



**To teach,
to learn:**

more effective
continuous
professional
development for
teachers

James Kempton

CENTRE:FORUM

To teach, to learn: more effective continuous professional development for teachers

James Kempton

The logo for the Centre for Education Research, featuring the text "CENTRE" in grey and "FORUM" in orange, with a stylized orange arrow pointing from "CENTRE" to "FORUM".

CENTRE FORUM

About the author

James Kempton is an associate director, leading CentreForum's work on social policy. A former council leader, teacher, medical royal college chief executive and management consultant, James has worked extensively on public services reform, with a particular focus on education and social mobility policy. He is chair of Islington Community Theatre, a trustee of Music First, a governor of New North Academy and a fellow of the RSA.

ISBN: 978-1-909274-09-9

Copyright November 2013 CentreForum

All rights reserved

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of CentreForum, except for your own personal and non-commercial use. The moral rights of the author are asserted.

■ Contents

	Executive summary	4
1	Introduction	6
2	Teacher quality and training	8
3	Current teacher CPD provision	12
4	Prioritising the CPD needs of teachers	16
5	Getting CPD right	19
6	Conclusion	28

■ Executive summary

“The quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers and their work”

Andreas Schleicher, OECD¹

The quality of teaching is what matters most to improving the education system. It is therefore astonishing that there is currently no expectation that teachers undertake a structured programme of certified and accredited career long continuous professional development (CPD). Indeed so bad is the situation that it is hard to justify much of the current CPD practice as either ‘continuous’, or ‘professional’ or even ‘developmental’.

This paper argues that the best way to improve the quality of teaching is through teachers making a commitment to enhancing their pedagogical skills, understanding of learning and child development, and subject knowledge within a culture of continuous improvement. The most effective way to achieve this change is to give teachers more responsibility for their CPD.

The first step to making this happen should be for the teaching profession to sign up to the aim of developing its own system of post initial teacher training (ITT) qualifications, CPD obligations and revalidation or recertification processes. A Royal College of Teaching (RCOT) is not essential for this but would be the most obvious body to oversee this process. It follows that each teacher should have an individual CPD plan. Schools would need to satisfy themselves that such a plan existed for each of their employees but would not be expected to approve its contents.

There are a number of sources of support for teachers in understanding their training needs and how best to meet

¹ A Schleicher ‘The quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers, Journal of Teacher Education March/April 2011 vol. 62 no. 2 202-221.

them. These would include RCOT, subject associations and universities. Teaching school alliances and others have an important role and should seek to foster learning communities of teachers across their network of schools. The introduction of specialist school based teaching and learning staff and departments is also worthy of further investigation. Another body with a key role is the Education Endowment Fund (EEF) which, alongside funding and publishing high quality research, could take on the role of supporting teachers in the application of research into classroom practice. To support this new CPD regime, the government should encourage schools to pilot a system where teachers have access to a budget to contribute towards the training costs involved and an allocation of time in which to undertake this training.

Recommendations

1. The teaching profession should sign up to the aim of developing its own system of post initial teacher training qualifications, continuous professional development (CPD) obligations and revalidation or recertification processes.
2. Those developing plans for a Royal College of Teaching should give detailed consideration to the role it could play in professionalising teacher CPD and to how quickly such arrangements could be put in place.
3. Every teacher should be required to have an Individual CPD Plan. Schools would need to satisfy themselves that each member of their teaching staff had a properly drawn up plan but would not be expected to approve it.
4. The remit of the Education Endowment Fund should be extended to include a wide-ranging responsibility for encouraging the evaluation, dissemination and application of research into classroom practice.
5. The government should encourage schools to pilot a system where teachers access a personal budget to fund their CPD costs and an allocation of time in which to undertake it.

1 Introduction

For a government that believes in the importance of teaching² it is strange that the coalition has paid so little attention to the professional development of teachers (CPD).³ This is noteworthy given that we are in the middle of particularly energetic period of education reform, which has seen major changes to what is taught (eg national curriculum reform and reform of approved vocational courses), how it is taught (eg the focus on phonics), how it is examined (eg the reform of GCSE and A level exams), how schools are inspected (eg the changes to the Ofsted inspection framework), how the effectiveness of schools is judged (eg the new primary and secondary school accountability measures), and the reform of teachers pay and conditions. And while the government has significantly changed initial teacher training, Teacher CPD is seemingly unique as an area that has escaped the same spotlight. Where the government has expressed a view, it is that headteachers and schools are best placed to make decisions about teachers' professional development based on the needs of pupils and the school.⁴

It is not that that quality of current teacher CPD has a clean bill of health or that the in-career training of the vast majority of the teaching workforce is not a relevant issue to raising the attainment of all pupils in our schools. Government and education reformers often repeat the mantra "the first, and most important, lesson is that no education system can be better than the quality of its teachers"⁵. But this is too often presented as

2 'The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper', DfE, 2010.

3 The DfE's most recent report into effective CPD was produced for the Training and Development Agency (TDA) as long ago as 2008 (Schools and Continuing Professional Development (CPD) in England – State of the Nation' Research Project (T34718) July 2008.

4 HC Deb 10 July 2013, vol 566, col 296W.

5 D Cameron, N Clegg, 'The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper', DfE, 2013.

simply an imperative to raise the quality of 37,000⁶ new entrants annually to the profession and to deal with the very lowest performing teachers through performance management and capability arrangements.⁷ Both are important, but even taken together the impact of these interventions would be dwarfed by what could be achieved by improving the teaching delivered by 438,000 established teachers in the vast majority of schools' classrooms.⁸

This paper sets out high level proposals for the radical improvement of teacher CPD that would fill this yawning gap in the education reform agenda and make a significant contribution to raising attainment in our schools. Teachers aspire to be part of a culture of lifelong learning and continuous improvement. One of the most important things a teacher can do to improve their teaching is to keep up to date, particularly in fast moving subjects like science and technology. Current CPD arrangements do not do enough to support this, indeed the focus which the school accountability process places on school led priorities often does quite the reverse. There is little indication that the CPD received by teachers is based in evidence of effective learning practices. Indeed so bad is the situation that it is hard to justify much of the current CPD practice as either 'continuous', 'professional' or even 'developmental'.

The answer has to be to place more responsibility on teachers as professionals, for undertaking the professional development they require. In the same way that the education system has been reformed over recent years to give schools high levels of autonomy within which to deliver high standards of pupils' outcomes, so teachers should equally be able to expect high levels of professional autonomy, including over their professional development, in return for delivering a high quality of teaching and learning in the classroom.

6 A Smithers, P Robinson, MD Coughlan, 'The Good Teacher Training Guide 2012' Centre for Education and Employment Research, University of Buckingham, 2012.

7 The Education (School Teachers' Appraisal) (England) Regulations 2012.

8 School workforce in England: November 2011 www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-workforce-in-england-november-2011

■ 2 Teacher quality and training

Teacher quality is important to achieving good pupil outcomes. Summarising the international research on student learning, the OECD concludes that there are three key factors. First, the largest source of variation in student learning is attributable to differences in what students bring to school which are difficult for policy makers to influence – including their abilities and attitudes, and family and community background. Second comes ‘teacher quality’, which is the single most important school variable influencing student achievement. Thirdly and perhaps most contentiously, OECD cites those teacher characteristics that are harder to measure, such as the ability to convey ideas in clear and convincing ways; to create effective learning environments for different types of students; to foster productive teacher-student relationships; to be enthusiastic and creative; and to work effectively with colleagues and parents.⁹

The preeminence given to the impact of teacher quality is backed up by many studies which compare the effectiveness of effective and poorly performing teachers^{10 11 12 13 14}, with the Sutton Trust suggesting that the effects of high-quality teaching are especially significant for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds: over a school year, these pupils gain 1.5 years’ worth of learning with very effective teachers, compared with 0.5 years with poorly performing teachers. In other words, for

9 Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers, OVERVIEW, OECD, 2005.

10 F Whelan ‘Lessons learned: How good policies produce better schools’, F Whelan, 2009

11 Improving the impact of teachers on pupil achievement in the UK – interim findings, Sutton Trust, 2011.

12 SG Rivkin, EA Hanushek, JA Kain ‘Teachers, Schools and Academic Achievement’, in *Econometrica*, Vol 73, No.2, March 2005.

13 D Aaronson, L Barrow W Sander ‘Teachers and student achievement in the Chicago public high schools’, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 25(1), 2007.

14 JE Rockoff ‘The Impact of Individual Teachers on Student Achievement: Evidence from Panel Data.’ *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, 94(2), 2004, 247-252.

poor pupils the difference between a good teacher and a bad teacher is a whole year's learning.¹⁵

Supporting this, the Teacher Development Trust points to research published by the New Zealand Ministry of Education which showed that classes where the teachers had taken part in high-quality professional development were improving twice as fast as those in other classes.¹⁶ Perhaps even more significantly given the priority the DfE gives to narrowing the achievement gap and reducing England's large tail of underachievement the 20% least able pupils improved by four to six times faster than other pupils.¹⁷

One way to ensure there are high quality teachers is by training them properly. Entry to the teaching profession has historically been quite closely regulated though there has been criticism that entry standards have not been particularly exacting.¹⁸ The main route into teaching is through completing initial teacher training (ITT). You can complete ITT through a university degree course (BEd), straight after a degree (Postgraduate Certificate of Education), through school-centred initial teacher training (SCITT) which is a programme for graduates, run by and based in schools, or through employment-based routes (Schools Direct and Teach First). There are approaching some 40,000 recruits to initial teacher training each year, the vast majority of them going into university courses, though this is something the government's reforms are now seeking to change.¹⁹ These routes lead to qualified teacher status (QTS) which is required for all teachers in maintained schools in England, though not in academies and free schools which are free to employ teachers without a specialist teaching qualification if they wish.²⁰

In an attempt to tighten up expectations, the government recently published a new set of eight simplified Teachers' Standards

15 Improving the impact of teachers on pupil achievement in the UK – interim findings, Sutton Trust, 2011.

16 J Parr, H Timperley, P Reddish, R Reddish, r Adams 'Literacy Professional Development Project: Identifying Effective Teaching and Professional Development Practices for Enhanced Student Learning', Report to the Ministry of Education, 2007.

17 P Marshall, 'The Tail: How England's schools fail one child in five – and what can be done about it', CentreForum, 2013.

18 'Training our next generation of outstanding teachers', DfE, 2011.

19 A Smithers, P Robinson, MD Coughlan, 'THE GOOD TEACHER TRAINING GUIDE, Centre for Education and Employment Research, University of Buckingham, 2012.

20 www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/education/article3792648.ece about 5300 in academies, www.theguardian.com/education/2013/mar/10/free-school-head-no-qualification 21 in free schools

following a review carried out by teachers and headteachers led by Dame Sally Coates.^{21 22} These new standards are intended as a baseline of expectations for the practice of teachers from the point of qualification onwards. They were designed to be used by ITT providers to assess when a trainee can be recommended for QTS and can also be used to assess the extent to which newly-qualified teachers have consolidated their training and confirmed their competence at the end of the induction period.

A second way to ensure high quality teachers is through effective continuous professional development.²³ However in terms of CPD, the government's Teaching Standards state that teachers should "take responsibility for improving teaching through appropriate professional development, responding to advice and feedback from colleagues". However, they seem to have limited value because the review group did not attempt to prescribe in detail what 'good' or 'outstanding' teaching should look like, nor did they seek to specify increments in the expectations for how teachers should be performing year on year over the course of their career. Similarly OFSTED has little to say about CPD in its inspection framework referring only to the need to 'ensure that all teaching staff benefit from appropriate professional development and that performance is rigorously managed'.²⁴

Beyond ITT, formal qualifications do not play any significant role in guaranteeing teacher quality. Teaching has nothing like the system of revalidation such as the General Medical Council has recently introduced for doctors²⁵ nor any compulsory requirement to undertake certified CPD as is the case with other professions such as lawyers.²⁶ Since the coalition government decided that the national qualification for headship (NPQH) should cease to be mandatory, the only post ITT teacher qualification that can now be required in mainstream schools is the masters level National Award for Special Educational Needs Co-ordinators (SENCOs).

21 www.gov.uk/government/publications/independent-review-of-teachers-standards-first-report

22 www.gov.uk/government/publications/second-report-of-the-independent-review-of-teachers-standards

23 www.curee.co.uk/files/publication/1260453707/Robinson%20Summary%20Extended%20Version.pdf

24 Ofsted: The Framework for School Inspection 2013 www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/framework-for-school-inspection

25 www.gmc-uk.org/doctors/revalidation.asp

26 www.sra.org.uk/solicitors/cpd/solicitors.page

The absence of any requirement on teachers to certify that their practice remains up to date, coupled with concerns about the quality and value of ITT, and the fact that a specialist teaching qualification is not even mandatory in academies and free schools, raises major questions over the role and effectiveness of current CPD provision in ensuring the quality of teaching during the course of what may be a 40 year or more career in teaching.

■ 3 Current teacher CPD provision

In contrast to the other parts of the education system which tend to be highly regulated and subject to detailed inspection, it is not easy to get a good picture of CPD provision. This is not unique to the English education system. The OECD also points to the scarcity of international data on professional development.²⁷

The coalition government's overall approach to professional development focuses on building the capacity for schools to take the lead in the training and development of teachers and creating more opportunities for peer to peer training. In April 2013 it merged the National College for School Leadership and the Teaching Agency to create a new government agency, the National College for Teaching and Leadership. It has two key aims: improving the quality of the education workforce and helping schools to help each other to improve. It works with schools, particularly the newly designated teaching schools, to develop a 0–18 education system that means teacher and leadership training, continuing professional development and school to school support are delivered locally by partnerships led by the best headteachers. Teaching schools, working within networks of affiliated schools, called teaching school alliances, are intended to play a leading role in supporting other schools and developing peer to peer improvement strategies. They offer a range of professional development opportunities for teachers and support staff that work in schools, for example using data and intelligence to identify the best teachers and leaders to deliver a range of school based continuing professional development (CPD) and leadership development opportunities that meet the needs of the schools within the alliance. While there is a good research base supporting collaborative learning

27 'Teachers' Professional Development, Europe in International Comparison', OECD and EU, 2010.

partnerships, often called joint practice development²⁸, it is far too early to assess this particular approach or draw out best practice. Currently there are already well over 300 teaching school alliances involving some one in eight schools.²⁹ Even if the model proves to be an effective way to deliver teacher CPD, it is likely to be some considerable time before the benefits are available to all 24,000 schools in England.

The most common CPD activity across English schools continues to be the five contractual in-service training (INSET) days. INSET days were introduced by Kenneth Baker in 1988 as part of a series of reforms, including the introduction of the National Curriculum and they are probably the last unreformed element of that major early package of changes. In terms of the time allocation to CPD this would appear to be broadly in line with other jurisdictions. While over half of the countries surveyed by the OECD had no minimum requirement for teachers' participation in professional development, the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) shows that, across a range of countries, almost 90% of teachers participated in some form of professional development.³⁰ The report notes that of those countries where a minimum time requirement for CPD was set³¹, the requirement was most commonly five days a year. However it is possible to point to examples of more demanding requirement: 104 hours a year in Sweden³², in the Chinese province of Shanghai, each teacher is expected to engage in 240 hours of professional development within five years of being hired, while Singapore provides teachers with an entitlement of 100 hours of professional development per year.³³

However INSET days tend to be delivered much more flexibly today (e.g. divided into smaller units or delivered in twilight sessions) than the contractual obligation might imply and free schools and academies can if they wish exercise flexibility in relation to teachers' contractual matters. The way in which

28 Sebba, J., Kent, P., & Tregenza, J. (2012) Joint Practice Development: what does the evidence suggest are effective approaches? Nottingham: National College of School Leadership.

29 HC Deb 25 April 2013, vol 561, col 1211W.

30 'Preparing Teachers and Developing School Leaders for the 21st Century: Lessons from Around the World', OECD, 2012.

31 Australia (some states), Austria, Belgium (French Community), Finland, Hungary, the Netherlands, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States (some states).

32 'Teachers' Professional Development, Europe in International Comparison', OECD and EU, 2010.

33 'Preparing Teachers and Developing School Leaders for the 21st Century: Lessons from Around the World', OECD, 2012.

INSET days are used is entirely a matter for headteachers and it is difficult to obtain a clear picture of how effective they are.

Another way to look at the amount of CPD that is taking place is through how much money is being spent on it. The Children, Schools and Families Committee in its 2010 report on the 'Training of Teachers', struggled with this, not least because schools defined CPD very differently. It reported that spending on CPD by schools accounted for anywhere between 0.25 and 15% of their budgets. If accurate this would amount to a huge variation in the resources schools dedicate to teacher development across the school system. It suggested that a more reliable estimate would be that around 2% or 3% of schools' baseline budgets (equating to between £600 million and £900 million a year) is actually spent on CPD. The DfE (then called the Department for Children, Schools and Families) put the figure at 0.5% or some £180 million.³⁴ It is also worth noting that the actual amount spent directly on CPD training is likely to be lower than the figures provided because they also include the cost of cover staff to free up teachers to attend courses. Notwithstanding these huge disparities in estimated levels of spending, it seems reasonable to conclude that current levels of spending on teacher CPD are modest and that without any significant change in expectations, they are likely to remain so given the increased pressure on school budgets.

In trying to assess the quality of current CPD provision, the Teacher Development Trust paints a depressing picture of how CPD is used in many schools in England.³⁵ It cites a report for the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) report showing that the most common CPD involved sitting and watching a PowerPoint presentation, while the most common reason for selecting a course was simply that 'the teacher wanted to go' rather than any more clearly articulated or assessed need.³⁶

The classic image of teacher CPD is likely to involve a teacher going out of school for a one day course with professionals from other schools. While off site courses can be effective for filling

34 Training of Teachers, Vol. 1, Children, Schools and Families Committee, 2010, www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmchilsch/275/275i.pdf

35 Teacher Development Trust, see Our presentation on the state of CPD in England.

36 D Pedder, Anne Storey, V Darleen Opfer October 2008 'Schools and continuing professional development (CPD) in England' – State of the Nation research project (T34718), Cambridge University and The Open University, 2008.

gaps in knowledge, there are many more effective interventions for changing teaching habits, such as a focus on research informed ideas, observation, joint practice development and collaborative learning, coaching, and social media based learning.

Another TDA report found that barely 1% of training they looked at was effectively transforming classroom practice.³⁷ And the NFER Teacher Voice Omnibus June 2009 Survey indicated that when teachers got back to classrooms only 7% of schools checked to see if there was any effect on student attainment. Worryingly in terms of addressing the needs of individual teachers, the most commonly booked courses tended to be in reaction to external threats and changes focussed largely on the institutional level (e.g. Ofsted inspections, new regulations, changing exam syllabuses). This appears to be replicated internationally with the OECD reporting that among the countries surveyed in 2007, only 30% of teachers felt that their professional development needs had been fully met in the past 12 months while some one in six felt they had not been met at all.³⁸

While there undoubtedly is some excellent practice in teacher CPD, the parlous state of current teacher CPD provision is endorsed by the government which commented: “too little teacher training takes place on the job, and too much professional development involves compliance with bureaucratic initiatives rather than working with other teachers to develop effective practice. Only 25% of teachers report that they are regularly observed in classroom practice and two-thirds of all professional development is ‘passive learning’ – sitting and listening to a presentation”.³⁹ It is beyond the scope of this paper to prescribe a programme or a set of principles around which effective CPD could be developed. However evidence presented here leaves little room to doubt that teacher CPD is an area which is ripe for reform.

37 Evaluation of CPD providers in England 2010-2011: Report for providers.

38 ‘Preparing Teachers and Developing School Leaders for the 21st Century: Lessons from Around the World’, OECD, 2012.

39 The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper, DfE, 2010.

■ 4 Prioritising the CPD needs of teachers

It is surprisingly difficult to find a single definition of teacher CPD, though it is difficult to disagree with the high level definition offered by the General Teaching Council for Scotland:

“CPD is what teachers do to keep their professional practice fresh, up to date and stimulating. We believe that by undertaking a wide range of CPD experiences, teachers are more likely to inspire pupils and teach more effectively, enabling pupils to achieve their best.”⁴⁰

The goal of CPD in any profession is about doing your job better, so it is right to be explicit that the ultimate purpose of teacher CPD is to enable pupils to achieve their best. The Teacher Development Trust has been collating the evidence about the effectiveness of professional development as a means of improving student outcomes and reducing inequality. It takes a very granular approach to effective teacher professional development and learning which must:

- maintain a tight focus on pupil learning needs with ongoing rigorous evaluation of outcomes
- be applicable and relevant to the teacher’s current classes, and contribute toward whole-school development
- be collaborative and teacher driven
- be sustained over a period of at least two terms (and ideally more)
- involve regular external expert input and build on the best existing practices and understanding.

40 GTC for Scotland www.gtcs.org.uk/professional-development/cpd.aspx

This is a helpful definition of what one might expect good CPD provision to look like, but risks driving us into an overly narrow definition of professional development based on immediately presenting pedagogic demands in the classroom rather than long term professional development over what may be a lifetime in teaching.

Looking at examples outside of teaching, the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development is explicit that priority should be given to the needs of the individual, and states that CPD should:

- be continuous - professionals should always be looking for ways to improve performance
- be the responsibility of the individual learner to own and manage
- be driven by the learning needs and development of the individual
- be evaluative rather than descriptive of what has taken place
- be an essential component of professional and personal life, never an optional extra.

Making teacher CPD in the words of the CIPD 'the responsibility of the individual learner to own and manage' is some distance from where we are at present in England. But it is exactly what any profession should aspire for its members.⁴¹ And indeed the Scottish GTC supports this view and qualifies its definition of Teacher CPD by pointing out that *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century*⁴² emphasised that CPD should not only meet the needs of the school but also the needs of the individual teacher.

There is a danger of the content of school led CPD or whole school INSET days being overly management led and disproportionately focussed on the demands of centrally directed reform (like a new national curriculum) or the whole school priorities (which will be set out in the school development plan). CentreForum has been particularly critical, for example, of schools focusing on training and strategies aimed at getting pupils over the C/D

41 CA Madden.VA Mitchell, 'Professions, standards and competence: a survey of continuing education for the professions.' University of Bristol, Department for Continuing Education,1993; C Day 'Developing Teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning.' London:Falmer Press 1999.

42 'A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century: Agreement reached following recommendations made in the McCrone Report', Scottish Parliament, 2001.

borderline so that the school is seen to have performed well against the five A*-C GCSEs (including English and maths) Key Stage 4 accountability measure.⁴³

One of the reasons why this can happen is that CPD is primarily funded directly out of schools' budgets. A second reason is that governments have a tendency to allocate additional funding to their own priorities. This again means that rather than addressing the needs of individual teachers, CPD can become very preoccupied with priorities like rolling out new national policy changes. Current examples of this are the funding to support maths teaching (e.g. the National Centre for Excellence in the Teaching of Mathematics and Further Mathematics Support Programme) and science (Cambridge Physics Project and the Triple Science Support Programme).

Thirdly, when power and resources sit with government and with the headteacher and their senior leadership team, and in the context of schools operating within a high stakes performance culture, it is hard to imagine that teachers are always open with school managers about their own training and development needs or feel they have sufficient autonomy as professionals to set their own professional development agenda to extend their knowledge, interests and skills.

This is a far from ideal position for any professional to find themselves in.

School and system level development needs and priorities impact on pupil achievement and must have a place within any CPD system. However, there is a strong argument that after the completion of qualified teacher status, current practice in teacher CPD under prioritises the needs of individual teachers. Even a reasonable balance between the interactive and complementary priorities of government, school and the individual professional, will require a major shift in policy drivers, accountability measures and resource allocation.

⁴³ C. Paterson, 'Measuring what matters: secondary school accountability indicators that benefit all', 2013, CentreForum.

: 5 Getting CPD right

The propositions underpinning this paper are that: the best way to raise pupil outcomes is to improve the quality of teaching; that the most effective way to do that is through teachers in enhancing and keeping up to date their pedagogical skills, their understanding of learning and child development and their subject knowledge; and that the most beneficial way to achieve that is to give teachers more responsibility for their CPD.

As this paper has made clear, the way CPD system operates at present in state funded schools is at a considerable distance from this approach. The first step to making this happen should be for the teaching profession to sign up to the aim of developing its own system of post ITT qualifications, CPD obligations and revalidation or recertification processes. This approach would not be without its difficulties, but would certainly be preferable to having it designed and imposed by government. A Royal College of Teaching (RCOT) is not essential for this but would be the most obvious body to oversee this process.

It follows from this that each teacher should have an individual CPD plan. Schools would need to satisfy themselves that such a plan existed for each of their employees but would not be expected to approve its contents. There are two further measures which would help to support this new CPD regime: more needs to be done to promote and disseminate more quality research; and teachers should have great control over the resources they need to support their CPD. These ideas are explored in more detail below.

Post ITT qualifications, CPD obligations and revalidation or recertification processes

It is astonishing that currently teachers have no right to have their CPD needs met, nor is there any professional expectation on teachers to undertake certified and accredited career-long CPD. Teaching, of all professions, should surely apply to itself the belief in the importance of learning, and the certification of knowledge and skills. To their credit teachers have been critical of the government's decision to allow academies and free schools to employ people as teachers who do not have a specialist teaching qualification. It is time for the teaching profession to be equally robust over the benefits to pupils of a system of accredited CPD. This would also provide a good way to demonstrate teachers' expertise and skills to parents, schools and government. This could take the form of specifying a particular number of hours that should be devoted to CPD, or it be achieved by identifying a developmental lifelong learning curriculum or qualifying professional standards.

Through a system of chartered teachers and chartered fellowships, the teaching profession could over time develop its own system of higher qualification, CPD and research obligations and revalidation or recertification processes much like the medical profession. Subject associations would have an important role to play in this, with qualifications like the Chartered Geographer (Teacher) and Chartered Physicist providing a useful starting point, alongside the existing College of Teachers' framework of qualifications.⁴⁴

These are complex issues that will require much more detailed consideration than is possible in a paper of this length. However what should not be in doubt is that such moves to professionalise and develop teacher CPD is primarily a matter for teachers themselves not government. The coalition government, like all governments, has prioritised and funded specific CPD activities as noted earlier. While this is perhaps inevitable, the government's role should not be to invest funds in directing or monitoring teachers' CPD. Its primary role is to hold schools and teachers to account for improved pupil outcomes.

44 www.collegeofteachers.ac.uk/accreditation/qualifications-framework-in-progress

The best contribution government can make to teacher CPD would be to give schools and teachers the time and space to concentrate both individually and collaboratively on improving the classroom practice of individual teachers and embed best practice by ensuring a reasonable period of stability following the tsunami of reorganisation and reform that it is currently taking place.

The teaching profession should sign up to the aim of developing its own system of post initial teacher training qualifications, continuous professional development (CPD) obligations and revalidation or recertification processes. (Recommendation 1).

A professional body for teaching

A Royal College of Teaching would be the most obvious body to lead on drawing up a more formal and accredited CPD process. The Prince's Teaching Institute is leading a commission to explore the idea of a new member driven college of teaching, including headteachers, representatives from universities, subject associations, teaching unions, the existing College of Teachers, the Royal College of Surgeons and other education stakeholders. They have published a discussion document and surveyed teachers on a blueprint for a new college.⁴⁵

As well as overseeing and setting standards for a professionally led system of CPD, an RCOT would also provide a strong professional voice for teachers in arguing for the infrastructure to enable this to happen. This might include the right to protected time and access to funding to undertake research and further study; promoting deep subject knowledge alongside understanding of child development and excellent pedagogy, and supporting better high status career progression routes as a practitioner, rather than solely through school and education management. There is also potentially a role for the RCOT over time to address the issue of quality, as well as quantity, of CPD activities that could be accredited. With presently an effectively unregulated market in the provision of courses, this would be a major undertaking.

45 www.princes-ti.org.uk/CollegeofTeaching/

While there is clearly widespread support for and growing momentum behind the idea of a Royal College of Teaching, as things stand it will be some time before it emerges and potentially longer before it can start to play a significant role in CPD. And there are many organisational, cultural and legal barriers still to be overcome, but the real challenge remains likely to be that of convincing teachers at the chalk face that it will actually make a difference.

There are strong reasons why setting up an RCOT should not be a government initiative. Indeed government, apparently learning the lessons from the failure of the General Teaching Council, has rightly been at pains to make it clear that this is solely a matter for the profession. But that is not to say the government could not play a more facilitative role in encouraging those working for a RCOT by offering discussions on ceding certain professional matters (such as the definition of professional standards) from the DfE to the RCOT, and even offering arm's length financial support, such as the very significant endowment it gave to support the creation of the EEF.

Those developing plans for a Royal College of Teaching should give detailed consideration to the role it could play in professionalising teachers CPD and to how quickly such arrangements could be put in place. (Recommendation 2).

Developing individual CPD plans

Helping to support teachers in understanding their training needs and how best to meet them would at one time have been seen as a core role for the local education authority. While some councils continue to offer support of this kind, most no longer retain the infrastructure to do so. In the current circumstances this is more likely to be regarded as a matter for schools and school federations, along with academy chains, subject associations, teacher unions, universities, as well as the RCOT if and when it is established.

One way to support CPD would be for each teacher to have an individual CPD plan which would be reviewed at least annually. This should be both an entitlement and a professional obligation. Based around specified professional standards, this

could set out particular personal classroom challenges; whole school and school development plan priorities set by the school leadership; and areas where the teacher wished to develop their professional practice. As well as identifying these needs, it should set out how the teacher planned to address them. The individual plan would need to embrace opportunities for working collaboratively with other colleagues, which as indicated earlier can be a highly effective CPD intervention. To facilitate such a scheme, schools would need to satisfy themselves that a proper plan existed for each of their employees. Schools could have some role in drawing it up or could commission support arrangements from others, but they should not be expected to approve the content of each plan. The effectiveness of these arrangements is something which could be reviewed by Ofsted as part of the normal school inspection process.

Schools as employers have a responsibility to ensure that their staff are trained and developed to meet the requirements of the job they are employed to do, but the way in which they support teacher CPD is a sensitive matter. The government has rightly highlighted the role for school leadership in addressing underperformance through revised performance management arrangements and the reform of pay progression. But it is important to recognise that teachers will be reluctant to accept help in identifying their CPD needs from headteachers and/or school leaders if the process is perceived to be linked in any way to a punitive or disciplinary action.

Therefore, in terms of CPD, the headteacher and senior leadership team could support this best by putting in place arm's length arrangements to help teachers to understand their CPD needs and to support them in realising their potential to be even better teachers.

One option for further consideration is the model of schools (or indeed teaching school alliances, or groups or federations of schools) employing in-school CPD specialists or CPD coordinator, perhaps an RCOT accredited position, whose role is to help to help teachers identify their training needs and the best way to meet them, including brokering CPD and developmental links with other teachers. And they could certify that these plans had been conscientiously and appropriately drawn up by the teacher. This option would also help to separate the line

(summative) management role for quality and school level CPD priorities held by the headteacher and senior leadership team from the identification of (formative) developmental needs of individual teachers.

The infrastructure offered by teaching school alliances is also likely to be better placed to offer teacher independent advice on developing individual CPD plans than school management. They can also help to facilitate collaborative learning and peer to peer improvement strategies across schools, perhaps focused around creating learning communities of teachers within the alliance alongside their more explicit remit of being a learning community of schools.

Every teacher should be required to have an Individual CPD Plan. Schools would need to satisfy themselves that each member of their teaching staff had a properly drawn up plan but would not be expected to approve it. (Recommendation 3).

Harnessing research

Education has long needed a body like NICE, the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. NICE guidance supports healthcare professionals with independent, authoritative and evidence based guidance on the most effective ways to prevent, diagnose and treat disease and ill health, reducing inequalities and variation.⁴⁶

Internationally there appears to be a growing interest in both increasing education research and also in applying research to the classroom. But in England, as elsewhere, the current capacity in the education system to do this is weak.^{47 48} The government initiative which has the most potential to be a game changer in relation to CPD is the investment of £125 million in setting up the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF), an independent grant making charity dedicated to breaking the link between family income and educational achievement. The EEF identifies and evaluates promising educational innovations that address

46 www.nice.org.uk/

47 Levin, B, 'To know is not enough: research knowledge and its use', Review of Education, vol.1 no.1, February 2013.

48 Mulgan, G and Puttick, R, Making evidence useful: the case for new institutions, Nesta and ESRC, 2013.

the needs of disadvantaged children in primary and secondary schools in England, with a particular focus on what can be made to work at scale. The EEF's remit also includes encouraging schools and others to apply evidence and adopt innovations found to be effective in addressing the needs of disadvantaged children

The EEF is beginning to sponsor interesting research and practice (such as supporting Edge Hill University to train primary school teachers in Lesson Study or the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust to provide training in TEEP, the Teacher Effectiveness Enhancement Programme) and to publish useful research (including the Teaching and Learning Toolkit, a meta analysis of some 6500 intervention effectiveness studies). The ambition behind the EEF is laudable and its focus around disadvantaged children reflects an important government priority. It is however still finding its feet as an organisation.

Sharing best practice and research between researchers and schools is a challenge. Continual, rather than occasional or one-off exposure to research has the most impact. But despite the potential impact of the EEF, there still remains an issue over informing teachers about education research more generally (and not just in relation to disadvantaged pupils) and over helping them to apply research findings in the classroom in relation to the education of all pupils. Effective measures to promote and disseminate quality research are also potentially one of the ways to counteract the dangers of having such an unregulated market in the provision of CPD courses.

The idea of something like a 'NICE' for education, provisionally called the Office for Educational Improvement, is currently being floated by the Labour Party.⁴⁹ There would certainly be merit in exploring this further once detailed proposals become available. But in the shorter term, one way to meet this need would be to maintain the focus of the EEF's research sponsorship role on disadvantage, but to extend its evaluation and dissemination roles to all relevant education research. This would enable the EEF to produce frequent reviews of practice so that for example teachers had easier access to the latest practice.

49 www.labour.org.uk/evidence-not-dogma-way-to-raise-education-standards,2012-02-21

The remit of the Education Endowment Fund should be extended to include a wide-ranging responsibility for encouraging the evaluation, dissemination and application of research into classroom practice. (Recommendation 4)

Funding CPD

There are currently a lot of factors in the ways schools are organised that make it difficult for teachers to gain a significant voice in setting their personal professional and pedagogical priorities: high stakes assessment of school performance; headteachers holding the budget for teacher CPD; the organisation of CPD around whole school INSET days.

Giving the teaching profession as a whole the opportunity to set expectations for CPD, and enabling individual teachers to clearly own their personal CPD challenges, would be decisive moves in promoting the professionalism of teachers. But potentially the final piece of the jigsaw would be to devolve to teachers the resources to meet those needs. This would have to include a personal budget allocation of both funds and time. In simple terms, teachers could be given a notional budget allocation from their school's overall CPD budget to fund their CPD costs. However given the lack of certainty over (and probable wide variation in) what is currently being spent, there may be an advantage in specifying a target allocation. And in terms of time, a significant proportion of the contracted hours represented by five INSET days should be made available to teachers to use to undertake their Individual CPD Plan. Teachers could also if they wished consider undertaking CPD activities in preparation, planning and assessment (PPA) time and outside contracted hours.

This would represent a major vote of confidence in the teaching profession and could play a major role in kick-starting the profession adopting the post ITT qualifications, CPD obligations and revalidation or recertification processes set out above in Recommendation 1. However this would be a bold move and it would have significant operational and implementation challenges. For that reason the logical next step would be to pilot this approach.

The government should encourage schools to pilot a system where teachers access a personal budget to fund their CPD costs and an allocation of time in which to undertake it. (Recommendation 5).

■ 6 Conclusion

This paper has explored the central role that effective CPD should play in ensuring high quality teaching in England's schools. Faced with concern about current CPD activities and the absence of any formal structured programme of certified and accredited career long continuous professional development, it has argued for teachers to take more responsibility for their CPD.

There is a huge opportunity here for a Royal College of Teaching to lead the development of the teaching profession's own system of post ITT qualifications, CPD obligations and revalidation or recertification processes. This would be based around an individual CPD plan for every teacher, with schools, subject associations, universities, EEF and teaching school alliances having a role to play in supporting this process. This new CPD regime should be supported by government encouraging schools to pilot a system where teachers have access to a budget to contribute towards the training costs involved and an allocation of time in which to undertake this training.

When effective teacher CPD can achieve so much in improving the outcomes of pupils, it is strange that it has received so little attention in recent years. It is time for the teaching profession to put teacher CPD under the spotlight.