IMPACT REPORT

LEAD-IN

Leadership Empowerment and Development
for Inclusive Education in Europe

AUTHORS

Loth Van Den Ouweland holds a PhD in Educational Sciences and currently work as a senior researcher at KdG's Future-Driven Education Research Centre. She is responsible for the research area 'Sustainable Leadership and Careers in Education'. Her research focuses, amongst other things, on: teacher and headteacher shortages, attractive careers for education staff, performance management, school leadership development and succession, shared leadership and co-leadership, and the functioning of school boards.

Ama Amitai holds a PhD in the sociology of education and works as a senior researcher at KdG's Future-Driven Education research centre, focusing on the theme of citizenship education and inclusion and diversity within education.
Her work focuses on questions such as: how can teachers collaborate on citizenship education? How do you deal with controversial topics in the classroom? How can school leaders ensure an inclusive school policy? How do we prepare (future) teachers to recognize (unconscious) biases and act inclusively?

DESIGN AND LAYOUT

Maria Hristova

Project 2024-1-AT01-KA220-SCH-000251434- Leadership Empowerment and Development for Inclusive Education in Europe (LEAD-IN) is funded by Erasmus+ Key Action 2: Cooperation partnerships in school education (KA220-SCH).

IN COLLABORATION WITH

TFA Teach For Austria

TEACH*for*BELGIUM

TEACH FOR POLAND

KdG Research
Karel de Grote Hogeschool

Teach For Bulgaria

Co-funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Table of

CONTENTS

1. METHODOLOGY 1

2. RESULTS 2

3. CONCLUSION ABOUT IMPACT 10

4. EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR SCHOOL LEADERS: LESSONS LEARNED 13

5. REFERENCES 16

1. METHODOLOGY

1.1. Needs assessment interviews with 38 school leaders from the 4 participating countries:

- KdG developed an interview protocol for all TFA-partners, who performed the interviews in their countries. The interviewers made an anonymous report of each interview. These interviews were analysed by KdG.
- This analysis resulted in an overview of common and country-specific needs, challenges, weaknesses and strengths concerning inclusive leadership.

1.2. Pre-assessment survey

- 75 training participants filled in a pre-assessment survey at the start (*BE-Fl 12, BE-Fr 5, Bulgaria 27, Austria 21, Poland 10)*, developed by KdG. They were asked to assess the diversity in their schools (students and staff), and to self-assess their competencies in different domains of inclusive school leadership.
- Together with the needs interviews, the results of the survey were analysed by KdG and reported to the training team which developed the training content for LEAD-in.

1.3. Evaluation surveys:

- After each training and LC session, trainers and trainees were asked to fill in a short evaluation survey, to evaluate their satisfaction with and usefulness of the session for their work, as well as the learnings and intention to implement what was learned in their school.

1.4. Post-assessment survey:

- 50 training participants (*BE-Fl 7, BE-Fr 4, Bulgaria 19, Austria 14, Poland 6)* filled in a post-assessment survey similar to the pre-assessment survey, to self-assess their competencies in different domains of inclusive school leadership at the end of the training. Moreover, participants indicated the extent to which their knowledge and attitudes concerning inclusive leadership evolved due to the training, the extent to which they implemented the gained insights in their practice, as well as experienced effects on their schools (students and staff).

2. RESULTS

1.2. Results of the needs assessment interviews:

At the start of our project, we interviewed 38 school leaders from the 4 participation countries about their professional development needs. For more information and details, we refer to the needs analysis in attachment 1. Across countries, participants indicated the following needs as most urgent:

- School leaders need professional development that equips them to respond effectively to increasingly diverse student populations and needs. This includes training on addressing language barriers and socioeconomic disparities, on discussing sensitive topics such as religion and LGBTQIA+, and on developing and implementing inclusive policies for both students and staff, for example through interreligious dialogue and targeted support for immigrant students.
- School leaders also expressed training needs related to instructional leadership, supporting their teams in differentiation and adapting teaching methods for mixed-ability classrooms, managing classroom behavior and addressing challenges like bullying or inappropriate interactions.
- Another frequently mentioned training need was training about parental Involvement and developing strategies for engaging parents effectively, especially in challenging situations.
- School leaders indicated a need for PD on conflict resolution: resolving conflicts between staff, students, and parents, and fostering trust.

Next to these inclusion-related development needs, participants expressed PD needs in more general leadership skills, related to decision-making, shared leadership, data-informed leadership, and HRM topics (teacher evaluations, encouraging professional development, addressing burnout and teacher motivation, coaching novice teachers and career-switchers).

Concerning the training format, school leaders expressed a preference for interactive and practice-oriented forms of professional development. They indicated valuing opportunities to experience different school contexts through school visits and job shadowing, as well as workshops, training based on authentic cases and the exchange of good practices. These findings cement the idea that training should balance theory and practice and provide sufficient

opportunities for networking and peer learning. School leaders also preferred having the flexibility to select training modules that match their own interests and professional needs. In addition, they suggested that PD programs should reserve dedicated time for participants to work on concrete challenges and inclusion policies within their own school.

2.2. Pre-post measurement

For further information and more details about the pre-post results, we refer to attachment 2. These were the main findings of the pre-assessment survey:

- Overall, the majority of the school leaders felt rather **knowledgeable about inclusion and had a clear vision but needed to work on carrying out this vision in the whole school**. 56% of the participants indicated knowing how to create an inclusive school culture and environment, 55% felt able to advocate for inclusion (resources, support, educational policy) to policymakers, 73% indicated encouraging students and staff to adopt a common set of values, 73% indicated knowing the strengths and weaknesses of their school concerning inclusive education, and 32% agreed that their school had a clear and shared vision with the whole team on inclusive education. A question about how school leaders relate to neutrality also arose, since some responses appeared to suggest that a number of participants preferred neutrality over celebrating diversity.
- Generally, school leaders felt confident about their **understanding of concepts such as inclusion, diversity, equity, and equality, and felt aware of their own identity, biases, and privileges**. Moreover, 72% felt confident as a school leader in dealing with all different domains of diversity.
- Concerning **data-informed leadership**, principals felt less confident: 53% indicated knowing how to collect data on the current situation of inclusion in their schools, 39% indicated that data is used to drive and make decisions in their school, and 22% indicated that a data-driven action plan for inclusion has been developed in their schools.
- Concerning **supporting and motivating their team in inclusive education**, the majority of participants felt self-confident, but another substantial amount didn't. 74% indicated providing ongoing professional development opportunities to the entire team to update and enhance instructional skills in working with diverse students. Around 55-68% felt able to motivate their team to work on inclusive education, to support their team to diversify learning content and methods of addressing students' diverse needs and backgrounds, to support teachers to foster a safe and cohesive classroom community and a brave space to discuss

multiple perspectives. 60% indicated knowing how to address diversity in the curriculum. 47% felt able to encourage teachers to use a diversity of learning approaches as a resource for teaching. 42% felt that their teachers had high expectations for all students.

- As for **conflict resolution and controversial issues**, there seems to be more room for improvement for most schools in terms of more tools and policy being put in place. 72% felt confident addressing differences in the school (with students and/or team members) related to ethnicity, gender, language, class, special needs, and other forms of diversity. 51% indicated knowing how to react to controversial issues in the school and to support their team with dealing with these in the classroom. 26% indicated having a conflict resolution plan in the school for diversity related issues, and 39% indicated having an anti-discrimination policy in the school that is known by all staff and students.
- Although our participants acknowledged the value of **working with parents and families and communities,** they appeared to not tap into the full potential of this collaboration yet. 94% believed that working collaboratively with parents and families is an added value. 58% felt confident about engaging a diverse group of parents/the community surrounding the school. 40% knew how to tap into the learning potential of parents and families and use it as a resource for learning.

These were the main findings of the post-assessment survey:

- **Inclusive school vision and culture.** Most school leaders felt confident about developing an inclusive school vision and culture, although translating this into a shared whole-school approach remained a challenge. 86% indicated knowing how to develop an inclusive school vision, 90% knew how to create an inclusive school culture and environment, and 96% recognised their school's strengths and weaknesses concerning inclusive education. Furthermore, 72% felt able to advocate for inclusion among policymakers, and 82% encouraged students and staff to adopt a common set of values. However, only 52% reported a clear vision of inclusive education shared by the whole team. The responses concerning neutrality remained important to explore: 44% agreed that their school paid little attention to cultural differences because of its neutrality, while 82% reported valuing cultural differences. **Compared with the pre-assessment, agreement increased particularly for developing an inclusive vision (52% to 86%) and culture (56% to 90%), while a shared team vision increased from 32% to 52%. Agreement with the neutrality statement also increased, from 24% to 44%, indicating that higher agreement should not automatically be interpreted as progress towards inclusion.**

- **Understanding inclusion and self-awareness.** School leaders continued to report strong knowledge of inclusion and awareness of their own position. 96% felt confident about understanding concepts such as inclusion, diversity, equity and equality, and 94% reported awareness of their own identity, biases and privileges. In addition, 84% felt confident in dealing with different domains of diversity, and all respondents recognised that school and classroom populations are constantly changing. **Compared with the pre-assessment, confidence in dealing with different domains of diversity increased from 72% to 84%. Agreement concerning conceptual understanding and self-awareness remained high, although it decreased slightly from approximately 99% to 96% and 94%, respectively.**

- **Data-informed leadership.** Most participants felt confident about collecting and using inclusion-related data, although translating this into an action plan remained less common. 76% indicated knowing how to collect data on the current situation of inclusion in their school, and 70% reported that data informed school decisions. However, only 40% indicated that a data-informed action plan for inclusion had been developed. **Compared with the pre-assessment, agreement increased from 53% to 76% for collecting data, from 39% to 70% for using data in decision-making, and from 22% to 40% for having an action plan. This suggests stronger confidence in using data, alongside a continuing need to support implementation.**

- **Supporting staff and inclusive teaching practices.** Most school leaders felt able to support and motivate their teams in inclusive education. 82% reported providing ongoing professional development opportunities, 84% felt able to motivate their team, and 82% felt able to support staff in adapting teaching content and methods to students' diverse needs and backgrounds. Furthermore, 78% felt able to support teachers in creating a safe and cohesive classroom community, and 76% in creating a brave space for discussing different perspectives. 87% knew how to address diversity in the curriculum, and 72% felt able to encourage diverse learning approaches. However, only 58% reported that teachers had high expectations of all students. **Compared with the pre-assessment, the largest increases concerned addressing diversity in the curriculum (60% to 87%), supporting differentiated teaching (55% to 82%), and encouraging diverse learning approaches (47% to 72%). High expectations increased from 42% to 58%, but remained an area requiring attention.**

- **Conflict resolution and anti-discrimination.** Participants

generally felt confident about addressing differences and controversial issues, while formal policies were less consistently established. 84% felt confident addressing differences related to ethnicity, gender, language, social class, special needs and other forms of diversity. 72% knew how to respond to controversial issues and support teachers in addressing them in the classroom, and 68% knew strategies for challenging non-inclusive attitudes, racism, sexism, classism and ableism. However, only 46% reported a clear conflict resolution plan addressing diversity-related issues, while 68% reported an anti-discrimination policy known to staff and students. **Compared with the pre-assessment, agreement increased from 72% to 84% for addressing differences, from 51% to 72% for responding to controversial issues, and from 42% to 68% for challenging non-inclusive attitudes. Formal policies also became more common: conflict resolution plans increased from 26% to 46%, and anti-discrimination policies from 39% to 68%.**

- **Working with parents, families and communities.** Participants continued to strongly acknowledge the value of collaboration with parents and families. 94% considered this collaboration an added value. In addition, 70% felt confident about engaging a diverse group of parents and the wider community, and 70% knew how to draw on parents' and families' learning potential as a resource for education. **Compared with the pre-assessment, the perceived value of collaboration remained stable at 94%, while confidence in engaging parents and communities increased from 58% to 70%. The strongest development concerned drawing on families' learning potential, which increased from 40% to 70%, suggesting a shift towards making more practical use of this collaboration.**

2.3. Evaluation surveys of the specific modules

The evaluation of the Lead-In training modules points to a consistently positive response from participating school leaders across Belgium, Poland, Austria and Bulgaria. To get an overview of all the averages on the different items for the different modules, we refer to attachment 3. On a five-point scale, all five overall evaluation items received average scores above 4.2, indicating strong satisfaction with the training content and methods, perceived usefulness for professional practice, learning, and intention to apply what was learned in participants' schools or organisations.

Across countries, the highest overall average was for satisfaction with the training content (4.45/5), followed by perceived usefulness for practice (4.39/5) and intention to apply learning in the school or organisation (4.37/5). Satisfaction with the methods scored 4.35/5,

while the item on learning new things scored 4.30/5. Although this was the lowest-rated item, it remained clearly positive. It may indicate that some participants were already familiar with parts of the content, rather than suggesting a lack of value in the training.

Taken together, the findings suggest that the programme offers relevant and usable professional learning for school leaders. The feedback points not only to the value of the formal training content, but also to the importance of creating opportunities for reflection, collaboration and the exchange of experience among peers. The evaluation primarily captures participants' perceptions and intentions; it does not by itself establish the extent to which learning was subsequently implemented or led to measurable changes in schools.

One of the clearest perceived benefits was the opportunity to exchange experiences with colleagues, learn from peers, receive feedback and connect with professionals working towards similar goals. Participants valued the open and supportive atmosphere and the sense of being part of a community. This indicates that the learning community itself is an important programme outcome alongside the formal curriculum.

Participants particularly appreciated concrete examples, practical tips, case studies and frameworks that could be transferred to their day-to-day work. Feedback referred to tools for assessing equality and inclusion, adapting interview questions, engaging students and turning broad concepts into manageable actions. The strong average score for intended application (4.37/5) reinforces the perceived relevance of the training, while remaining an indicator of intention rather than verified implementation.

The modules also encouraged school leaders to reconsider their assumptions, leadership practices and professional responsibilities. Participants highlighted the value of self-awareness, constructive feedback, learning to work with criticism and taking small, concrete steps towards improvement. The feedback suggests that the programme supports reflection on how inclusive leadership can be translated into everyday decisions and conversations with teams.

As for the specific countries, results only slightly differed.

- Belgium recorded the strongest overall results, with an average of 4.41–4.62 across the five evaluation items (n=58 across the Flemish and French-speaking groups). Satisfaction with content was particularly high (4.62/5), as were perceived usefulness (4.59/5) and intention to apply learning (4.51/5). The Flemish group rated usefulness and application especially highly, while the French-speaking group gave the highest score to training methods.

- Bulgaria's results were consistently positive and balanced, ranging from 4.48 to 4.53 (n=86). Participants rated the methods and usefulness of the modules highest (both 4.53/5). Austria also reported strong results, ranging from 4.24 to 4.56 (n=66), with high satisfaction with content (4.56/5) and a strong intention to apply learning (4.50/5).
- For the Austrian school leaders, the given scores to the modules are also consistently strong (4.24-4.56), mostly rating the content high and showing a strong intention to apply learning. Austrian participants valued the quality and practical relevance of the training.
- Poland reported comparatively lower scores, but evaluations remained positive, ranging from 3.81 to 3.98 (n=48). Content (3.98/5) and methods (3.96/5) were the highest-rated items, while intention to apply learning (3.81/5) was lowest. These differences suggest an opportunity to explore how training content, methods and practical examples can be adapted to different participant needs and contexts. The available results do not establish the reasons for the country-level differences.

Different **modules** had different scores. Module 4, "Lean on your team," emerged as the strongest-performing module overall. Participants rated its content at 4.57/5 and their intention to apply learning at 4.52/5, indicating that the module was seen as relevant and actionable. Module 8, "Setting directions for a more inclusive school," was the next strongest overall and appears to have helped participants consolidate learning and look ahead to their school practice. Module 2, focused on inclusion assessment of self and the organisation, was also among the stronger modules.

Modules 3 and 7 received comparatively lower ratings, although their results were still generally positive. For example, Module 3 received 4.25/5 for content and 4.17/5 for intention to apply learning, while Module 7 received 4.25/5 for content. These findings may help guide future refinement, with attention to the clarity of practical takeaways, relevance to participants' existing experience and the time available to work through examples.

2.4. Opportunities for improvement and next steps

The most common improvement request was for a better balance between group work, discussion, trainer input and practical application. While peer exchange was valued, some participants felt that group activities and presentations left insufficient time for concrete tools and implementation-focused discussion. Providing case studies or preparatory materials in advance could free up session time for deeper analysis and practical application.

Participants also asked for greater differentiation according to prior knowledge and experience. This was especially clear in feedback about AI-related content: participants already familiar with basic tools wanted more advanced cases and complex, practice-oriented applications rather than introductory overviews. Future delivery could therefore offer differentiated tasks, optional advanced material or examples matched to participants' experience levels.

Based on the evaluation, the following priorities are recommended: (1) preserve peer learning and professional exchange while ensuring sufficient time for practical application; (2) provide key materials and case studies in advance; (3) tailor examples and activities to different levels of experience; and (4) use feedback on Modules 3 and 7 to identify specific opportunities for refinement. To understand longer-term impact, a follow-up could also examine which tools participants have used, what changes they have introduced in their schools and what barriers or enabling factors they encountered.

3. CONCLUSION ABOUT IMPACT

Overall, the **post-measurement survey** indicates that respondents are positive about the impact of the training. Across the first four questions, 90–98% agree or strongly agree that the training strengthened their knowledge, insights, leadership skills and professional disposition. 94% report applying insights from the training in their work. Although the post-measurement took place shortly after the training ended, more than half of respondents already report positive effects on school operations, their team and/or their students.

The open-ended responses and the evaluation of the modules point to a fairly consistent picture: participants valued the training especially for its practical relevance, opportunities for (international) exchange and reflection on leadership. Its strongest perceived effects were increased reflection and self-awareness, improved communication and collaborative leadership practices, and stronger attention to inclusive school culture. Participants also reported emerging benefits for team functioning and student engagement, although organisational impact was not yet visible for everyone. The criticisms mostly concerned time constraints, the rigid schedule, limited room for discussion/networking, role-play, and insufficient differentiation for participants in different roles.

1. Satisfaction with the training. Participants particularly appreciated practical methods and examples for implementing inclusion, international exchange, school visits, peer learning, theoretical input linked to practice, and opportunities to reflect on their own school context. Networking and direct contact with colleagues and schools were repeatedly described as valuable.

2. Strengthening of knowledge, skills and professional disposition. Respondents reported increased knowledge of inclusive leadership and teaching, school organisation, teamwork and supporting teachers, conflict management and relevant literature. Several emphasised greater self-awareness, reflection on personal values, and a stronger connection between theory and practice. They also described improved communication skills, more confidence in applying new ideas, and a better understanding of how different actors within the education system operate.

3. Changes in leadership behaviour. The clearest reported changes were towards a more collaborative, reflective, coaching and distributed leadership style. Participants mentioned listening more carefully, delegating responsibility, involving colleagues in decisions, giving feedback with greater confidence, paying more attention to others' perspectives, and becoming less impulsive or controlling. Several also reported a stronger focus on dialogue, shared responsibility, team leadership and inclusive approaches to diversity among staff.

4. Effects on the school, team and students. The reported organisational effects mainly concerned better team communication, collaboration, cohesion and professional dialogue, alongside greater use of new teaching approaches and stronger attention to inclusion. Some respondents described more engaged students, a more supportive learning environment, increased student participation, and more active partnerships with parents. Others noted developments such as expanding the leadership team or recognising the need for an explicit inclusion policy. At the same time, a few respondents cautioned that it was still too early to observe or measure organisational effects.

The **pre–post comparison** also suggests positive development following the training. Across the 33 items, the average item score increased from 3.58 to 3.98 on a five-point scale. Mean scores increased on 32 of the 33 items, while average net agreement ("agree" or "strongly agree") rose from approximately 58% to 76%. The largest increases in mean scores concerned participants' perceived capacity to develop an inclusive school vision and culture, implement anti-discrimination policies, use data for decision-making, address diversity in the curriculum, and challenge non-inclusive attitudes. Substantial gains were also observed in supporting staff in inclusive practices and drawing on the learning potential of parents and families. Basic knowledge and self-awareness items showed smaller increases in mean scores, consistent with their already high baseline scores.

Together, the evaluation findings suggest that the LEAD-IN training generated impact at multiple levels, although the strength of the evidence differs across these levels.

Level 1 – Reaction. The programme achieved a strong impact at the level of participants' reactions. Participants evaluated the training very positively in terms of content, methods and practical relevance. Across modules, average scores were 4.45/5 for satisfaction with the content, 4.35/5 for the methods used and 4.39/5 for usefulness in practice. Qualitative feedback particularly highlighted the practical

Level 2 – Learning. There is also strong evidence of impact on

participants' learning. In the post-measurement, 92% of respondents indicated that they had deepened or broadened their knowledge and 98% reported gaining new insights. Participants also reported development in leadership skills, professional dispositions, self-awareness and confidence. The pre–post comparison supports this pattern: across 33 items, the average score increased from 3.58 to 3.98, with improvements on 32 of the 33 items. Particularly notable improvements concerned participants' perceived capacity to translate inclusive leadership principles into practice, for example by developing an inclusive school vision, engaging families, supporting staff, using data for decision-making and implementing inclusive policies.

Level 3 – Behaviour. The findings provide substantial indications that learning was transferred into leadership practice. In the post-measurement, 94% of respondents indicated that they applied insights from the training in their work. Participants provided concrete examples of behavioural change, including listening more actively, delegating responsibilities, involving colleagues more in decision-making, approaching conversations differently, giving feedback more confidently and paying greater attention to different perspectives. These findings suggest that the programme moved beyond knowledge acquisition towards changes in day-to-day leadership behaviour. As these changes are self-reported, however, they should be interpreted as evidence of perceived behavioural transfer rather than independently observed behavioural change.

Level 4 – Outcomes. Finally, there are emerging indications of impact at the organisational, team and student levels. Participants reported improvements in team communication, collaboration, cohesion and professional dialogue, as well as stronger attention to inclusion within their schools. Some also perceived positive effects on students, such as increased engagement, participation and a more supportive learning environment. However, these higher-level outcomes were less consistently observed than changes in individual learning and behaviour. Several participants explicitly indicated that it was still too early to identify measurable effects at school level. The findings therefore suggest emerging Level 4 impact, rather than established organisational or student outcomes.

Overall, the evaluation suggests a progressive impact pathway from positive reactions and learning to changes in leadership behaviour and, for some participants, early changes within their teams and schools. The evidence is strongest for Levels 1 and 2, provides meaningful support for Level 3, and shows promising but preliminary evidence for Level 4. A longer-term follow-up would be needed to establish whether changes in leadership practice become embedded in school structures and ultimately result in sustained effects for staff and students.

4. EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR SCHOOL LEADERS: LESSONS LEARNED

In this final section, we reflect on the lessons learned about effective professional development for inclusive leadership within the LEAD-In project and formulate a number of key recommendations for trainers and professional development programme designers.

These lessons draw on several sources of evidence: our literature review (see attachment 4); needs analysis interviews with school leaders in the four participating countries; pre- and post-training surveys with participants; evaluation surveys completed by both trainers and participants after each training session; and insights gathered through discussions with participants and trainers during international exchanges, school visits, and other project activities.

Address inclusive leadership comprehensively. PD should cover the leadership practices that matter for inclusion: developing a shared inclusive vision and culture, supporting inclusive and high-quality teaching, maintaining high expectations for all students, and connecting the school with families, communities, and wider support networks (Groomes et al., 2024; Leithwood, 2021).

Treat inclusive leadership as a collective organisational responsibility. Professional development should help leaders embed inclusion in sustainable school-wide structures, shared policies (e.g. anti-discrimination policy) and distributed leadership, while also strengthening the relational, communication, and advocacy skills needed to build trust, engage stakeholders, navigate difficult conversations, and promote equitable practices (Booysen, 2013).

Integrate 'being', 'knowing,' and 'doing'. Effective PD should address leaders' self-awareness, values and beliefs (*being*), knowledge about diversity, equity, social justice and inclusive education (*knowing*), and the practical leadership skills needed to

translate these into action (*doing*) (Booysen, 2013). Leaders need structured opportunities to examine how their own experiences, assumptions, biases, values and beliefs shape their leadership practices, while also connecting these practices to theoretical concepts and evidence (Forde & Torrance, 2017; Precey et al., 2013).

Connect theory to authentic leadership challenges. PD should familiarise leaders with research on inclusive leadership, culturally responsive education, equity, teaching and learning, and high expectations, enabling them to apply theory to real school problems and critically assess existing practices (Carpenter & Diem, 2013). Our participants particularly valued concrete tools, examples, and methods that helped them translate conceptual frameworks into their own practice.

> "*Taking the time to reflect on certain concepts and question the way I operate within my school—or simply connect my practice to theory and gain reassurance about that practice—was very valuable. One example is my relationship with staff members and the way I analyse each person's position in order to identify the real issues at stake and appropriate ways forward.*" — Belgian school leader

Make the school context a central object of learning and strengthen data-informed leadership. Leaders should learn to understand the specific students, staff, families, values, resources, and challenges in their own school community. Therefore, PD should equip leaders to collect, disaggregate, and analyse school data, conduct equity audits, identify patterns of inequity, and monitor whether inclusive policies and interventions produce the intended outcomes (Spikes, 2018).

Build in an action component, with problem-based and field-based learning. Inclusive leadership is unlikely to develop through workshops alone. Programmes should include authentic cases, school-based inquiry, experimentation, field experiences, and opportunities to observe, test, and refine leadership practices (Barakat et al., 2019).

Make peer learning and professional networking a core part of professional development. Structured exchange, peer feedback, school visits, and international learning can deepen reflection, provide reassurance, and expose school leaders to alternative approaches and contexts. This exposure can make alternative approaches to inclusion visible and urge participants to question practices that may otherwise be taken for granted (Barakat et al., 2019).

> *"I appreciated the concrete examples and practical tips that can be immediately applied in daily operations. I found the exchange of experiences with colleagues especially valuable, especially when you find a part of yourself in other like-minded people."* – Belgian school leader

Prioritise depth over coverage. Programmes need sufficient time for discussion, reflection and detailed examination of participants' own cases (Kemp-Graham, 2015). Fewer topics explored in depth may produce more meaningful learning than a highly structured programme covering many topics superficially.

Encourage participation by leadership teams rather than isolated individuals. Having two or more colleagues from the same school or organisation participate can strengthen collective reflection, facilitate implementation, and reduce dependence on one individual to sustain change.

5. REFERENCES

- Barakat, M., Reames, E., & Kensler, L. A. (2019). Leadership preparation programs: Preparing culturally competent educational leaders. *Journal of research on leadership education*, *14*(3), 212-235. https://doi.org/10.1177/1942775118759070
- Booysen, L. (2013). The development of inclusive leadership practice and processes. *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion*, 296-329. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118764282.ch10
- Carpenter, B. W., & Diem, S. (2013). Talking race: Facilitating critical conversations in educational leadership preparation programs. *Journal of School Leadership*, *23*(6), 902-931. https://doi.org/10.1177/105268461302300601
- Forde, C., & Torrance, D. (2017). Social justice and leadership development. *Professional development in education*, *43*(1), 106-120. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2015.1131733
- Grooms, A. A., White, T., Peters, A. L., Childs, J., Farrell, C., Martinez Jr, E., ... & Duran, S. (2024). Equity as a crucial component of leadership preparation and practice. *The Clearing house: a Journal of educational strategies, issues and ideas, 97*(1), 8-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2023.2286373
- Kemp-Graham, K. Y. (2015). Missed opportunities: Preparing aspiring school leaders for bold social justice school leadership needed for 21st century schools. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, *10*(1), 99-129.
- Leithwood, K. (2021). A review of evidence about equitable school leadership. *Education sciences*, *11*(8), 377. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11080377
- Precey, R., Entrena, M. J. R., & Jackson, C. (2013). Leadership for Inclusion: Professional development of leaders. In *Leadership for inclusive education: Values, vision and voices* (pp. 131-148). Rotterdam: SensePublishers.
- Spikes, D. D. (2018). Culturally competent and racially conscious professional development for school leaders: A review of the literature. *Teachers College Record*, *120*(14), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811812001403

Acknowledgements

The realisation of this impact report and the LEAD-IN project would not have been possible without the dedicated support of the European Union.

We would also like to sincerely thank the school leaders who opened their doors, shared inspiring practices, and generously contributed their practical expertise. Their openness and willingness to share have been invaluable to this project.