**Creating and Maintaining the Effectiveness of Teachers in Scotland**

**PART 1**

***How will the new Standards impact on teacher education? Solutions and suggestions of how to respond***

***Group 1/2***

* The fact that some people will have accomplishment in some areas but will still be working towards it in others.
* Need to spell out clearly what will be expected at different leadership levels. Leadership of adults different from leadership of children/pupils.
* Danger in ‘normalising’ leadership.
* Needs to be a culture of enquiry through all Standards.
* Leadership needs to be right from the beginning.
* Teachers will be confronted with Standards.
* Need to embed PRD process into universities too.
* Point missing about supporting staff (whose responsibility?)
* Obviously Standards will have to be embedded in universities.
* Needs to be harmonisation of assessing standards against new Standards
* Maybe need more on Teaching and Learning (SFR)
* Still don’t have enough about pupil voice in the Standards.
* Needs to be resourced system-wide.
* Need better funding for universities to improve staffing quality.
* Who will validate the authority PRD systems?
* Need a consensus of what Masters level means in practice.
* Variations in degree of Standards – some will have accomplishment in some areas, others working towards, therefore do we need 2 side by side?
* Need to spell out leadership at each stage – thread running through.
* Standards – need different versions? If so need to see the clear continuum, not 3 separate silos.
* Masters level – definition where this appears in each standard.

***Group 3***

* 1 Standard – 2 yr process (PGDE)/5 yr process (Bed) continuation of Standards into first year – happy with this.
* Are the Standards sequential?
* Aspirational – 21st century profession but legislative? Improved PR and D.
* If a teacher has reached SF and not interested in becoming accomplished or lead, what would happen? How could they be encouraged or should they be?
* Does the profession have an expectation for all teachers to become accomplished/lead?
* Culture shift – it’s happening and needs to continue.
* ‘Standard’ or ‘Framework’ for career-long professional learning?
* How do we determine ‘accomplished’ or ‘lead’? Who makes this judgement?
* Changing ethos of CPD? Also professional learning?

***Group 4***

University roles: cultural change

 Evaluative skills SITE

 Professional development to

 Assessment and evidence issues SFR

 Critically reflect Large jump for PGDE/

 1 year course

Institutional vision versus cultural change

E-learning reflective tools

Local authorities

How robust the assessment is between student teachers. Clarification of role of supporting and assessing. Triad discussions useful at a range of levels.

Potential use of peer support

Where Probationers’ Action Plan is truly reflective

Supporter skills – paraphrasing/coaching and collaboration – GTCS – coaching documentation.

Generic issues

* Partnership approach to assessment e.g. agreed final CAS mark. Issues of placement experiences
* Probation supporters know Standard well.
* Need for professional judgement/professional conversations
* Don’t use Standards as a checklist, illustrated features
* The strongest and best source of evidence to pass an aspect
* Focus on self-reflection – regular reflectives – self regulation

***Group 5***

PROFESSIONAL PARTNERSHIP COMMUNICATION – MENTOR, LINE MANAGER, SCHOOL

1. Merging of SITE/SFR not considered a problem – quantifiable? Expectations require clarification (not tick box, but holistic)

Shift – agent of Time to reflect - 5 year entrant and

Change and recipient stocktake 5 year expectation

Change-managing Standards

Change process Compatibility

 Continuity

 Systems

1. Career long professional learning: what is in it for me? Incentive – aspirations

PDR system? Measured against SFR

Increase reflection/ critical etc.

1. Partnership links

Recognition as positive move

Consolidate attitude New entrant

 On-going – end career

MANAGING CHANGE PROCESS – HOLISTIC

NAMED AWARD

***Group 6***

* What sections do SITE sit at and SFR? How will students and probationers show SFR and SITE?
* Developing shared understanding of STs between schools, universities of what the measuring points are in relation to students and probationers
* Exemplification i.e. straplines same but demonstrating at difference level
* CLARITY!
* Suggestion – GTCS: facilitation joint discussion between universities and schools to achieve shared understanding /developments of what constitutes meeting the standard
* Advice for LAs to link SFR – St for career long professional learning via PRD and location of teachers’ profile
* The focus on research, following up positive aspects of research based learning
* Access to research i.e. registration of teachers, block access to ATHENS research via GTCS, one location
* Important – mentoring professional journey through the Standards i.e. mentoring currently through SITE to SFR but not beyond
* Interviews common approach to students selection for ITE to build on current best practice
* Looking at common interviews, set criteria i.e. increase academic profile // social interviews
* GTCS examine entry memorandum i.e. include values, include capacity to reflect and psychometric test
* Advantage of joint evaluation on the Standard for SFR. Joint discussion on where students are on Standard (SITE/ SFR)

**PART 2**

***How the University Review Process can link with Professional Update Process – suggestions for ways forward***

***Amalgamated group responses***

* Not sure how staff review and development at university could allow demo of Professional update in relation to become different methods, criteria for success
* Can one standard be mapped to other?
* Evidencing, keeping relevant skills updated e.g. teaching and learning
* Could universities and LAs identify which areas of Standards their remit allows them to demonstrate?
* Which standard or blend of is relevant to university and LA PRD? i.e. process could be the same. Outcome or measurement would be different
* All staff in ITE need to be GTCS LA and uni staff need 2 PRD experiences relevant to remit or relevant to teaching
* How relevant is registration to the remit roles of uni staff and LA officers
* Different focus
* Edinburgh model teach return teacher or in period of induction Voluntary
* University PRD systems vary so much and are not necessarily compatible with requirements of GTCS registration.
* ‘Live management’ is not always as clear cut in a university where people work in a number of different teams under different leadership.
* Don’t particularly like the idea of active/inactive registration – practising/non-practising... prefer school/non-school based.
* Suggest possibility for tinkering or amendment of the uni Annual review process which directly leads into the GTCS 5 year Professional Update
* More radical? GTCS Update may influence the university annual review
* Tensions – conflict from managing the demands of the Professional body versus QA in preparing students as teachers
* Requirement for uni Professional Review and Development system to be in place with modification to take account of GTCS
* Programmes or staff?
* How do internal processes align?
* It is good that the value of what you are doing and how you are doing it is recognised.
* Corporate or individual validation – submission?
* Reviewers GTCS registered?
* Link HMIE
* Need to understand partners’ roles
1. PETPs – unknown – quality of documentation

Workload for PETPs

Students’ feedback – condensing

Universities – to what extent do tutors get involved? Needs elsewhere

1. Uni – links to what students do next
* No longer in classroom
* ‘Professional’ not ‘ strengths and practice’ update
* tension – removed from classroom but supposedly ‘advisor
* LAs/secondments – back in classroom after 2-3 years
* Feeling of being more knowledgeable about teaching outside the classroom
* Supporters/LAs – realistic targets for term 1 /development needs
* Learning with and from each other
* QA mechanisms – external examiners
* Variation for teacher educators.
* Something in Standards that wouldn’t be relevant and some things we do in ITE/Las that wouldn’t be reflected
* PETP – feeling that perhaps the strengths and development needs could be more focussed
* Provides a focus and first point of self-evaluation process
* Issues of timing – students don’t always have enough knowledge of stages they are entering
* Continued building of uni processes and impact in LA. Possible links between probation year and ITE

University procedures for:

* Appraisal
* Tension re University ‘employer’ requirements, LA credibility diminishes for re-entering schools
* Credibility – do all colleagues in education (teachers/units/LAs) value the roles, knowledge and expertise of these roles?
* Issue of HE staff with a teaching commitment who are not trained/qualified teachers.