (2018), it is not implausible to claim that the tension caused by the interaction between the individual (the school principal) and the context (the two state reforms) affects and guides the principal's behaviour and practices regarding the implementation of the new model of PD.

Recently, the Israeli MOE publicly published the 2018 official data, based on teachers' reports and collected by RAMA (The National Authority for Measurement and Evaluation in Education). Figures indicate that primary school principals are more involved in directing the development of staff compared to lower secondary and upper secondary school principals. The data show that 64% of elementary school teachers reported school involvement in staff development, when asked about the extent to which school is involved in their development and their professional promotion, by means of setting personal objectives, observing their classes and the principal involvement in planning a professional programme. Figures in lower secondary and upper secondary school run far behind: 48% and 40% only respectively (MOE 2019). These figures imply that among the great many tasks high school principals have, developing their school and staff professional development programme is not their top priority. These data also support Margolin's et al. (2018) general findings. Similarly, Oplatka (2016) elucidates that as it appears in many other developed countries, in Israel too, there exists a gap between policy and the actual managerial practice. One possible explanation for it, Oplatka concludes (2016, p. 413), is that principals do not fully realise the educational policy and thus they do not believe in their power to initiate changes and design local policies. It is argued that this might be the case with the above figures.

The above figures might also be read with the understanding that schools are the end unit within a complex system, in which the MOE functions as a regulator, imposing its accountability, especially (but not only) when the end unit, school, fails to meet the system's expectations and objectives. Burns and Fokler (2016) explain that the difficulty to steer complex systems effectively led to a declared shift from practices of centralisation to decentralisation recently. It has been stated above, that this shift from a trend of centralisation to decentralisation is felt in Israeli schools only to a certain extent. Nevertheless, at the end of the day, principals have to comply with the district and the headquarter demands. Eyal (2007) adds that government sponsored projects increase levels of centralisation and restrict school entrepreneurship. Furthermore, Gibton et al. (2000) who studied how principals in autonomous schools in Israel view the implementation of decentralisation, found that principals felt that autonomy meant less power for the school, the staff and themselves to initiate change (p. 206). The authors explain their findings by lack of legislation when implementing decentralisation policies. Thus, though schools are allegedly more autonomous to attend to their local needs, mission and values, they are trapped in the formal goals and objectives dictated

by the MOE, which is just the opposite pole of the conception of the pedagogical flexibility conception.

## Conclusion

We live in an era of turbulence, constant change and uncertainty about the future. Education systems rethink and recalculate their strategies, introducing large-scale reforms aiming at meeting the state's future needs. In this global context a revised model of teachers' PD, the pedagogical flexibility in teachers' PD, was introduced to the Israeli education system. The model adheres to the "new paradigm" researchers have been calling for, yet the implementation of the model has not proved to yield the expected outcomes. School principals who are in charge of administering the model do not seem to attend to it fully for a variety of reasons discussed in this article. It is concluded that conditions have not matured yet for Israeli school principals to prioritise PD over all other multifaceted tasks and challenges they face. The MOE that declares increased autonomy to schools and demands measurable outcomes regardless of school's contexts, delivers a clear message to school principals about what really counts. This clear gap between declared ideology and actual practice is the complex reality in which school principals in Israel have to function, hindering the principal from initiating change and from responding to the school's local needs. The MOE is accountable for developing and empowering the educational leadership in the country. The establishment of Avney Rosha, the national centre for school leadership, in 2007, is a milestone in the right direction of growing a new generation of school leadership in Israel.

## References

- Aldahmash A.H., Alshamrani S.M., Alshaya F.S. & Alsarrani N.A. (2019), *Research Trends in In-Service Science Teacher Professional Development from 2012 to 2016*, "International Journal of Instruction", Vol. 12(2), pp. 163-178.
- Avney Rosha (2008), *Perception of the principal's role in the state of Israel – Report*, [http://www.avneyrosha.org.il/eng/Documents/Perception\\_of\\_principal.pdf](http://www.avneyrosha.org.il/eng/Documents/Perception_of_principal.pdf) [25.08.2019].
- Avidav-Ungar O., Rosner M. & Rosenberg I. (2013), *Professional Development of Teachers in the Light of 'New horizon' and "Courage to Change" Reforms – From Policy to Implementation*, in: *On the Continuum: Training, Induction and Teachers' Professional Development – Policy, theory and practice*, Shimoni S. & Avidav-Ungar O. (eds.), Mofet Institution and the MOE, Tel Aviv, pp. 165-196 [in Hebrew].
- Bredeson P.V. (2000), *The school principal's role in teacher professional development*, "Journal of In-Service Education", Vol. 26(2), pp. 385-401.
- Bush T. (2003), *Theories of educational leadership and management*, Sage. London.

- Bush T. (2016), *School Leadership and Management in England: The Paradox of Simultaneous Centralisation and Decentralisation*, "Research in Educational Administration & Leadership", Vol. 1(1), pp. 1-23.
- Castagnoli P. & Cook N. (2004), *Growing your own leaders: The impact of professional development on school improvement*, National College for School Leadership Nottingham.
- Cole P. (2004), *Professional development: A great way to avoid change*, Vol. 140, IART, Melbourne, pp. 1-24.
- Conner M.L. (1997), *How adults learn*, "Ageless Learner", Vol. 2007, pp. 1-15.
- Creemers B., Kyriakides L. & Antoniou P. (2012), *Teacher professional development for improving quality of teaching*, Springer, Dordrecht, Heidelberg, New York, London.
- Darling-Hammond L. & McLaughlin M.W. (1995), *Policies that support professional development in an era of reform*, "Phi Delta Kappan", Vol. 76(8), pp. 597-604.
- Darling-Hammond L. & Richardson N. (2009), *Research review/teacher learning: What matters?*, "Educational Leadership", Vol. 66(5), pp. 46-53.
- Darling-Hammond L., Hyler M.E. & Gardner M. (2017), *Effective Teacher Professional Development*, Palo Alto, Learning Policy Institute.
- Donaldson G. (2011), *Teaching Scotland's Future: Report of a review of teacher education in Scotland*, Scottish Government, Scotland.
- Education policy outlook 2015: Making reforms happen* (2015), OECD Publishing, [https://www.theewf.org/uploads/Education-Policy-Outlook%202015\\_Making-Reforms%20Happen.pdf](https://www.theewf.org/uploads/Education-Policy-Outlook%202015_Making-Reforms%20Happen.pdf) [11.10.2019].
- Fullan M. (2009), *Large-scale reform comes of age*, "Journal of Educational Change", Vol. 10(2-3), pp. 101-113.
- Geva O., Peterka J., Pont B., Field S., Figueroa D.T., Golden G., Jankova B., Horvathova M., Linden R. & Fraccola S. (2016), *Education Policy Outlook: Israel*, OECD Publishing.
- Gibton D., Sabar N. & Goldring B. (2000), *How principals of autonomous schools in Israel view implementation of decentralization and restructuring policy: Risks, rights, and wrongs*, "Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis", Vol. 22(2), pp. 193-210.
- Guskey T.R. (2002), *Professional development and teacher change*, "Teachers and Teaching", Vol. 8(3), pp. 381-391.
- Hallinger P. (2018), *Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership*, "Educational Management Administration & Leadership", Vol. 46(1), pp. 5-24.
- Kim T. & Lee Y. (2019), *Principal instructional leadership for teacher participation in professional development: evidence from Japan, Singapore, and South Korea*, Education Research Institute, Seoul National University, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-019-09616-x>.
- Leithwood K., Harris A. & Hopkins D. (2008), *Seven strong claims about successful school leadership*, "School leadership and management", Vol. 28(1), pp. 27-42.
- Leithwood, K., Harris A. & Hopkins D. (2019), *Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited*, "School Leadership & Management", Vol. 40(1), pp. 5-22.
- Margolin I., Regev H., Dushnik L. & Rafaeli V. (2018), *A Summative research report on professional development*, Mofet institute, Tel-Aviv, Israel, [http://www.library.macam.ac.il/study/pdf\\_files/d12845.pdf](http://www.library.macam.ac.il/study/pdf_files/d12845.pdf) [7.10.2019].
- MOE official website, <https://shkifut.education.gov.il/national> [14.10.2019].
- <https://edu.gov.il/owlHeb/CHativa/YozmutHinochyotVRefurmot/ofekChadash/Pages/IkarayReformat.aspx> [14.10.2019].
- [https://poh.education.gov.il/MerhavMinhali/OfekHadash/Pages/reformat\\_ofek\\_hadash.aspx](https://poh.education.gov.il/MerhavMinhali/OfekHadash/Pages/reformat_ofek_hadash.aspx) [14.10.2019].

- [https://poh.education.gov.il/MerhavMinhali/OfekChadashOzLetmura/Pages/reforma\\_oz\\_lit-mura.aspx](https://poh.education.gov.il/MerhavMinhali/OfekChadashOzLetmura/Pages/reforma_oz_lit-mura.aspx) [14.10.2019].
- Murphy J., Elliott S.N., Goldring E. & Porter A.C. (2007), *Leadership for learning: A research-based model and taxonomy of behaviors*, "School Leadership and Management", Vol. 27(2), pp. 179-201.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015), *Professional standards for educational leaders 2015*, Author, Reston.
- Oplatka I. (2016), *Israel: Research on School Principals in Israel, Varied Topics and Limited Scope*, in: *A Decade of Research on School Principals*, "Cases from 24 Countries, Ärlestig H., Day C. & Johansson O. (eds.) Springer, Cham, pp. 403-420.
- Papastamatis A., Panitsidou E., Giavrimis P. & Papanis E. (2009), *Facilitating teachers' & educators' effective professional development*, "Review of European Studies", Vol. 1(2), pp. 83-90.
- Schwille J., Dembélé M. & Schubert J. (2007), *Global Perspectives on Teacher Learning: Improving Policy and Practice*, International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) UNESCO.
- Tracey B. & Florian K. (eds.) (2016), *Educational Research and Innovation Governing Education in a Complex World*, OECD Publishing.
- Villegas-Reimers E. (2003), *Teacher professional development: an international review of the literature*, International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris.
- Yemini M., Addi-Racah A. & Katarivas K. (2015), *I have a dream: School principals as entrepreneurs*, "Educational Management Administration & Leadership", Vol. 43(4), pp. 526-540.