Introduction

The White Paper ‘The Importance of Teaching and Learning’ (DfE, 2010) highlighted that effective pastoral care in United Kingdom (UK) schools considers pupil’s mental and physical health, enjoyment, safety and their academic achievement. In attempting to achieve such objectives, a healthy balance needs to be sought ‘between the pressures to raise standards of attainment and the responsibilities to meet the broader needs of young people’ (Jones 2006, p. 64). The multi-faceted nature of such pastoral care has resulted in the Head of Year (HoY) role being described as the ‘engine room of the school’ (Purdy, 2013, p. 23) given they are responsible for the academic attainment and welfare of one year group of pupils assisted by subject teachers acting as form tutors to a smaller group of pupils.

In raising pupils’ academic attainment and meeting the wider needs of the individual child, Nathan (2011) identifies four key HoY roles. Firstly, the need to provide a positive learning environment that motivates pupils to learn and develop their social capabilities. Secondly, the HoY should provide positive leadership for pupils and form tutors focusing on learning, achievement and developing the self-worth of both pupils and staff. Thirdly, the HoY is required to manage pupil progress and behaviour. This involves regular monitoring of academic targets and behavioural issues, managing rewards and sanctions policies, and liaising with a range of appropriate ‘external’ agencies such as parents, educational welfare officers and educational psychologists. Finally, the HoY should co-ordinate year group assemblies and events that consider pupils’ personal, spiritual, moral, social and cultural development (Nathan, 2011).

In fulfilling the four key HoY roles identified above, two ‘best’ practice inter-related principles should be adopted (Barrowcliff, 2010; Bragg, 2001; Carline, 2007; Hornby, 2011;
Nathan, 2011; Purdy 2013; Taylor & Robinson, 2009). The HoY should be well organised and develop effective relationships with staff, parents and pupils. In fulfilling ‘the hardest job in the school’ (Carline, 2007, p. 17), the ability to complete administrative tasks requires exemplary organisational skills (Hornby, 2011). The need for effective time management is obvious. Nathan (2011) argues that the HoY must be able to recognise the differing nature of tasks requiring completion. Urgent and important tasks need to be completed (almost) immediately. Tasks seen as important should be completed as soon as possible (Nathan, 2011). Acknowledging the wide-ranging nature of the four HoY roles, and that urgent and important issues do arise, indicates the HoY cannot complete all the required tasks independently.

Encouraging and, in some cases, authorising staff, parental and pupil involvement in the four roles of the HoY may reduce the workload. It also gives those three groups the right to self-determination and democratic participation in the school (Taylor & Robinson, 2009). Gaining staff commitment and encouraging them to take part in the decision-making process can be difficult. The HoY must provide input and guidance to their year group tutors to instil confidence in whatever they do (Carline, 2007). Nathan (2011) suggests that the HoY must listen actively to individual staff to foster such confidence, get to know teachers well and be prepared to trust and support staff when delegating tasks to their year group team. Despite such potential difficulties, fostering staff involvement may be more straightforward than encouraging parents to work in partnership with the school.

Ensuring parents are active participants in their child’s education is problematic yet essential if the guidance process to empower pupils at school and in the home is to be effective (Irving, 1997). Traditionally parents have existed at the periphery of schooling (Carline, 2009). They
are rarely given an insight into the curriculum or the practice of teaching which could translate into the family environment. While they are given information about their child they are not always given the means to use this information effectively outside the school walls (Irving, 1997). In attempting to foster positive relationships with parents, Hornby (2011) suggests the HoY must possess knowledge of the pupil, the parents, family dynamics and the range of services available to parents. The HoY must be genuine in their relationships with parents and show respect to parents by listening to their concerns. They must be able to sensitively and yet assertively, identify their pupil’s strengths and limitations (Hornby, 2011).

However, establishing effective relationships with parents will be largely irrelevant if such relationships are not forged with the pupils.

Acknowledging that the teaching profession is not merely a technical or cognitive practice but also fundamentally social, the quality of relationships between teachers and pupils is critical if the former are to influence the latter effectively (Aspfors & Bondas, 2013; Fan, 2012). Traditionally, the HoY has been seen largely as a disciplinarian of pupils (Carline, 2007). While this function still exists, a move to a more child-centred approach to the role appears to have taken place (DfE, 2010; Hornby, 2011; Purdy, 2013). Children need to be given a ‘voice’ as an ethical and moral practice to provide them with an opportunity to participate in school processes (Taylor & Robinson, 2009). Discussion between the HoY and pupils will help the latter to take responsibility for their actions and potentially find their own solutions to issues that may arise (Nathan, 2011). Moreover, those pupils who can be encouraged to talk and listen effectively will engage more positively in school life, while those lacking such social skills will be the voices teachers may not want to hear (Bragg, 2001). How a subject teacher such as a Physical Education (PE) specialist with HoY
responsibilities interacts with their pupils and fulfils the other HoY roles will largely be the result of their previous and current socialisation experiences in education.

The occupational socialisation framework

Occupational socialisation is all the kinds of socialisation that influence persons to enter the field of PE, and latterly are responsible for their perceptions and actions as teachers (Lawson, 1986). PE teachers face three stages of occupational socialisation (Lawson, 1986). Acculturation is the first phase and refers to childhood observations and experiences of education. It has been argued that this ‘apprenticeship of observation’ (Lortie, 2002, p. 61) means beliefs such as the teacher’s role is to tell pupils what to do, become dominant. Such beliefs act as sieves screening out inconsistent perspectives while reinforcing the teacher’s consistent view of education (Richards, Templin & Graber, 2014). The second phase is professional socialisation. It refers to those values, knowledge and skills deemed necessary and taught by universities to teach children. Organisational socialisation is the final phase and refers to the influence of the on-the-job experiences in learning a specific organisational role (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). It has been recognised that while teachers may adopt innovative practices during organisational socialisation, they are more likely, as a result of the ‘institutional press’ to adopt the school’s customary culture and practices (Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981).

Rationale and aims of the research

The purpose of conducting this study was multi-faceted. Firstly, on a general level middle leadership research is limited, particularly with regard to middle leadership itself, as opposed to studies examining such posts as stepping stones to senior leadership positions (De Nobile, 2018; Thorpe & Bennett-Powell, 2014). Secondly, research on how teachers with pastoral
care responsibilities interpret and exercise their role is minimal (Bennett, Woods, Wise & Newton, 2007). Thirdly, while a number of organisational phase factors have been identified as impacting on how secondary school teachers enact the HoY role such as, the need to raise academic standards, fellow teachers, ‘external’ agencies, the subject taught and the pupils (Crow, 2007; Nathan, 2011), the influence of acculturation and professional socialisation on teachers’ undertaking this pastoral role is conspicuous by its absence (Barrowcliff, 2010). For this reason, occupational socialisation provides an ideal framework to examine the influence of PE teachers’ educational backgrounds in fulfilling the HoY role. Finally, despite the HoY role being seen as one of the most difficult jobs in UK secondary schools (Carline, 2007) the role provides a very popular career route for PE teachers (Burrows, 2016). The unique experiences PE can offer in curricular and extra-curricular settings can encourage close working relationships between pupil and teacher (Bosco, 2013). The strength of this relationship means PE teachers are seen to have a ‘special’ understanding of pupils’ needs which is crucial in effective pastoral care (McGuire, Cooper & Park, 2006). For these reasons it seems prudent to examine how a PE teacher fulfils the role of HoY and what childhood, university and on-the-job experiences influenced execution of this role. Such a contribution may identify how the significant number of PE teachers with pastoral HOY responsibilities might carry out such responsibilities more effectively.

Methods

This constructivist-interpretive study underpinned by relativist ontology with a subjectivist epistemology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011) sought to explain the practices of the participant teacher and evaluate reasons for such practices (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007). The use of a qualitative single participant case study design (Yin, 2013) and the occupational socialisation
framework (Lawson, 1986) would provide multiple sources of in-depth data rich in context (Creswell, 2013) in order to address the purposes of the study.

**The research site**

The North-End School (pseudonym), the case study site, is an 11-16 comprehensive school situated in Lancashire, UK. During the research study the school population was 930. The percentage of girls’ on-roll was 52%. Ninety-seven per cent of students speak English as their first language; three per cent were eligible for free school meals and seven per cent had special educational needs. The current school prospectus states that the aims of PE must match those of the school. Pastoral care is the responsibility of the form tutor who is managed by the HoY and Assistant Head of Year (AHoY).

The last the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) inspection rated the overall effectiveness of the school, achievement and standards, personal development, quality of provision and leadership and management as outstanding (Ofsted, 2007). The inspection report commented that leaders of pastoral care have an understanding of performance in their areas of responsibility and demonstrate a perceptive awareness of whole-school provision. An interim assessment concluded that standards had been maintained (Ofsted, 2011).

**The participant biography**

The following details of the participant were generated during the initial interview (see data collection methods below). The participating teacher Mark (pseudonym) was 33 years old. Raised in Lancashire, UK, Mark identified that his secondary school HoY was great for him and his brother adding, ‘she looked out for us and acted as a motherly figure being firm but fair.’ Mark ‘enjoyed being part of school teams’ and the ‘sense of belonging’ that sports
teams provided. As a result of his childhood experiences of PE and sport, Mark completed a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) PE, Sport and Dance degree with Qualified Teacher Status. He felt he learned a great deal from two PE teaching practice mentors who had great relationships with pupils ‘by talking to them like you’d speak to an adult and getting some common ground by listening to them.’ Following his university experiences, Mark was appointed as a PE teacher in the North-End School. He has spent ten years teaching at this school, five as a HoY. He stated the role entails ‘looking after the kids, monitoring, recording and reporting positive and negative behaviour and organising his year team.’

**Data collection methods**

To produce a reconstructed understanding of the HoY’s practices (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011), three data collection methods were used: interviews, non-participant observations and a self-reflective journal. Data were collected over a six month period between June and November 2018.

Two semi-structured interviews were conducted with the participant in a classroom within the research site. The initial interview (II) took place prior to the non-participant observations (NPO). The questions explored the participating teacher’s acculturation, professional and organisational socialisation in PE and as a HoY and how the teacher believed they fulfilled the HoY role. The final interview (FI) was developed from the other sources of data. The FI questions sought to ascertain those factors that had influenced how the teacher had executed the HoY role. Unstructured conversational interviews (UCI) were also used to further obtain the teacher’s perspective regarding enactment of the HoY role. They took place after identified observational ‘hotspots’ (see below). While informal in nature with no
predetermined questions, these interviews were not unfocused given the aims of the study provided relevant foci (Patton, 2002).

The purpose of the NPO and subsequent field notes was to allow the researchers to experience how the teacher fulfilled the HoY role (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007). Furthermore, it allowed the researchers to compare how the teacher said they would enact the HoY role in other data collection methods and how they did so (Mason, 2002). Observations consisted of the lead researcher ‘shadowing’ the HoY for one week focusing on agreed ‘hotspots’ (with the HoY) throughout a ‘typical’ school day. These ‘hotspots’ were before school (7.00 am – 9.20 am), break time (10.55 am – 11.10 am), lunchtime (12.50 pm – 1.40 pm) and after school (3.20 pm – 4.00 pm). The use of the ‘benchmarks’ from identified HoY roles and ‘best’ HoY practice (shown in Table 1) acted as sensitising concepts during the observations thereby providing an initial focus (Blumer, 1954).

Insert Table 1 near here

The self-reflective journal (SRJ) was completed by the teacher. Acknowledging the revealing nature of written words (Mason, 2002), it was felt that a SRJ would provide an additional insight regarding the HoY’s enactment of the role and potentially support, contextualise and verify other data collected. The teacher was asked to report on satisfying and dissatisfying experiences during the observed week. The HoY was also asked to identify any critical incidents (Flanagan, 1954) that he found significant and finish the statement with ‘this was significant because . . . ’
Data analysis

Given the exploratory nature of the research, a general inductive approach (Thomas, 2006) and constant comparison (Patton, 2002) were used to analyse data. The researchers independently identified specific units of text and, following discussion between them, these were organised into initial codes. Further discussion resulted in these codes being reduced to summary themes (Creswell, 2013). This process was completed to identify how the teacher fulfilled the HoY role and how his past and current educational experiences had influenced these practices.

Results and discussion

Fulfilling the role of Head of Year

Inductive analysis and constant comparison produced two overriding themes regarding how Mark fulfilled the HoY role. Firstly, it was evident that he was an ‘administrative finisher’ determined to complete tasks as soon as possible. Secondly, Mark attempted to ‘empower’ staff, parents and pupils.

The Head of Year as an ‘administrative finisher’

Mark attempted to complete administrative tasks as soon as possible. In recording telephone calls to parents on the school system he stated that ‘I have been trying to get into the habit of doing this straight away to ensure the information is accurate and out of the way’ (SRJ). He regularly used short spaces of ‘free’ time to complete tasks. This desire to be an ‘administrative finisher’ impacted on his PE lessons, caused him to regularly work at home and increased the length of his working day.

Mark was in school far earlier than most staff. He commented, ‘I like to get in early so I can complete some paperwork and try to be ahead for the day’ (UCI). He always stayed late at
school to ‘catch up’ on ‘admin’ tasks or make phone calls later in the day’ (SRJ). If he was unable to complete administrative work at school, Mark would conduct such work at home. He stated, ‘if a parent has rung school that day, I want to speak to them that day to get an outcome’ (UCI). Mark admitted to contacting parents from home acknowledging that, on one occasion, he was feeding his daughter. His desire to be an ‘administrative finisher’ impacted upon his teaching responsibilities.

Mark was often late for his PE lessons. On his way to one lesson, a staff member asked him to have a ‘word’ with a boy who was upset about how his brother was treating him. Rather than prioritising the PE lesson and dealing with this issue later, Mark spent time listening to the pupil and offering him advice resulting in the lesson starting late (NPO). In prioritising such incidents, there were occasions when Mark did not teach his PE lesson and, consequently, his PE class was combined with another.

The ‘empowering’ Head of Year

Mark identified that staff regularly stopped him to deal with various issues. He stated ‘it is their job and should be dealt with by them, but I do feel it is important for staff to be supported when dealing with certain situations’ (SRJ). His year team were ‘encouraged to sort out different pupils … and speak to the parents if necessary’ (SRJ). Such empowerment was occasionally seen in the relationship between Mark and the AHoY. An educational opportunity outside of school for a pupil resulted in Mark asking his AHoY to collect the pupil from a lesson and make the necessary arrangements (NPO). However, many staff empowerment examples observed were informal in nature and limited to completing written tasks (NPO).
Mark attempted to empower parents by encouraging them to provide potential solutions and make decisions for their children. He had agreed to a request from a parent involving taking her daughter’s mobile telephone off her every morning (SRJ). Telephoning another parent over a friendship issue, Mark offered the mother several potential options for her daughter and agreed he would support the mother’s decision (NPO). Such empowerment was also evident in Mark’s dealing with pupils.

Recognising pupils academic and wider needs (Jones, 2006), Mark frequently gave pupils a chance to express their point of view and make decisions. He commented, ‘I don’t want anybody in my year group to say, “Sir, that’s not fair”’ (II). Prior to taking the mobile telephone off the afore-mentioned pupil, Mark gave her an opportunity to provide her point of view. She agreed with her mother that it would be better if she did not have the telephone in lessons (NPO). Mark felt such empowerment enabled pupils to take responsibility for their actions and ‘understand how to deal with things better in the future’ (SRJ). He sought to develop the self-worth of pupils by providing them with opportunities to make decisions about school processes (Irving & Parker-Jenkins, 1995). During a weekly prefect meeting, Mark sought their views on the design of prefect badges and what their specific roles should be in assisting staff in the administrative ‘running’ of the school (NPO). ‘Difficult’ pupils were also given a voice (Taylor & Robinson, 2009) and chances to make their own decisions. Mark gave a pupil exhibiting inappropriate behaviour a chance to give his views and the opportunity to select his own behavioural targets (NPO).
The factors influencing enactment of the Head of Year role

It was evident that three themes influenced Mark fulfilling the HoY role. These were the de-prioritisation of PE, the need to retain control of administrative situations and the influence of past and present teachers.

The de-prioritisation of Physical Education

Mark readily admitted that the HoY role took priority over subject responsibilities commenting ‘I remember being told you are a PE teacher first and foremost and a HoY second. In reality and in my head it’s sometimes the other way around’ (FI). He felt that the organisation of PE allowed him to de-prioritise the subject:

I feel that being a PE teacher does allow me to do my job with a bit more ease as I can use changing time to make a phone call or finish off a task. We have a teaching technician that completes registers or in the worst case scenario will step in and take a class (FI).

In contrast to other subjects, PE may provide greater opportunities for such de-prioritisation to take place. Multiple classes getting changed before and after lessons in one changing room means that such management necessities can be overseen by fewer staff. The large teaching environments of sports halls, gymnasiums and sports field’s means classes can be put together. The transient nature of ‘completed’ work and perceived marginality, non-academic status of PE (Kougioumtzis, Patriksson & Stahlman, 2011) may further encourage the merging of classes.

De-prioritising his PE work allowed Mark to vindicate working at home. He stated, ‘I know my own kids want to see me and yet I’m working and you can justify it being a PE teacher. I’ve not got a mountain of books to mark. I’m making a phone call to justify not having the marking’ (FI). Despite frequently commenting on time spent marking PE examination work
and his significant involvement in extra-curricular provision, Mark did not consider this considerable workload as a reason for not completing HoY tasks at home.

The need to retain control of administrative tasks

Despite recognising the need and benefits in empowering staff (Irving & Parker-Jenkins, 1995; Nathan, 2011; Taylor & Robinson, 2009), Mark stated, ‘I’m guilty of taking on too much and I’ve always said that’s a weakness of mine’ (FI). Despite attending leadership courses that provided advice on staff delegation, Mark recognised ‘I should be delegating more’ (FI). Two reasons appeared to make Mark retain control of administrative tasks. Firstly, he believed that giving responsibility to other staff elongated getting the task finished. He cited an example of giving his AHoY a task based around pupils’ attendances commenting, ‘I feel uncomfortable because I like to know what the kids’ attendances are and if I’m waiting for her to give it to me then I find myself doing it anyway’ (FI). Secondly, there appeared to be a distrust of staff completing the tasks to his ‘high’ standards. Despite acknowledging ‘we’ve got a really good year group team and really good working relationships’ (FI), Mark was concerned that tasks had to be done his/the ‘right’ way:

If I give a task to the AHoY, then she wouldn’t necessarily speak to them in the same way and I am guilty of thinking … they will come to me anyway or ring up and say if you had dealt with it would have done better or another way. I feel that I know the pupils and parents better (FI).

Mark felt his knowledge of pupils, parents and family dynamics put him at an advantage in dealing with parents and pupils, yet, it appears to have negatively impacted on the requirement to trust his form tutors and particularly his AHoY (Bosco, 2013; Burrows, 2016; Hornby, 2011).
The influence of past and present teachers

Two teaching practice mentors encouraged Mark to keep parents informed of their child’s progress and give them options in their child’s education (Hornby, 2011; Irving, 1997; Nathan, 2011). Acknowledging the ‘debt’ he owed to such teachers, of whom had been or were HoY’s, Mark stated ‘I spent a lot of time listening and asking them questions. I learned how they spoke to the parents (FI). The two mentors also emphasised to him the importance of finding common ground with difficult pupils. They stressed to Mark ‘the need to let pupils know where you’re coming from and find out where their coming from, so you can reach a decision together’ (FI).

The advice and influence of such teaching practice mentors has been found to be particularly powerful when its supports childhood experiences (Standal, Moen & Moe, 2014). Mark’s own secondary school HoY also influenced his relationships with pupils. He commented that he ‘respected his HoY massively and if you did something wrong you felt like you had let her down which then influenced your choices moving forwards’ (FI). In congruence with the two teaching practice mentors, she built a similar relationship with Mark ‘making me understand where we had gone wrong and that everything has a consequence’ (FI). His own childhood experiences of pupil empowerment appear influential in his current relationships with pupils. Mark felt it important that the pupils could voice their opinions, make decisions (Irving & Parker-Jenkins, 1995; Taylor & Robinson, 2009) and understand his perspective so they could reach a sensible decision together.

Conclusion

This exploratory case study supports Carline’s (2007) belief that being a HoY and subject teacher is one of the hardest jobs in schools. Analysis of interview and observation data
identified that the participant attempted to be an ‘administrative finisher’ who empowered staff, parents and pupils. The desire to complete administrative tasks quickly was influenced by the de-prioritisation of PE and a desire to retain control of administrative situations. Crucially, we argue that the nature, lesson organisation and academic marginality of the subject (Kougioumtzis, Patriksson & Stahlman, 2011) may encourage the HoY role to be prioritised over PE teaching and learning. Research examining the influence of teaching other subjects on fulfilling the roles of the HoY is required.

The impact of attempting to be an ‘administrative finisher’ and someone who empowers staff, parents and pupils was five-fold. Mark worked long school days, used short spaces of time to complete tasks and regularly worked at home. He was often late for PE lessons and on occasions, did not teach his lessons. While the authors feel working a long day is unavoidable, two suggestions are offered to help alleviate the other four ‘negative’ outcomes. There is a need to be proactive in managing time and ‘formalise’ the empowerment of the AHoY. Accepting that tasks that are urgent and important need to be completed almost immediately (Nathan, 2011), it is suggested that a ‘timetabled’ period at the beginning and/or end of the day be implemented to complete tasks that are viewed as important. While this will inevitably impact on the provision of PE extra-curricular activities, it should reduce the stressful and potentially less effective use of short spaces of time to complete tasks. If staff and pupils are made aware that this ‘timetabled’ period must be used to discuss and solve important issues with the HoY, it will dramatically reduce the two negative effects on PE lessons highlighted above (authors’ emphasis). However, in recognising the wide-ranging nature of the HoY role (Nathan, 2011) and the fact that unexpected, urgent and important issues do arise (Carline, 2007), the informal empowerment of the AHoY should change.
The current use of the AHoY to largely fulfil written tasks and Mark’s desire to control various tasks only increased his workload. The authors recommend that the AHoY is given pastoral responsibility for specific members of the year group or responsibility for specific issues such as monitoring across the whole year group. This has four potential benefits. Firstly, it would reduce the HoY’s workload. Secondly, it would improve the efficiency of the ‘timetabled’ period outlined above given there would be less pupils and/or issues to manage. Thirdly, the AHoY would get to know pupils, parents and staff better and would therefore be potentially, a more efficient pastoral leader. This, in turn, might encourage the HoY to relinquish control of a number of tasks. Finally, if the allotted responsibilities were changed incrementally, in time, the AHoY would be ready to undertake the HoY role.

Viewed through the lens of occupational socialisation, it is clear that all three stages of this theoretical framework contributed to Mark fulfilling the HoY role. Common sense would suggest that the organisational stage would act as the major socializing force given the acculturation and professional phases lack direct experience of the HoY role. However, this apparent ‘absence of apprenticeship’ (Pugach, 1992) has not resulted in a ‘salvaged’ organisational phase upon which to base beliefs and approaches to fulfilling the HoY role. Instead, the manner in which the role was enacted was reinforced by factors from the acculturation and professional socialisation stages. It appears that childhood and higher education experiences provide a basis or evaluation screen which impact on carrying out the role of HoY during the organisational phase; something that has been reported in previous PE teacher socialisation literature (see, for example, O’Leary, Longmore & Medcalf, 2014; Richards, Templin & Graber, 2014). Such findings indicate that those responsible for the appointment of HoY’s should examine those candidates’ acculturation and professional experiences to ensure congruence with the HoY requirements. Research examining the
impact of the acculturation and professional stages upon (PE) teachers fulfilling the dual roles of subject teacher and other pastoral/leadership roles, such as Head of Department, Deputy Head or Head Teacher appears warranted.

Utilising the three stages of the occupational socialisation framework (Lawson, 1986) in this study has provided a unique opportunity to examine the influence of a PE teacher’s past and current educational experiences on fulfilling the dual roles of HoY and subject teacher. However, it should be recognised that this framework may not totally capture how the role of the teacher is developed (see Richards, 2015; Richards et al., 2013). It should also be acknowledged that the findings are based on a relatively short timescale (six months) from a single participant case study and for these reasons care should be taken in drawing conclusions from this research. However, the similarities facing other teachers undertaking the HoY role means they are likely to be able to make ‘moderatum generalizations’ (Williams, 2002). In short, other teachers can recognise and identify the issues attempting to complete the dual role of HoY and subject teacher, and the solutions offered may aid their pastoral and teaching responsibilities.
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### Table 1: Head of Year roles and ‘best’ practice benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head of Year roles (WHAT to observe)</th>
<th>‘Best’ practice benchmarks (observing HOW roles are carried out)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aims:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Raising pupils’ academic attainment</td>
<td>Administration: time management skills – recognise urgent and important tasks; be flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing pupil’s needs (mental and physical health, enjoyment, safety)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide positive learning environment</strong></td>
<td>Working with staff: give guidance, support, actively listen, trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide positive leadership to:</strong></td>
<td>Working with external agencies including parents: possess knowledge of pupil, parents, family dynamics, and resources available. Be genuine, respectful and realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Pupils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manage pupil progress and behaviour</strong></td>
<td>Working with pupils: be available, know each pupil, give pupils a voice; listen actively, give pupils responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(academic targets, behavioural issues, rewards, sanctions, links with external groups especially parents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organise range of activities to develop pupils personal, moral, social, cultural development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from: DfE, 2010; Hornby, 2011; Jones, 2006; Nathan, 2011; Taylor & Robinson, 2009)