Making Sense of Masters 2

How things looked in 2003

Looking back from 2010 at this paper of 2003 I see that I have used the word 'fragile' and others like it to describe the condition of the masters degree in education. I think I was wise to do so. Nevertheless, at the time there were lots of reasons to feel optimistic: to hope that politicians who continually applied the phrase 'evidence based' to their own policies would take some notice of the masses of evidence for the benefits of masters degrees for teachers. This evidence has done nothing but accumulate since I wrote the paper; unfortunately, the propensity of politicians to seek the simplistic means that they ask only for evidence that targets have been set, aimed at and hit.

I used this paper deliberately to further my agenda which was and remains to somehow squeeze critically examined professional views past a rapidly closing policy-making door. To this end I disseminated it at a National College for School Leadership conference devoted to 'The Future'; at an annual conference of the International Professional Development Association (ipda); in a modified form at the annual conference of the British Educational Research Association (BERA); at a seminar in Israel; and to newly appointed directors of CPD in education at UK universities. My evidence base for its impact can be no more than anecdotal but I was pleased by the responses.

If you are in the business of devising, providing and participating in M-level programmes for teachers you may have exceeded by far my seven year old vision. I hope you have. If, however, you are involved in, for example, the masters degree in teaching and learning (MTL) you may think that what follows sets it to some extent in relief.

The Abstract was written some time after the paper and may help you to decide whether or not to read further. After all, much has happened since 2003. Unfortunately, however, much that could have happened has not.

ABSTRACT

The Future of Masters in Education

This paper was commissioned by ESCalate as a thought piece. Reading the paper now I see it partly as an emotional diary written by someone who has spent the period of its composition closely involved in attempts to convince power brokers that masters level CPD provision is worthwhile. Worthwhile, not simply because it helps teachers and related professionals more closely approach the targets set by government and its agents but because it has the capacity to transform professional life: to support teachers in defining, questioning and testing the values to which they might wish to work.

Two pictures of accredited CPD seem to be emerging from a set of confusing, contradictory and sometimes chaotic government policies. One is the picture of masters provision as a part of the entitlement of every teacher and related professional. I see possibilities of this being delivered in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. In England however, despite growing discernable agreement by representatives of unions, HE, inspectors, civil servants, LEAs and the GTCE etc., the chances that this entitlement will be delivered are fragile. The paper explores some of the reasons for this.

The other picture is somewhat elitist. It sees the few teachers and related professionals who have gained masters degrees as catalysts and change agents. This view is expressed by Soulsby and Swain (2003) in their Report on The Award Bearing Inset Scheme. It is a view that makes a virtue of necessity because there is so little money to go round and the unit of resource so low that some HEIs are unwilling to bid.

After a review of some of the effects of the ebb and flow of government policy the paper outlines nine component parts for successful operation of a CPD in Education enterprise in HE. I am not dogmatic about this and I do not for one moment expect that any of us engaged in this work will ever achieve nine good passes.

There are a number of annexes. They include a draft document designed to generate discussion about the kind of principles that might underpin CPD partnerships and consortia; a model of the kind of programme that might fit in with such principles; the UCET principles governing assessment of portfolio evidence at masters level (arising from an ESCalate funded initiative); the UCET bridging assignment linking NPQH and masters; and a report on a meeting with David Miliband. All of the annexed documents have been or are the subject of discussion by UCET.

The literature referred to in the paper includes some that might not be thought to be in the academic box.

Cliff Jones

The Future of Masters in

Education

Cliff Jones

August 2003

Table of Contents

Introduction

This paper was commissioned as a thought piece. As I see it this gives me freedom to write a paper that pretends to be neither exhaustive nor definitive and to call upon an additional literature outside the normal academic box. I write from my own perspective, relying very much upon my own experience, but I hope that this provides something that can be of value to others. As I mostly work in England it should not be surprising that I am very much concerned with that particular national context and that I naturally exemplify much of what I say by reference to it. Nevertheless, I also work with colleagues from the other countries of the UK and sit on various committees that have a UK wide remit and I work overseas. I hope, therefore, that what I have written touches on concerns and interests that we can all share. And, as a hostage to fortune and a contribution to discussion, I have taken the opportunity to offer some principles for partnership or consortia work in this field **(see Annex One)** and a model of masters provision designed with some diffidence to work within what I perceive to be the future environment of education **(see Annex Two)**. On page 14 I also set out what experience tells me are some of the key components for successful work in this field and some key questions for HE Directors of CPD in Education to ask of themselves.

I am now very much convinced that, without sacrificing any of the values espoused, advocated and continuously tested by HE, the masters degree for the education profession of the future can and must be assembled from, and to a degree legitimated by, the combined efforts and shared values of a wide and assorted number of stakeholders. It will consist of a wide variety of styles of teaching, learning and assessment, including the innovative and the traditional set of essays plus dissertation. I am also convinced that, despite the possibility of an exciting future, those of us in HE who remain committed to this component of the educational enterprise deceive ourselves if we think that we have a guaranteed, problem free future. This appears to be especially the case in England but possibly less so in the other countries of the UK.

The gestation period for this paper has included serious uncertainty about the future and towards its end I find that I have made reference to the ebb and flow of events during that time. This, perhaps, explains the paper's imperfect cohesion. Furthermore, my relatively close involvement in making a case for the continued funding of accredited CPD at masters level for teachers and related professionals gave rise to disquieting personal doubts about its viability. Despite strong evidence that many key players have become convinced of the value that is added to the teaching profession by the masters degree, it has, I believe, a fragile grip on life. There must be a considerable effort to influence school cultures if the entitlement of teachers and related professionals to accredited CPD is ever to be accepted as the norm. And, even more worryingly, the case for the survival of anything so beset by bidding regimes, inspection schedules, energy sapping partnerships and a

low unit of resource is not easy to make to HEIs that are obsessed with the achievement of, preferably simultaneously, high research scores and high income.

Background

I started to think about and plan this thought piece just before I went to Israel last year. The University of Liverpool, where I work, has, since1996, registered approximately eight hundred masters degree students in Israel. Most of them are teachers or members of related professions; and they represent a wide variety of religious, secular, ethnic, political, geographical and cultural backgrounds and opinions. They have in common, however, a strong impetus to succeed as professionals. A masters degree is not only seen to confer intrinsic professional value, it brings with it extra increments[1] and a better pension and it is often supported by a sabbatical lasting a whole year. We have had a very small number of dropouts and I like to think that, from a variety of motives, the students and Israeli colleagues with whom we work have created a professional and academic community that crosses all sorts of boundaries, weak though the life support system of such a community often is.

The professional context for Israeli teachers is subject to governmental interference but it has not, as yet, suffered from a rash of testing, target setting and inspection. It is possible, therefore, to undertake masters level work without constant reference to centrally imposed priorities; and for me one of the benefits of working in these two countries has been the opportunity to try out new ideas in contrasting contexts. Whenever I go there it occurs to me that I travel thousands of miles to work in a country that has, in effect, implemented the James Report while retaining a degree of professional autonomy that teachers in England in particular have surrendered to central imposition. In other words, the high value ascribed to a masters degree for professionals working in education is, there, relatively unchallenged and the professional context relatively free from sterile target setting.

At home I was leaving behind a considerable degree of uncertainty about postgraduate CPD awards; that is to say, those awards that generally fit into what we usually call M level and use to accredit the work of teachers: post graduate certificate, post graduate diploma and full masters. This uncertainty developed partly because the message from government was that, notwithstanding all the evidence available that HE was offering a product that met teachers' needs and was high quality in terms of both provision and systems, they were still unsure of the impact of this product in terms of its contribution to long-term school improvement.

Despite the contestable nature of a concept such as long-term school improvement and a consequent degree of unwillingness to accept what appeared to be a competence, compliance and target based CPD culture[2], those HEIs that had taken part in the two year long HMI/Ofsted inspection of TTA/DfES funded masters level provision in England had felt vindicated by the publication of the inspection report[3]. We felt that we had done more than

was expected of us and so it was a shock to discover from a representative of government, at the UCET National Conference of 2001[4], that uncertainty about the impact of our provision had yet to evaporate. My feeling is that, although HE can win arguments about the value that masters level work can bring to the education business, we need to remember that key decision makers, to whom we may not have easy access, often have perceptions about us that are quite different. We sometimes invest our energies in convincing the converted rather than the more senior members of, or advisers to, government. There is now a growing community of stakeholders, including teacher unions, teacher councils, private companies, LEAs, agencies and HEIs that are beginning to work together to construct some coherence for CPD. However, a single decision by government, such as the removal of earmarking of funds, can impose great stress upon such a construct.

We who work in England have, as a result of this uncertainty, been made to engage in another inspection as part of a general review of how accredited CPD for teachers should be funded[5]. This time we were assured that individual institutions were not to be graded and, in fact, the process went through a name change: rather than an inspection it became a survey. Nevertheless, there was a widespread feeling that the sector itself was being inspected. Along with the survey came visits of one kind and another to speak to providers and former participants. Questionnaires were distributed to participants and providers and two day conferences, organised by UCET and funded by the DfES, were devoted to impact[6]. My personal reaction to this might not be untypical. I felt a heightened sense of anxiety. It seemed to me that no matter what HE did it would be deemed to be insufficient.

Impact, the leit motif of modern day CPD, is a fascinating concept and it had occupied my thinking for some time. Liverpool's first bid to the TTA for the funding of masters provision had included a well-received proposal for a project that would examine the impact of accredited masters level CPD on long-term school improvement. In other words, we obtained funding to research the impact of what we were funded to do. The story of the demise of this project illustrates another kind of impact: the pressure upon infrastructure and the erosive competition between priorities[7].

Positive outcomes from the engagement of HE with government imperatives

There is no doubt in my mind that, nevertheless, progress has been made in accredited masters level CPD because of participation in this bidding and inspection process. For example, UCET has devised common approaches to needs analysis and to the assessment of professional portfolios **(see Annex Three)**. It has also established a means of bridging masters level work with the National Professional Qualification for Headship **(see Annex Four)**. And one example of really useful progress that has been made is general understanding that the concept of impact is rich with meaning.

It is unusual today to hear anybody who is engaged in this business talk or write about impact as though it consisted solely of short term and easily identifiable and easily measured indicators of, for example, improved pupil

performance. The Report on The Award Bearing Inset Scheme that was commissioned by the DfES and published in May 2003 (Soulsby and Swain, 2003)[8] even accepts that evidence for impact can be both problematic and intangible. As a result I now feel much more confident that the values generally espoused by HE are widely accepted. I mean, in other words, that, largely because of this report, it now feels safer to challenge participants on our programmes to interrogate all aspects of professional development, including those aspects for which the evidence may be problematic but represent significant development as opposed to those aspects for which the evidence may be unassailable but represent development of little significance. I had not felt safe to engage with students on this basis during the two-year inspection.

I now feel more able to tell participants in masters programmes that we in HE are not simply purveyors of best practice but that we are interested in what can be learned from perceptions of both professional success and professional failure. For me it is crucial that HE convinces policy makers and inspectors that masters level qualifications help build the confidence of professionals to the point where they feel able to try something new, cock it up, reflect on it and transform it into a valuable new way of working or thinking. I stress this point because HE is, I believe, good at making sense of the contestable, the uncertain and the problematic; and if policy or practice of any kind is to be worthwhile its proponents have to be willing to be challenged. The teacher of the future is, I hope, unlikely to face a straight choice between a diet of undiluted, critically minded scholarship or force-fed National Standards. Major stakeholders can now see the benefits of combining approaches. And I do not think that we should remain diffident about asserting the value that HE contributes.

The UCET CPD Committee discussed the meaning of impact on a number of occasions during 2002-3. It was, I think, a somewhat bothersome concept to begin with. In one sense the business of exploring the concept of impact might be exciting and close to the professional sense making purpose of an academic. In another sense it could be the concept that kills: the means of measuring what is easy to measure and excluding the problematic and the challenging. It looks now, however, as though we are released from constraint and shall be allowed to bring more creativity to our exploration of the concept and, furthermore, to do so in collaboration with colleagues and partners who represent other stakeholders. So, one of my purposes in attempting this piece of writing is to try to make sense of at least part of the professional world that I inhabit and to generate some ideas that might be useful in what I see as the emerging educational environment.

Perspectives from literature

It will be useful at this point to say something about the kind of reading I have been engaged in while writing this piece. At the end I have listed, in among the notes, the sources that I have used directly and those that I believe have had an indirect impact upon my writing. I normally encourage students to

make use of three perspectives and, therefore, to include three kinds of literature. The first is the official and regulatory kind of literature. For the purposes of this piece that has included bidding and inspection regimes and a variety of documentation emanating from government or its agents. The second is the academic and theoretical literature. Here I have chosen, in addition to some expected sources, to make use of a variety of works relating to political decision and policy making. The third kind of literature I usually refer to as the personal or practical, professional literature which, for a teacher, will probably be composed of school policy documents and, possibly, schemes of work. For the purposes of this paper I guess that this third kind includes the literature emerging from bodies such as the Teaching Councils, LEAs and UCET as well as various innovative programmes being developed by HEIs throughout the UK. I usually argue that it is the blend of these three kinds of literature that makes up the literature with which a professional should engage.

I have, however, also been reading some off the wall literature. This ranges from *No Logo* by Naomi Klein (2001) and *The McDonaldisation of Society* by George Ritzer (1996) to *Whatever Happened to the British Motorcycle Industry* by Bert Hopwood (1984). Wherever possible I have provided a short account of what I believe to be the relevance of this literature. Sometimes, however, it may be that the best I can say is that it might help the reader's sense making processes to know by what other literature I may have been influenced. And, as is always likely when writing a "thought piece", literature has emerged during writing that I wish I had been aware of at the outset.

Policy making

We are often confused by governmental decision making because we expect it to work in the manner of a textbook[9]. It never has done, of course, but there have been some interesting changes of late. In particular, there has been a degree of privatisation of policy making. A big surprise for me last year was to be told that the DfES was putting out to tender the construction of terms of reference for one of its own working parties on CPD accreditation in education. In other words, it was prepared to pay someone outside government to tell it what it felt it needed to know and what its values should be. When I got to the first meeting of the working party in the DfES it was to discover that a private company was in the chair, having carried out what seemed to me a survey based upon an inadequate knowledge of the experience and expertise of stakeholders. And this process was intended to lead to the formulation and implementation of policy.

It has, furthermore, always been the case that the clearly laid down processes and procedures of government could be short-circuited when those in supreme authority wished[10]. Policy groups and think tanks are thought to be useful by politicians because they can be the source of independent advice that can counterbalance perceived cosy relationships between ministries and interest or pressure groups. They do, however, cause confusion when they contradict carefully crafted consensus. What has happened to the National

CPD Strategy[11] is an example of this. Here was the initiative that would gather together and make sense of all initiatives; and so BPRS and sabbaticals and Early Professional Development (EPD) etc. could be given meaning because all key stakeholders were brought together to help move the Strategy forward. Now, direct from Downing Street, comes the decision to remove ring fencing and simply give most of CPD monies to schools in England to decide how they should be disbursed. In this kind of world the role of the members of the stakeholder culture changes from being joint constructors of policy to being reactors to policy. And when government behaves in this way I am reminded of all those managers who confuse communication with consultation.

The emerging environment, markets in which we operate, how we engage with them and some historical perspective

For those of us who are engaged in the education business in HE a masters degree is seldom the sort of qualification acquired by bright twenty one year olds who have recently impressed their tutors and look as though they have the potential to become colleagues who will, in due course, obtain doctorates and become fully fledged, campus based, members of the academic community. For us the masters degree is mostly a degree for *related* not fellow professionals. The terms and conditions of the vocation followed by these professionals have not been set by Higher Education. They are not even set by the professionals themselves. They have been set by government, sometimes using agencies, sometimes using private businesses and sometimes by direct fiat. The teacher unions and associations and the General Teaching Councils have been very much on-lookers in this process, as has HE. But this, I think, is changing, particularly outside England.

It might be useful, though, to remind ourselves of how the stages of apprentice, journeyman, master and full guild member used to fit together to make a complete professional; also to remember the notion of novice and cleric. We can, I think, root the definition of masters in ideas of induction to and graded membership of a caste, order or guild or community or society. To be a master implies a certain exclusivity. It also enables or even licenses a holder of this membership to speak or to act with some authority. Although this definition of a masters degree may appear to have a more vocational than academic slant to it, and might seem strange in a mainstream university department, what really is the difference? Whether academic or vocational it is still about induction to a higher grade of professionalism.

The difference is that, as yet, standards for teachers and related professionals mostly emerge from government or government agencies in the form of competence statements, targets, priorities and pay scales. The on-lookers referred to above are only just beginning to take initiatives that may establish frameworks for collaborative articulation of professional need and professional impact. It is part of my intention in this paper to generate some ideas that might help HE to contribute to the articulation of professional need and professional impact and to push forward the possible contribution that masters in education might make towards a partially self-defining profession.

So I guess that I am saying that the education masters degree of the future will not be defined by Bologna[12] and it will not be defined by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA). It will be informed by both of them but it will be constructed by the shifting and uncertain alliances that are emerging from years of government intervention in education and by years of response from institutions (LEAs, HEIs, teacher unions, agencies, inspectorates, teaching councils, schools etc.) trying to humanise what they have had to do while protecting and promoting what they wanted to do; and by recognition that we can build value together while separately we shall only build disappointment. The alliances appear stronger in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales which may be due to an emerging effect of devolution: that government dogma is most urgently pursued and imposed in England.

The educational environment continues to change, not necessarily at a faster rate than before but almost certainly at a rate faster than some systems and customs can accommodate. It tends to change because of explicit external pressures. The pressures are not, however, consistent or coherent. They express themselves in the form of national priorities, expectations and targets that alter and in the form of initiatives that sometimes evaporate just as providers and participants have learned how to make them effective. It seems quite ironic that Best Practice Research Scholarships (BPRS) in England should have been complained about as yet another initiative that contributed to an overall professional fatigue but that, at the point when HE and schools were learning how to embed these scholarships, they should be abolished. Part of the problem is administrative. We have to learn how to fill in application forms that have been devised by people who seem to have but little idea how an initiative might work. Another aspect of the problem is that we are called upon to construct imaginative means of linking sets of initiatives. If we do not make these links we will expend too much energy chasing fragments of CPD.

Given these pressures it would seem sensible for HE to tackle the problem of the scarce and ageing human resources upon which they depend (people like me) by trying to achieve a degree of coherence and cost effectiveness across ITT, CPD and research **(see Annex Three)**. Unfortunately there are differing bureaucracies and imperatives involved and, instead of working towards coherence, institutions usually concentrate upon the area that they perceive to be the most important and under a continuing threat. That is usually ITT. The threat is constant inspection. Quality is equated with uniformity and compliance. And if we do not comply with the rules of the ITT game we lose our right to participate more than peripherally in the educational enterprise. Dropping ITT from our portfolios might simplify our lives and provide relief from constant stress but the validity of any claim to full engagement in the process of building and supporting the educational professional will not be established.

Craziness, confusion and change in (mostly) England

In a very real and growing sense we in CPD have found ourselves chasing after models generated by the various General Teaching Councils of the UK, the National Union of Teachers, the National College of School Leadership et al; let alone Beacons, Excellence in Cities, LEAs etc and initiatives that seemed at one time to pour from the DfES faster than the educational digestive system could cope.

For some time my reaction to this was that it was a craziness that generated well-intentioned confusion; and that confusion equalled high cost and poor performance. You may remember the phrase "initiative fatigue". However, having spent so much time and energy responding to and making sense of initiatives as described above our new task appears to be to formulate an effective response to No. 10's current belief that simply transferring money to schools will do the job. We are not alone. I cannot believe that civil servants and advisers who have invested time, energy, reputation and personal professional commitment to an initiative such as BPRS can be happy to see it vanish on the point of fulfilment. Still, we have the ability to delude ourselves that the disappearance of something valuable represents a subtle form of dissemination. Disappearance of an initiative does not automatically equate to embedding. But the wish to maintain some kind of professional sanity may involve a degree of delusion. So we constantly pick ourselves up and get ready to respond to the next policy change convinced that our successive responses to a series of initiatives represents some kind of progress.

Another reason for change, one with which we may be more comfortable, is the pressure from within. This may be less noticeable today because we have become accustomed to respond to external pressures and, indeed, to describe what we do by employing the dialect of government agencies. But merely doing the job of teaching, organising learning and engaging with participants in the professional learning process and colleagues in other institutions generates new knowledge and altered understanding. The pedagogical facts of life change; and so does academic dialogue. Having written assessment criteria and performance descriptors, and much guidance to accompany them, I find that students can always show me new meanings in new contexts for my own work. This should surprise no one who has been a schoolteacher. It is a basic tenet for many teachers that nothing is proof against the disposition of children to generate valid reinterpretations of facts previously thought to be unassailable.

One reason why I continually argue that feedback against assessment criteria should be in the form of a dialogue is because I believe that making sense of learning has to be collaborative: that the student/participant should be helped by the tutor to take part in the process. Unfortunately, examination systems are also summative and judgemental. And the decision of so many HEIs to adopt unalterable number based systems of assessment so that, for example, 70% shall always be the mark needed for a distinction and, therefore, unaffected by changeable items such as the assignment or the teaching or the context for the carrying out of the assignment, illustrates for me how uniformity can masquerade as quality. Learning outcomes may head the same way. Rather than representing a draft of what might happen as a result

of a learning experience they have the potential to become sticks with which to beat those students (and tutors) who depart from them in any way.

The kinds of things that motivate us from within might also derive from a belief in the idea that initial teacher education/training, research and continuing professional development can be mutually supportive: that something constructive should come out of the interaction between these components of the Venn diagram. Teachers proceeding from ITT to accredited CPD can learn, we may hope, to use academic literature to open up professional practice to scrutiny. Likewise, they can learn to use a growing understanding of professional practice to challenge and contribute to the literature.

I have recently been very encouraged by taking part in discussion within the DfES in which the benefits of blending ITT, CPD and research are fully recognised by teacher unions, the TTA, the GTC(E) and others. That is not to say that we will see useful action on this front in the near future. But if belief precedes policy then we may have made progress here. To go further, however, involves extending the belief to the key shapers of policy.

Almost every schoolteacher, college lecturer and para-professional in the UK can either reach or be reached by an HEI. In most urban settings an HEI is within travelling distance for students and where that is problematic there are partnership models that allow for tutors to visit schools, LEAs and various forms of clustered schools. And, beyond that, on-line and other forms of distance learning mean that whatever the shape, nature or size of the market it can be reached. We may, however, question whether or not it should be reached to that extent. This is the issue of volunteer versus conscript and it connects to the concept of entitlement. When, we may ask, teachers become conscripted to accredited CPD should "entitlement" be the appropriate word to describe the process? Kenneth Baker, I remember, told us that the National Curriculum was an entitlement for all children. Teachers, and I am sure many children, felt more like conscripts than enthusiastic volunteers at the start of the National Curriculum.

The number of support staff in education in England is scheduled to increase by 50,000 in the next two years (there are 420,000 teachers and, before the planned increase, 200,000 support staff according to the DfES)[13]. There are, therefore, good reasons for seeing masters provision operating within a wider context than hitherto. Imagine a school devoted to CPD for all. It makes sense to have coherent approaches that involve different, though related, professionals. Systems of accreditation that interlock to form barriers between related professions instead of to facilitate cross fertilisation will not, I think, be tolerated.

In every country in the UK the Teaching Councils, the Teacher Associations (unions), the National College for School Leadership (or equivalent), private companies operating in education, the Teacher Training Agency and the Local Education Authorities are convinced that HE is an essential partner for CPD; and I guess that the DfES is also convinced of the value that HE brings to CPD. And the Report on the Award Bearing Inset Scheme (see [8]) provides

very powerful arguments and evidence to support this. It may be focussed upon England but HE throughout the UK could find reading it to be a great comfort.

The argument is, however, still heard that Higher Education should simply recognise and acknowledge the ordinary work of teachers as worthy of accreditation. I am very much aware that LEAs, bearing as they do considerable responsibilities without the power to exercise sanctions, may be unwilling to over ride pressure from schools to go easy on theory and assessment. If I am right we shall have some interesting struggles as we try to agree upon how we might enter into CPD partnerships.

Different countries, different approaches

It is interesting to examine and compare the public statements of intent made by the GTCs for Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and England. They would probably all subscribe to the GTCNI's statement on its website[14] that the teaching profession should be "…on a par with other professions such as doctors, accountants and solicitors". All GTCs have adopted professionalism as a theme. And they have each identified CPD as a key factor in achieving the desired level of professionalism. This plays to central and local government concerns about recruitment and retention because the outcome should be an enhancement of public and self-image. It also comes at a time when the varying roles of professionals and para professionals are undergoing re-definition. And this construction of new understanding of what it means to work in a school will, the GTCs hope, be undertaken collaboratively, with teachers speaking with authority via their respective General Teaching Councils.

Another area of agreement between the GTCs is that they see HE accreditation as playing a crucial part in supporting the CPD of teachers and, thereby, helping to develop the new understanding of what it means to be an educational professional. In my view this means that, as providers of masters programmes, we cannot construct new understanding of what we do without learning from teachers and related professionals.

Although all the countries of the UK wrestle with similar issues such as recruitment and retention there are, however, some interesting differences between them.

Scotland[15] has adopted the notion of a Chartered Teacher. This is not an exclusive idea. Ways of marking the passage of a teacher into a higher grade of professional, irrespective of the post held, have been explored for some time. People working in the other countries will be familiar with terms such as Advanced Skills Teacher and Threshold. But what makes the Scottish model different is, I believe, its straightforward coherence and the confidence gained from being the first GTC on the block. No doubt arriving at agreement was not easy, and possibly my perspective suffers from "grass is greener on the other side of the hill syndrome", but the commitment of the various stakeholders to

the notion of Chartered Teacher Status suggests that it will become a strongly rooted component part of what is required to become a full professional.

Crucial to Chartered Teacher Status is continuing professional development. Some of the credit towards achievement of the status, especially for experienced teachers, can be obtained by means of APL. Completion of masters level programmes is not compulsory. Nevertheless, the normal sequence of masters level awards can accompany and support the accumulation of evidence towards achievement of the status. A number of postgraduate programmes from a variety of HEIs have already been approved for this and will use shared assessment criteria. There are also established credit links between the Scottish Qualification for Headship (SQH) and masters provision.

The funding arrangements are that, while a teacher will have to pay a fee upon registration with an HEI that offers an approved programme, £1,200 will added to their salary in the form of increments upon completion of every two modules. The maximum salary increase obtained in this way will be £6,500. Thus Scotland has brought together enhanced professional status, increased financial reward and improved academic standing.

No doubt as the initiative gathers pace there will be a lot to be learned from interaction between the perspectives of the different stakeholders. The future shape of masters provision for professionals in education must be informed by this interaction. Masters degrees cannot survive in an ox bow lake.

Northern Ireland (see [14]) has the most recently established General Teaching Council. It also has a markedly different structure of government in that the distinction between central government and local government is not the same as elsewhere. There is an emphasis upon partnership and political impartiality is a key value. Stakeholders include the Curriculum Advisory and Support Service of the Education and Library Boards, the Council for Catholic Maintained Schools and HEIs.

While there is clearly much to be discussed before an agreed framework for the professional development of teachers can be arrived at, the GTCNI has clearly identified the role of teacher tutor as crucial. Accreditation is seen as optional for teacher tutors and for beginning teachers. Nevertheless, the importance of developing the reflective practitioner is acknowledged and I guess that this augurs well for HEIs seeking to establish masters provision as an appropriate component part of and support for the CPD framework. I am also aware of conversations between stakeholders making links between the Professional Qualification for Headship and masters provision.

Wales (Cymru)[16] is considering adopting the notion of the Chartered Teacher. Some of my colleagues working in Wales have expressed the cynical view that what Wales does is wait to see what England has done wrong and then copies it. But looking at it with an English perspective it seems that Wales manages to avoid some of the consequences of constant policy change as experienced in England. Fewer numbers of stakeholders may help, for

example, to produce what has been reported[17] as a good relationship between the GTCW and the HEIs. Many of the initiatives such as Early Professional Development that have come under threat in England because of changes of policy continue to be protected in Wales. Professional Development Bursaries, Teacher Research Scholarships, Teacher Sabbaticals, Professional Networks and Whole Staff Initiatives continue to be available and supported by funding. And they all have the potential to be incorporated in masters provision. The Professional Development Framework is subtitled: "An entitlement for all".

It helps that the University of Wales has a Standing Committee on Education. This can contribute to a rapid resolution of issues. It was this committee that recently adopted UCET guidelines linking NPQH with masters provision. There is no University of England. Potential links in England between, say, a GTC devised CPD Framework and masters provision can only be advisory. Advice is, however, more easily accepted if it is considered to be good enough to be adopted.

I have already made many references to the way that policy is shaping in **England**[18]. This is, however, a good place to make specific reference to the GTCE's Teacher Learning Academy, subtitled "a national system of professional recognition and accreditation". The framework provides for staged membership accompanied, if desired, by staged academic accreditation. Work is proceeding towards agreement upon the amount of credit, nature of evidence and common assessment criteria that can underpin a framework capable of meshing with masters provision; but, while I have been impressed by the energy, commitment, sense of purpose and willingness to work with HE demonstrated by the GTCE on behalf of teachers, I believe that they have the most difficult task. They do not control the funds going into schools. They have no power to veto changes of policy regarding the earmarking of funds. The Teacher Training Agency, not they, manage the funds for masters provision. They have no sanctions that they can apply to LEAs or to schools. And yet they have to bring about a cultural change in favour of CPD. Without that cultural change it will be difficult to deliver the commitment to enhanced professionalism.

I sympathise with the GTCE because I believe that HEIs in England are in a similar position. We have the power to do little more than show people that we have a good idea and to ask them if they might be interested in adopting it. It would be nice if OfSTED incorporated into its inspection regime an instrument that held headteachers accountable for making it possible for every teacher to obtain their entitlement to CPD. It would be nice if the sense of commitment towards CPD displayed by Estelle Morris when she announced the CPD Strategy were still evident at the highest political level. It would be nice if stakeholders, including central government, could establish common values. Instead, many of us spend valuable time working out how to make sense of and respond to changes in government policy.

One of the things that UK countries other than England seem to have in common is the ability to bring stakeholders together in relatively small

meetings. This does not guarantee the growth of trust or an unchallenged sharing of values but it can help to reduce confusion and it seems to help in maintaining commitment to what has been agreed. It appears that all of the countries of the UK have educational values of their own but are prepared to learn from the others and to pinch good ideas. I do, however, believe that the gravitational pull exerted by central government in England is not always of benefit to stakeholders who are endeavouring to encourage a positive and long term culture for CPD. Planning masters provision for teachers on the expectation that publicly announced government policy will actually be implemented is not, in England, a steady job. Funds may flow one way one year and another way the next year. The following year they may disappear altogether.

It is worth noting, by the way, that the Republic of Ireland will also be establishing a GTC. Considering the number of professional educators from the Republic working in the UK it seems as though, excepting my reservations about how things happen in England, the process of collaborative construction of what it means to become a professional educator is likely to be reinforced.

Two pictures of accredited CPD for teachers

Two pictures present themselves of teachers and accredited CPD. One is of a small volunteer band of highly influential teachers with masters degrees who occupy key professional roles and, at least partly because of the value they have accrued by participation on a masters programme, become catalysts, motivators and shapers with an overall positive impact upon fellow professionals and the practice in which they are engaged. This is the view put forward by the Report on the Award-Bearing Inset Scheme (see [8]). It is a view that has to make a virtue of necessity. The unit of resource is so small that most HEIs have difficulty recruiting large numbers and if they do their staff are spread thinly on the ground.

The other more conscript picture sees all teachers as entitled to accreditation and masters as the proper award for an experienced professional. This has connotations of the progress of an apprentice towards mastership. It is a view to which General Teaching Councils and teacher associations naturally lean. It is also the view advocated by UCET and supported by a recent paper from Gordon Taylor[19]. There are, however, some serious issues. They include: finance, relevance and priorities. Put another way, these issues represent concepts such as accountability and entitlement. Put yet another way, if teachers are to be held responsible for their own continuing professional development then those with the power to set priorities for a school must be held accountable if they have not created the conditions in which the entitlement of teachers to accredited CPD becomes possible. And who will pay for a comprehensive entitlement? Maybe not everyone will wish to be conscripted into an entitlement culture. If so then that would lessen the financial pressure.

Both pictures, the volunteer picture and the conscript picture, include a view that accredited CPD is linked very firmly to the improvement of schools. And that remains a contestable concept. Stephen Kemmis (1983)[20] presented a notion of the socially critical school. Such a school would contribute to the definition of improvement. It would not simply receive the concept of improvement as though it represented undisputable targets that it must strive to attain. It would contest an externally imposed definition and in that way arrive at something that was more generally agreed and the basis for progress. Continuous improvement is, by the way, a quality assurance mantra. And I guess that a Kemmis type definition of continuous improvement would involve a process of disputation, challenge and debate rather than simply aiming to reduce the gap between imposed target and attainment.

Summary of issues

So let's look at these issues and values again in order to find the possible points at which reconciliation can be achieved or ways forward identified.

We have:

- very little money allocated to accredited CPD but it is seen as a lever for improvement;

- plenty of CPD monies about to be distributed to schools in England but concerns that an overall cultural change is needed before accredited CPD is seen as a vital contributor to long-term school improvement;

- many key players convinced of the value of accredited CPD but perhaps, in England, not yet the most key and least accessible;

- a desire by key but not necessarily powerful players to spread that value to the whole profession;

- a need (cost effective, academically linked and professionally beneficial) to tie in more effectively ITT, CPD and research: a need recognised chiefly by those who have a day to day involvement in the business but not an easy internal partnership to achieve because of differing bidding and inspection regimes;

- a desire to make the transition from ITT to CPD part of a strategy to both improve schools and to improve retention;

- strong suggestions that we should build coherent alliances, partnerships and consortia while allowing for individual institutional inventiveness ;

- issues around work load and dumbing down;

- differences in how quality should be established: via varied implementation of principles or by rigid uniformity;

- issues around the kinds of HEI that will, in future, commit themselves to developing the educational professional.

It seems to me that HE will be required increasingly to operate in partnerships of varying kinds. Very few HEIs are likely to be able to deploy the full range of human resources demanded by CPD. It also seems to me that to establish partnerships with other stakeholders including LEAs, or equivalent, and schools might, given certain conditions, enable a radical cultural change. Instead of being dependent upon a relatively small cohort of teachers and related professionals becoming empowered to transform schools it could become the norm that all teachers engage in a process of continual, professional sense-making. The addition of £110m from the DfES to school budgets for CPD in England over the next three years, while removing earmarking, makes it urgent to tackle the culture question. Expecting LEAs to construct CPD strategies could be yet another example of acquiring responsibility without power. Collaboration looks like the only sensible option[21]. However, I need to remind myself here that not all HEIs will have to form institutional partnerships or to carry out all of their commitment to accredited CPD inside partnerships. I guess, however, that inside or outside a partnership, we shall see more collaborative approaches to learning.

Some options

We do, of course, have some options. They include:

- teaching overseas students because it brings in a much higher income than can be obtained from UK grants and fees (in England the annual income from an overseas student is sixteen times the annual grant from a TTA funded teacher and although they are full time as opposed to part time that not only means easier management it means that education departments look more like the normal university department, thereby fitting in better with general administrative and decision making systems);

- recruiting from professions in which the CPD pattern is similar to that in education but the willingness to pay higher fees is greater, such as law and medicine;

- adapting all our leadership and management provision to the requirements of an MBA, a qualification that usually commands much higher fees;

- increasing provision at undergraduate levels for para-professionals, thereby attracting higher levels of grant;

- recruiting high numbers, dumbing down and saving money on the assessment side by not expecting much in the way of assignments or completion rates.

We have the products to engage with a wider market. At postgraduate level we have a set of awards that cover a wide range of professional needs. UCET has produced a qualifications framework[22] that not only encompasses the education profession but has value as a model for other professions. We are also developing the same capacity to work at undergraduate level with para-professionals; and we have techniques and modes of assessment that work well in the variety of contexts in which professionals find themselves;

So why should we bother to continue to provide a service for teachers, especially as a combination of frequent inspection of the sector, a low unit of resource and frequent changes to government policy lessen our ability to invest in CPD and in research/publications? Our business can easily be perceived by HE senior management, as dodgy.

Achievements

The impact of government policy in England has not always been supportive. Nevertheless, the story of accredited CPD in the UK over the last few years is one of achievement. HE has managed, in all of the countries of the UK, to establish itself as a partner for government, government agencies, teaching councils, local authorities, schools, teacher associations, private companies and for each other. We have won over other stakeholders to the value of critical thinking. We have tested new ways of teaching and new modes of delivery and assessment. We have devised and adopted common procedures and principles. And, most of all, we are still here.

Although the Report (see [8]) is based upon the English experience it provides support for what we have been claiming to be able to do irrespective of country. We need, however, some long-term stability and that means that we need to have a notion of what it takes to survive in this business.

Nine components of successful masters level CPD in education

This is where I sum up. It seems to me that someone should have told me before I got involved in this business that I needed to get the following ducks in a row in order to survive. I do not pretend that the next section of this paper represents all that can be said. Rather, I have devised a set of headings or survival components into which I have put down what I believe to be relevant at the time of writing. They are little more than how I see things at the moment. Writing, say, in six months time I would probably fill in the headings differently and I might re-order things or modify a heading or two. For now, however, they help me to make sense of the position in which I find myself. Perhaps what people like me need is a survival kit for Directors of accredited CPD in education. And perhaps readers of this paper might like to amuse

themselves by devising their set of components for this survival kit. It should also be possible to detect in what follows that I began my professional educator's life as secondary modern teacher and that I retain a prejudice against selection and a continuing commitment to comprehensive education and mixed ability teaching. In other words, I favour the entitlement picture while recognising what stands against it.

What follows is in no order of preference but if the answers to the questions posed at the end of each of the following sections are positive then I believe we shall be justified in staying in business as providers of masters level accreditation for the education enterprise.

1. Institutional values and purpose

I once asked a headteacher how he managed to create a culture in which change was acceptable to the staff of his school. His answer was that he always began by establishing a shared religion. By this he meant an expression of the educational values and purpose to which most of the staff could subscribe for most of the time. He did not intend these values to become a stick with which to beat dissidents or to suppress argument. They were a starting point for the question: if that is what we believe how are we to make it happen? And it was permissible to revisit the basic set of beliefs from time to time.

One of the accusations laid against BSI 5750 (now ISO 9000) as a quality assurance system was that it merely asked organisations to demonstrate that they were doing what they claimed they were doing: it did not probe the appropriateness of the purpose for which their quality system was supposed to be fit. This seems to me very little different from the sterile effect of focussing solely upon externally set targets that allow no disputation.

So, in order to go into the future we need to articulate values and purposes to which other key players can subscribe and it might be best to do this on a collaborative basis. If our institutions separate out research, ITT/E and CPD we shall have a community of competing self interests: not at all the planned, Venn like, overlapping of activities. Scarce resources will go to those who can exert the most pressure and they will be assisted in this if the religion of the institution allows it: if it does not articulate a purpose to which different components can subscribe. And while we're about it we need to have a religion that at least allows us to get on terms with other HEIs and other key players.

My experience tells me that the place to start evangelising is at home. Those of us who work in this field will seldom be in a position to convince internal HE power brokers that we have access to an easy obtainable fortune. We have to construct our arguments on other grounds. Senior management in HEIs must be persuaded to commit to taking part in the whole education enterprise; and a crucial part of that enterprise is the contribution we can make to the development of professionals working in

the education business. And, let us not forget, connecting with schools in this way can establish a positive benefit for an HEI.

So the question is: does your institutional senior management subscribe to your religion or allow you to practise it?

2. Accessibility and widening our field

The points that I make here are really a development of the above. For those of us engaged in the HE CPD awards business, however, it is worth asking ourselves how we fit, or are perceived to fit, into other agendas. If we do not do this we may find ourselves wearing labels with which we are not comfortable. We already know that HE senior management value RAE scores very highly and that achieving such scores does not come easily to education departments, schools or faculties who are necessarily pre-occupied with responding to an externally imposed short term agenda. The recent adoption of the widening participation agenda seems, however, to be a gift to us because we have the means to reach classroom assistants and all the other para-professionals in schools and FE colleges. Many of us find exciting the notion of having a foundation degree underpinning honours and/or QTS, leading on to higher degrees for a much wider participant group than in the past, topped off by taught doctorates. In this way education in HE, particularly CPD, can acquire responsibility for or contribute to an HEI's commitment to widening participation.

In the process, however, we may be negatively labelled by colleagues in other parts of the HE business. Being world class has become an obsession with many universities. But being world class at widening participation is not what many of them mean when they use the words. If we expand we shall risk being accused of dumbing down. Our only answer is to convince colleagues who may not share our values that to work on accessibility is a worthy aspiration. It is no less than the core duty of a teacher and being key workers in the teaching business there are benefits for all if we improve accessibility. And we must convince those who control our fortunes that such values and purposes are worth supporting.

Whenever I teach about the concept of accessibility I find it useful to draw a wall as a vertical line on the whiteboard with a two-way door in the middle. I place the teacher on one side of the door and the learner on the other. Then I ask who should open the door. A lot of different beliefs emerge from the discussion. Sometimes I wish I could have more of this kind of discussion with senior management.

So the question is: can we make the argument to senior HEI management that it is possible to be world class at providing access to all of the education profession rather than to just a few of them?

3. Income

We operate in a rapidly changing market and we need to be able to respond quickly to opportunities to test our values. This is easier if those values are shared as a basis for action by people who influence our access to the resources we need. The education business does not have a golden goose: it has a bronze goose. We should not pretend otherwise. We live with the historical failure to have convinced people to fund our business adequately. In order to achieve desirable levels of quality in a labour intensive business we need human resources. And we need a fairly stable infrastructure as a basis from which we can respond to sometimes rapidly changing governmental priorities. It is no use adopting a simple income/expenditure model. If we apply such thinking without imagination or enthusiasm we shall never reap the benefits that sometimes come from guessing what the future might be like: and we shall close down activities at the first sign of declining recruitment.

It is, for example, not easy to recruit teachers to masters programmes designed for MFL in primary schools. Clearly this is not because they are not perceived by teachers to be valuable but because they do not lead directly to improved SAT results and are not, therefore, a priority for a school CPD budget. So, should we end them and end the contracts of the people who deliver them? My response to this is to ask, first, how such an activity relates to our values; and, second, does it contribute to our reputation. However, there is no doubt that, eventually, we have to ask if allocating resources to this activity damages other valuable activities. If we wish to operate in areas where the income is not high we will have to press the research and reputation buttons and if they do not turn on the financial taps or convince senior management that another kind of value is being added there is no other choice but to cease the activity.

We must persuade people (grant holders and fee payers) to pay a fair price. This is why making a cultural change is important. Sometimes it feels as though we are the possessors of the better mousetrap only to discover that we are useless at persuading people to fund it or buy it.

So the question is: can you either persuade people to buy your services at a fair price or persuade senior management in HE to allow you to operate with a lower than usual unit of resource?

4. Academic/intellectual curiosity

I cannot think of a reason for being in this business if we do not have a desire to make sense of the world in which we have either positioned or found ourselves. Doing this on a collaborative basis is simply thrilling and if collaborative sense making is what we are about then we should, to paraphrase Stephen Kemmis, seek commonality rather than uniformity. In other words, we should look for, but subject to scrutiny, what we can agree upon while avoiding a sterile sameness that can masquerade as agreed quality.

For me one way of doing this is to develop a common language of assessment:[24] a language that we can employ to jointly interrogate professional development; and another is to keep reminding policy makers that there are benefits to be had from interrogation of all aspects of professional life, including those areas where the evidence may be unsure, problematic and risky: that professional development is not always indicated by the extent to which "best practice" is followed.

Since coming to work in higher education I have heard a lot of the phrase, "academic community". Well, for CPD that community must include the participants on our masters programmes. Professionals and academics must be a resource for each other.

So the question is: can you get other people to see that collaborative professional sense making is an exciting thing to do?

5. Policy shapers

It is necessary to connect with those people who create the policies that affect us. There are two reasons for this. The first is that, in order to operate effectively we need a degree of stability. Planning requires an ability to make good guesses about the future otherwise we will be unable to convince senior management in HE to invest in what we do. The second reason is that, for me at least, our business is a sense making business within a policy driven field. That is to say, almost every aspect of masters provision in education has a political dimension: it is beset with questions of how, why and where value is to be ascribed, about the priorities for spending or the criteria against which we are measured. We must not, therefore, shy away from becoming involved in the process by which decisions that affect our future are reached by those in authority. We are professional sense-makers. To disconnect ourselves from the policy shapers is to give up.

So the question is: are we prepared to engage with politicians?

6. Other stakeholders

The question here is who are our fellows in the business in which we are engaged? With whom, in other words, should we form partnerships? To begin with, we often need to form partnerships with each other as there may be no other means of obtaining economies of scale; and the competition in which we have engaged in recent years has sometimes been corrosive and has not always delivered a better service. But we are, essentially, the same kind of stakeholder. Who are the others? They include schools, LEAs, Beacon clusters and a variety of organisations and groups that have emerged recently. They also include private companies. My experience of working with a private company overseas is that there are fewer differences between us than I thought. We both try to operate with a financial margin and to align income with the pursuit of improved quality and reputation. Without this alignment and interconnection of

money, quality and reputation we do not survive in the market place; we cannot, quite simply, do business.

So the question is: are we prepared to treat with others who have a stake in the education business?

7. Bureaucracy

A constant refrain to be heard from HE practitioners in our field is that the bureaucratic systems with which we operate are designed for undergraduates: for a steady stream of eighteen year olds arriving, every October, for a three year stay. These systems are not designed for a varied group of full-time professionals, trying to be part-time students, dipping in and out of study as the imperatives of their professional lives dictate.

So the question is: are we prepared to argue our case that bureaucracy is there to serve and not to be served?

8. The product

Do we possess the means of reaching the whole profession? One answer is to make it normal: make the cultural change; and an important factor that will help to effect this change is that HE possesses adaptable modes of delivery and assessment. We have the means of reconciling the tension between a largely target driven culture and a largely critically reflective culture.

One of the concerns that has dogged HEIs engaged in providing masters level accreditation for the teaching and related professions has been that we are easily stereotyped as a set of academic blimps who are wedded to the lecture as the sole means of delivery followed by several 5,000 word essays and eventually the 20,000 word dissertation. Having undertaken external examining and validating at ten HEIs and having reviewed the bids for the funding of masters provision of dozens of HEIs I see combinations of: face to face; on-line interaction; distance learning; working in languages other than English; residential; and partnered provision. It seems to me, therefore, that we have provision that ranges from the off the peg masters to the boutique or bespoke masters. And if we look, for example, at the kind of work being done by the London Institute on its M Teach[25] programme we see how student to student and student to tutor dialogue can play a part in establishing the legitimacy of the enterprise.

I am, however, concerned at what may be happening to the kinds of assessment criteria, learning outcomes and performance indicators employed by HE. In other words, the McDonaldisation of masters provision. I see more benefit in the boutique or bespoke masters operating to a set of principles that a variety of stakeholders have played a part in constructing.

So the question is: can we maintain our standards of enquiry and scholarship while expanding the number and variety of professional participants and the variety of modes of interaction with those professionals?

9. Infrastructure

If we are to stay in business we need stable infrastructures. When I began work as a Director of CPD who was new to HE I made a virtue of necessity by building on a network of teachers, LEA advisers, examiners and consultants who could be called upon to deliver programmes. The concentration of our resources upon other departmental activities gave me no choice but I also believed that this would connect HE with people who possessed a high degree of credible current experience and knowledge. I am sure it did but what made the connection effective was the construction of a strong infrastructure of managers and administrators/secretaries and a deputy CPD director. This team was capable of working both sides of the academic/professional divide. In other words, from that team we got planning, teaching, assessment, research, bid and inspection preparation, management and administration. Much of the money to pay for it, however, was not establishment money: it was what is euphemistically called "dirty money" or money from other activities, including consultancies, overseas work and non-award bearing courses. That made it fragile and the enterprise rather too dependent upon having the ear of university senior management who have a tendency to change people, positions, policy and minds. A dedicated, efficient team who enjoy working together is priceless. Convincing senior management to pay for the priceless is, however, another matter. The biggest connection should, therefore, be with the decision makers.

So the question is: can we build and retain an adaptable, multi talented team?

Conclusion and Postscript

This has been a very personal account, characterised during its composition by an ebb and flow of events and positive and negative thinking. We continue to be somewhat unwittingly subject to decisions taken in support of other agendas. At times we may feel that we have managed to obtain a hearing for our arguments and to have made progress towards their acceptance. This feeling only lasts until our next lesson in political reality. As illustrations of what I mean I provide accounts of two events.

The first is a meeting that took place on May 27th.2003 between David Miliband, the minister for schools, and UCET. Attending for UCET were Mary

Russell as Secretary, Peter Gilroy as Chair and me as Chair of the UCET
CPD Committee.
We raised three major points. They were that:

- the unit of resource for masters level work was inadequate;
- if partnerships and consortia were to become strong features of future
  provision for accredited CPD would he be prepared to fund the
  development by UCET and other stakeholders of principles governing
  such relationships and exemplars of appropriate programmes;
- the present separation of initial teacher education, accredited CPD and
  research into areas with their own bidding and inspection regimes
  restricted the effective use of staff, absorbed energy and militated
  against a coherent approach to the development of professionals.

I have included an account of the meeting that was presented to the UCET
Executive Committee **(see Annex Five).** It is fair to say, however, that the
meeting engendered a feeling of optimism. To hear, for example, a
government minister with strong connections to 10 Downing Street talk about
the desire to encourage "the thinking professional" was very encouraging.
This, after all, is what we desire also.

The second is a letter from the DfES, dated July 24th 2003, concerning Early
Professional Development, which I regard as the last remnant of the CPD
Strategy. The letter is addressed to local Education Authorities in England. It
explains "…that Ministers have now decided that a national Early Professional
Development Programme for teachers will not proceed as previously
planned." Essentially, the letter says that the funds previously earmarked for
EPD will now be used to provide extra resources for schools: "…to restore
confidence in the funding arrangements…". Readers may recall the fuss
about the potentially disastrous shortfall in the funding of schools this year in
England. Nevertheless, the letter hopes that there will be systematic and
structural approaches to CPD within schools. It talks of building capacity for
CPD in schools and of fostering links with HEIs.

Exactly how this capacity will be built while resources are diverted and their
focus becomes blurred is difficult to imagine. Optimism can quickly evaporate.

Notes and references

1. It is interesting to look for comparison at the proposals for the **Chartered Teacher in Scotland** because linking accreditation to increments may put the same kind of financial pressure upon the system as it has in Israel where the commitment to the linkage is under threat simply because the popularity of the masters degree has been greater than anticipated. For further information see **15** below.

2. **Bid specifications.** It is possible to engage with these specifications creatively, particularly by making full use of the concept of long-term school improvement. Nevertheless, it takes a degree of self-confidence and experience to adopt a creative approach when first faced by a document that emphasises the need to match centrally designated priorities, principles and criteria and in which there is a very strong connection to improved pupil performance. The consequences of failure to bid successfully can be very serious for an HEI. For further information contact **www.tta.gov.uk**

3. **OFSTED report, <u>In-service Training</u>, 1999/2000 <u>www.ofsted.gov.uk</u>.** This inspection of accredited CPD, funded by the Teacher Training Agency, was carried out by HMI on behalf of Ofsted over two academic years. The results of the inspection had a direct effect upon the next bidding round. Bids were required to show how they addressed points raised in the reports and institutions with identified weaknesses were at a disadvantage if they could not show the bid scrutineers that they had successfully addressed those weaknesses. The four inspection headings were Provision (quality of), Needs (meeting of), Impact and Quality Assurance. I remember vividly a conversation with an HMI in which I said that I thought we gave a lot of attention to needs analysis but that teachers were identifying needs that did not match government priorities. The reply was a chilling: "Well you must make them match". As a result I devised an exercise called "Relating Professional Needs to Professional Impact" **(see Annex Three)**. It was one of many attempts to reconcile what I felt we had to do with what it seemed we were being required to do. I also recall the managing HMI saying that although there were four areas for inspection they could all be seen as "impact", "impact", "impact" and "impact"

4. **UCET National Conference 2001.** My memory is that when members of UCET argued that the Inspection Report had vindicated HE Richard Harrison of the DfES (then the DfEE) replied that he agreed that it had, although there was a degree of uncertainty about evidence for impact. Our reaction to this was that if there was uncertainty it was because the inspectors had not understood what it was they were supposed to be looking at. Having attended the focus group that began the flip charting of the inspection framework I have a clear memory that the small group charged with exploring the notion of impact reported back with the least writing on their flip chart. It made only two points: impact can be short

term and it can be long term. It may be a measure of the lack of confidence engendered in HE at that time that I regarded gaining acceptance for those two perspectives for impact as a significant victory.

5. **TTA-MANAGED INSET SURVEY, September 2002, www.ofsted.gov.uk.** All such documents have the power to create stress. When they are new and untried they also have the potential to confuse because an agreed interpretation has yet to be developed. Given the feeling that HE would never be permitted to penetrate a negative perception barrier this framework was not greeted with enthusiasm. And yet it contained some welcome items. It was particularly good to see that inspectors were now going to be open to "soft" evidence for qualities such as enthusiasm. There was, however, mention of "value congruence". This is what we are supposed to generate when we teach our students how to recognise best practice. As the inspection team have yet to report I cannot say what form value congruence might take.

6. **CPD Impact Conferences report.** These conferences (one in London, the other in Manchester) took place in 2003 and were designed to demonstrate how HE and schools could work together to generate good quality impact. UCET produced a report on the conferences, written by Stephen Bigger. By the end of the second conference I believed that the benefit of accredited CPD was clear for all to see. Having chaired both conferences I felt quite euphoric afterwards. At first I kept thinking that I was hearing accounts of the kinds of innovation that would not have looked out of place before the National Curriculum. I was saying to myself: "This is what we/I did in the sixties/seventies/early eighties". I recognised this as the response of an old and tired teacher who was rather irritated by the sight and sound of young and energetic people usurping his role as a creative professional. But after a short while I had to admit that I was witness to some really exceptional professional/academic engagement. I was very impressed. The report on the conferences can be obtained from **d.hoogendoorn@ucet.ac.uk**

7. Despite the inadequacy of the funding, the decision was taken by the Department of Education in the University of Liverpool to undertake a Rolls Royce piece of research complete with four doctoral students, the cooperation of two other HEIs besides Liverpool and a steering committee that included seven LEAs. This would, we thought, have benefits for the RAE and generate a book of grail-like status. It was an attempt to make work the overlap between two of the three components (research and CPD, the other being ITT/E) in the educational Venn diagram. However, we optimistically overlooked the infrastructural weaknesses of a department that was fighting on too many fronts. The students were senior professionals managing schools and, therefore, subject to considerable professional stress. Meanwhile, the Department lost its project directors in the fall out of the decision by

senior management at the University of Liverpool to close down what was perceived to be a loss making ITT provision. Short-term priorities overrode the development of medium and long-term priorities. The timescale applying to our values was, in other words, shortened: the vision horizon had come much closer.

8. **Soulsby, David and Swain, May 14th. 2003 (originally published, prior to consultation, March 2003), <u>Report on The Award Bearing Inset scheme, DfES.</u>** This report has made a considerable difference to how HE is perceived as a provider of accredited CPD. As evidence of the professional impact of masters level work it should be disseminated widely. Not everyone will read it all (forty eight pages) but it has the power to win, or form the basis for, lots of favourable arguments if we deploy it well. An early reaction to it by members of the UCET CPD Committee was that the devil is in the detail. The next twelve months will be concerned with devising responses to the report that can contribute to a new model in England for the funding of accredited CPD for teachers and possibly related professionals. For a copy of the report contact **www.teachernet.gov.uk/profesionaldevelopment/opportunities/aw ardbearingandandinset/**

9. **Sibeon, Roger, 1996, <u>Contemporary Sociology and Policy Analysis-The New Sociology of Public Policy</u>, Tudor, Merseyside.** Having acquired a first degree in political theory and institutions in the sixties, and having since (but no longer) set many CSE and GCSE papers on the subject of politics and government, I have a reasonable grasp of what most text books tell young people about the construction of policy. One of the joys of teaching politics is the opportunity to reveal other realities that lie behind conventional perceptions. I read this book to help me gain an insight into current understanding of policy construction. It is fascinating to discover the extent to which the term postmodernism can now be applied to what continues to be considered by many to be a straightforward subject.

10. For an understanding of how politicians operate, particularly at the highest level, I recommend **Hennessey, Peter, 2000, <u>The Prime Minister-the office and its holders since 1945</u>, Penguin, London and Paxman, Jeremy, 2002,<u> The Political Animal, An Anatomy</u>, Michael Joseph, London.** I found them both invaluable. Both authors are almost unputdownable (Hennessey has, of course, many more such works to his credit) and Paxman's account of how carefully constructed argument and policy can come to grief when faced with a contrary prime ministerial commitment is illuminating for those of us who scratch our heads about changes of educational policy.

11. **<u>CPD Strategy</u>, ref. DfEE 007/2001 www.dfee.gov.uk/teacher/cpd.** This strategy was announced March 1st. 2001. Its strength was that it seemed to hand over to the profession the responsibility for making sense of their professional lives. Given the number of initiatives

emerging from the government at the time a degree of sense making was highly desirable. More than two years later, however, we are struggling with the problem of how to bring about the culture change that will embed CPD in professional life. We also have perceptions of CPD that range from the input of subject knowledge to critical sense making. For some these perceptions are mutually exclusive and have yet to be reconciled. Nevertheless, the formation by the DfES of a CPD Strategy Advisory Group has brought together a collection of stakeholders. In my view that group has gradually overcome suspicions of each other and it has been surprising how much commonality there is.

12. **Bologna http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/erasmus/guide/bologna.pdf.** The Bologna Declaration was signed by 29 countries in June 1999 as an intention to ensure convergence in higher education. The issue for us may be that what is developing in the UK from interaction between all the stakeholders may not be sufficiently reflected in Bologna decision-making.

13. **Estelle Morris quoted these figures in the foreword to the consultation** document on **Developing the Role of School Support Staff, DfES, October 2002.**

14. **GTCNI www.gtcni.org.uk** (web site not yet in operation, 19th August 2003)

15. **GTCS www.gtcs.org.uk** (last consulted 19th August 2003)

16. **GTCW www.gtcw.org.uk** (last consulted 19th August 2003)

17. **UCET www.ucet.ac.uk** The various UCET committees have agenda items that cover all the countries of the UK. There are also regular reports from UCET representatives on the different GTCs.

18. **GTCE www.gtce.org.uk/homepage.asp** (last consulted 19th August 2003)

19. **Taylor, Gordon, March 2003, Report of the National Framework for Accreditation Subgroup, DfES National CPD Advisory Group.** This report has been discussed by the DfES CPD Strategy Advisory Group and by the UCET CPD Committee. The subgroup included expertise from LEAs, private consultants, the DfES, the GTCE, UCET, the NUT and the NCSL. It not only made the point about the need for coherence but also provided a strong case for the benefits that HE can bring to CPD in terms of, for example, critical reflection and theoretical insight. The paper was very well received. For a copy it will probably be best to contact **D.Hoogendoorn@ucet.ac.uk**

20. **Kemmis, S, Cole, P, Suggett, D, 1983, <u>Towards the Socially Critical School</u>, Victorian Institute of Secondary Education, Melbourne.** For Kemmis school is often separated from society, responding or reacting to what it perceives that it is required to do. He explores the notion of school as part of society, interacting with it. It is interesting to see how this can affect styles of teaching, learning and assessment.

21. **EPPI, <u>http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/EPPIWeb/home.aspx?page=/reel/reviews.htm</u>, <u>How does collaborative Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for teachers of the 5-16 age range affect teaching and learning? June 2003.</u>** This research underlines the point made by a number of people that there are benefits to be gained from collaboration.

22. **Higher Education Awards for the Teaching Profession, Autumn 2002, UCET, <u>www.ucet.ac.uk</u>** This paper was written in response to the proposition that "Higher Education would serve the teaching profession well if it were to offer a coherent sequence of awards, leading from the earliest stages of a person's study in HE to the highest levels of PhD and EdD, this sequence accompanying a teacher into the profession and helping mark their progress once within it.". The forces demanding coherence (not uniformity) must now engage with the forces encouraging confusion.

23. **Riggs, F.W., (1973), <u>Prismatic Society Revisited</u>, General Learning Press: New Jersey.** Fred Riggs is an anthropologist with an interesting take on how societies can be assembled. If we decide on the component parts of a society (perhaps, at one time, church, industry, judiciary, the military etc.) it is noticeable that at times they can be assembled so that one component dominates the others. For a nicely balanced society this should not be the case. Of course we can argue about the components and disagree about their relationships and we might object that the idea of society bound up like this lacks a certain dynamic. Nevertheless, his work sprang to my mind when I came to think about what ducks it is necessary to assemble in a row in order to survive in this aspect of the education enterprise. Put another way, if we collaborate we may have to lose something in order to progress.

24. **Jones, C and Johnston, K, 1999, <u>Modular Advanced Professional Studies (MAPS), Assessment and Results MEd, The Liverpool Extension in Israel, 1998/99.</u>** Available from cliffj@liv.ac.uk. This analysis of how, over two years, 111 masters dissertations were assessed is based upon a thorough exploration of how the Liverpool assessment criteria work for the dissertation. It was an attempt to anchor the notion of "M" ness in a shared understanding of our language of assessment. We have changed some things since then; in particular we are now required to provide numerical grades. Nevertheless, I continue to use it as a sense-making prop.

25. **London Institute http://ioewebserver.ioe.ac.uk/ioe/index.html**
My reference to the M Teach programme of the London Institute should not imply that it has a monopoly of creative thinking about how to connect theory and practice. And it should not imply that I have a full knowledge of what else is available in terms of such HE provision. I admire it because it enters the interesting territory in which legitimacy can be constructed from inter action between all participants.

Below I have listed some of what I have referred to above as **off the wall or out of the academic box literature**. At first I was inclined to make this a very long list because it can be fascinating to try to trace the sources of ideas as they enter your thinking. There comes a realisation, however, that this game could go on for a very long time and that, unless controlled, reference would also have to be made to television programmes, newspapers and magazines. I have, therefore, tried to be ruthless and limited myself to three sources. I did not seek out the first two as part of my preparation for this paper. They were purchased for train journeys. The third is a book that I have known since it was published. I think it is always useful to step outside a context when we become so familiar with it that we acquire blinkers. Reading such a book helps. If nothing else, literature from outside the usual academic box can provide a few fresh metaphors.

26. **Klein, Naomi, 2001, <u>No Logo,</u> Flamingo, London.** This book provided insights into the relationships between income, markets, perceived quality and brand value. It seems to me that higher education, whether it is prepared to admit it or not, operates in such a set of relationships

27. **Ritzer, George, 1996,<u>The McDonaldisation of Society</u>, Pine Forge Press, California.** This book provided encouragement in my struggle with those who equate uniformity with high quality. It irks me considerably that, for example, so many in higher education have adopted the learning outcomes approach without allowing for unexpected evidence for unintended outcomes. And as we enthusiastically construct franchises, partnerships and consortia shall we smugly reassure ourselves that we can be confident about quality because everything will be the same? Some people even seem to think that if we agree that 70% represents a first class honours degree then all firsts are the same.

28. **Hopwood, Bert, 1984, <u>Whatever Happened to the British Motorcycle Industry</u>, Haynes, Yeovil.** I regard this book as invaluable because it provides an insider's picture of how the greatest and biggest industry of its kind in the world managed to disregard experience and expertise on its way to oblivion. The lessons for me are that just because a thing has never happened before do not think it will not happen and just because you have a good plan do not imagine that senior management will understand it for what it is. This book should, in my view, be compulsory reading for those managers who think that all they have to do is to examine the ledger. Without commitment to the

industry there will be a poor understanding. Without understanding there will be no commitment.

ANNEX ONE: Principles for CPD Partnerships and Consortia

The Report on The Award Bearing Inset Scheme (see 8) makes great play of the wisdom of developing this style of working. A great many HEIs already have considerable experience of working in partnerships and consortia of one kind or another; and there is an increasing number of LEAs developing CPD Strategies, either on their own or in conjunction with partners. It becomes important, therefore, to establish some commonality that will work across disparate geographical and administrative areas. The enclosed document is intended to bring about discussion. It pretends to do no more. The UCET CPD Committee has already seen it so the debate about what form the principles should take has already begun. I have not, however, changed anything at this stage. I need some more written response.

Principles for CPD Partnerships and Consortia

I believe that the future will and should involve a variety of forms of partnership or consortia. I intend, therefore, to outline a set of principles that might cover such partnerships; also a model of the kind of programme leading to accreditation that might adapt to proposals emerging from the GTCs and some LEAs. It could also incorporate the new Career Entry and Development Profile being developed by the TTA and it would work very well with the UCET principles for the assessment of professional portfolio evidence within masters provision.

I am also very much aware of the need to encourage planned links with ITT and also with developments taking place for support staff. And, despite the stratification of HE envisaged by government and the funding councils whereby only a few HEIs will be encouraged to carry out research, it is my view that everything we do in CPD will benefit from a research perspective. Perhaps partnerships and consortia will be in a stronger position to bid for research funds.

The business of setting up a partnership between a school or cluster of schools or LEA or similar body and one or more HEIs involves the establishment of a means by which accreditation can be transmitted from the HEI to the school or cluster and to an individual within the school. There should be two stages to this and the process to be engaged in is essentially a process of validation leading to accreditation. In order to avoid any confusion, however, I propose to use the word approval rather than validation. And I wish to emphasise that, in the spirit of a thought piece, what I write is intended only as a contribution to the debate.

For an HEI to transfer partial use of its accreditation rubber stamp it needs to be assured of the following. First the partnership or consortium should have a clear and resilient **structure** that includes key players working together in relationships that they understand and believe in. Structural resilience is important because relationships such as those between schools, LEAs, HEIs etc. often founder when it is realised too late that they have been dependent upon particular people who have left or been given other responsibilities. Second there should be no confusion about the **functions** of the component parts of the structure. Confusion erodes motivation and costs a lot of money. Third is **process.** By this I mean that all participants should subscribe to a code of practice designed to fulfil the purpose of the partnership.

I propose, therefore, a model for CPD partnerships between HEIs and others, chiefly schools. I must point out that the model is designed to be adaptable and responsive to a variety of professional concerns and interests. As I pointed out earlier, I use the word "approval" instead of "validation". I do this because of the specific connotations of validation; but, whatever the word, it has to be the basis for accreditation.

I am, by the way, aware that many HEIs have experience of designing, developing and operating such models. This one is derived from ideas developed originally from discussion between teacher unions, an LEA and two, potentially competing HEIs. In its early life in Liverpool this model was intended to cover ITT and support staff. With the enforced concentration of our CPD efforts upon participants who have QTS and the divergence of inspection systems gaps have opened up both in HEIs and in schools between those responsible for ITT, CPD and support staff. Funding and bidding arrangements are also different. I cannot help thinking that we lose so much coherence and waste so many resources because of these gaps. And, of course, if we work in partnership, investment in building expertise is not wasted when people move jobs within the partnership or even exchange jobs with others in different partnerships.

Approval of School Based Continuing Professional Development

1. Purpose and key concerns of a CPD partnership or consortium

   The partnership or consortium should:

   - support, recognise, record and acknowledge the continuing professional development of teaching and support staff;

   - approve school plans for professional development;

   - support school-based provision, management and ownership of CPD;

   - provide both institutional and individual accreditation (a school achieves institutional accreditation by becoming a member of the partnership or consortium);

   - enable schools to demonstrate the quality, value for money and impact of their plans for CPD;

   - contribute to school effectiveness and improvement;

   - encourage CPD that is fair, positive and inclusive;

   - make appropriate links with ITT and research.

2. Scope

   - All staff engaged in the work of the school (note the points made earlier about the need for CPD policies that cohere with those for ITT and support staff).

3. Approval processes and procedures

   This is the basis for the quality assurance of continuing professional development. That is to say, it must be demonstrated

that school plans for the professional development of staff are fit for their purpose and, specifically, fit to lead to accreditation. In order to be approved school plans for CPD shall:

- make clear their institutional purpose (E.g. to carry forward aspects of the School Development Plan or to address a post inspection action plan);

- outline the context of the plan (E.g. the school environment or background);

- outline the professional outcomes that the school intends to engender (this is not the same as the skills, knowledge, understanding, attributes and experiences that individuals might list as wishing to acquire or develop);

- describe, in general terms, the range of activities to be undertaken by participants;
- describe the forms of expected evidence (again, this is for the school rather than for individuals and will help to demonstrate impact);

- explain the internal arrangements designed to manage, monitor, review and evaluate the implementation of the plans for CPD (another basis for the demonstration of impact);

- outline the budget, resources and timescale that underpins the plans for CPD (this will help to demonstrate value for money and impact);

- make clear the school's commitment to fair, positive and inclusive professional development.

A completed plan should be **scrutinised** by competent personnel representing key players in the consortium. As far as HE is concerned a prime interest will be to ensure that the key elements are in place to enable approval to be given. Where more than one HEI is involved it is likely that they will find some commonality (though not necessarily uniformity) between their individual **assessment criteria and modes of assessment.** This is not simply because of credit accumulation and transfer but because of the need to foster professional dialogue. I am arguing that assessment criteria should be used as the language for such professional dialogue and that feeding back and feeding forward to participants is part of an essential sense-making, formative process that makes the business worthwhile. Assessment criteria are, I believe, closer than ever in the kinds of demands that they make upon participants. There are some differences in the challenges to professionals between, on the one side, GTCs and the National College and, on the other, HEIs. But a feature of the last few years has been a willingness by those bodies to explore differences and to find ways of complementing and supporting each other for the benefit of participants and the overall education business.

4. School based management

In order to support school-based ownership, provision and management of CPD, and as a further means of continuously improving quality, there should be a support programme for staff with direct or indirect responsibility for managing the CPD of colleagues.

I propose four components for this support:

- **induction** to the processes and procedures of obtaining institutional approval or accreditation as a basis for the transmission of accreditation to individuals (in other words an initial training programme that equips, say, a staff development co-ordinator to submit a school CPD plan for approval and to work on behalf of the partnership or consortium);

- **construction** of relevant CVs (I believe that staff with such responsibilities will gain understanding of their role from help in constructing CPD dedicated CVs and this should be part of the induction process);

- **admission** to a community of such providers (the potential of such a community is enormous and there is much to be gained from conferring on matters such as the use of the language of assessment to make sense of professional life and the intrinsic and extrinsic reasons why teachers and others engage in CPD);

- **completion** of a verified, evaluative annual report.

ANNEX TWO: The kind of programme that might serve the interests of a CPD partnership or consortium

This is intended to begin discussion about what kind of programme might emerge from or accompany the Principles for Partnership and Consortia. I realise that, on the one hand, there is pressure to simply accredit the work of teachers and related professional without subjecting them to any kind of informed critical assessment and evaluation; while, on the other hand, there is a view that all masters provision should include a high degree of expert input. What I hope I have done here is to offer a small, critically sense-making, module that helps to interrogate a larger module that is, in effect, a portfolio of evidence that could comprise traditional, essay style assignments, action research by an individual or an individual working collaboratively or a combination of different types of evidence. It would, I hope, enable professionals to assemble evidence drawn from a variety of learning experiences, some of which can come from working with different providers.

Many HEIs have or are developing such programmes. I do not pretend that mine is the earliest or the best for all circumstances. I do, however, wish to receive feedback as part of the debate about principles that can underpin working with others.

The kind of programme that might serve the interests of a CPD partnership or consortium

I suggest that a masters level programme designed to work within the kinds of relationships that consortia and partnerships foster would include:

- **a** *common language of assessment* **as the basis for discussion between all participants and the construction of judgement;**

- **a** *rationale* **that recognises and acknowledges the value to be gained from making sense of professional life;**

- **a supportive and challenging means by which teachers and associated professionals can do this in** *a work based context*;

- **explicit attention to the acquisition and development of the knowledge, understanding, skills and attributes required to express and make sense of initial and changing** *professional needs and* **to relate them to** *professional impact*.

Such a programme would not specify content in terms of content or subject areas. It would in no way be free of content, however. Because of its very strong purpose of making sense of professional life the

content would require negotiation and customisation. There is a risk that fragmenting continuing professional development might militate against the sense making process: that a loss of cohesion could lead to confusion and a draining away of motivation. For this reason the strength of such a programme must lie in the sense making instruments it provides; and in the appropriateness of the choices made from a variety of modes of assessment.

I suggest that for a busy full time professional who can be no more than a part time student the key for a provider is to concentrate, at an early stage, upon the sense making techniques.

I guess that it makes sense to plan for a staged progression (possibly three years) towards a full masters. This matches the DfES/TTA notion of funding and, if it proves to be the case that the funding policy will last for ten years, it will also enable participants to build in some pauses in that progression so that the pace of accreditation can match the pace and imperatives of professional life. Experience tells me that what tells against completion rates is not the level at which we pitch our accreditation requirements but the workload expected of a busy professional. If the various GTCs manage to get accredited CPD for all adopted as policy then HE shall be engaging with conscripts rather than volunteers and it will be even more important to address the timescale issue.

In terms, then, of structure**, I suggest that each of the first two stages be built around** two major components**. The** first **would be constructed around the UCET Principles for using Portfolio Based Evidence at Masters Level** (see Annex Three)**. An assignment constructed like this would enable participants to interrogate or comment critically upon the contents of a portfolio. The** *second* **would be the portfolio. This could consist of a varied range of evidence. The evidence could be very subject or pedagogically focussed; and it could be more diffuse, built, for example, around a professional role. The evidence could consist of a series of traditional assignments or essays and it could consist of a variety of forms of professionally generated material. The major point is that the first component interrogates the second even if the second is largely composed of critically reflective essays. Another way of looking at this is to see it as a version of what an academic presents for examination when seeking a doctorate by means of publication. This is usually a collection of pieces of work, the coherence and significance of which are established by an accompanying critical commentary.**

Content.

In all three stages of the programme content would be based upon a range of negotiated and appropriate activities. They could be school based or school related and may be part of the CPD provision planned by school, agency or contracted organisation. They could also be subject or role related.

The emphasis in stage one of the programme **will be upon needs analysis, professional relevance, usefulness and the key factors affecting improvement; and there may be a connection with the Standards Framework and a range of other initiatives. It would also be crucial to introduce participants to sense-making techniques.**

The emphasis in stage two of the programme **is likely to be more upon enabling participants to plan, implement, review and evaluate specific strategies for improvement.**

The emphasis in stage of the programme **will move beyond action research to encompass a range of research methodologies appropriate to preparing for a more substantial piece of research.**

Teaching and learning methodologies.

Subject to negotiation a variety of methods may be employed, including seminars, tutorials, group work and presentations. Teaching may be off-campus and on-line and involve action research

For the third stage **the methodologies will include research training workshops supported by individual supervision leading to submission of a sustained piece of work such as a dissertation (although I guess that we have yet to explore the variety of forms in which a dissertation may be presented).**

Intended learning outcomes for the first stage of the programme.

Participants will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of:

a) **institutional purposes, priorities, targets and action plans;**
b) **national priorities, expectations and standards;**
c) **the relationship of (a) and (b) to personal professional needs and targets;**
d) **current relevant research and basic research techniques;**
e) **current relevant inspection evidence;**
f) **the relationship between a specific professional area of responsibility and a school as a whole;**
g) **a range of strategies for improving and sustaining high standards of professional performance.**

Participants will be able to:

h) **access relevant professional literature and information;**
i) **critically reflect upon:**
   - **relevant theoretical/academic material,**
   - **relevant regulatory/official/inspection documentation,**
   - **practical/professional material;**
j) **use relevant professional literature and information to monitor, review and evaluate an aspect of school performance;**

k) **establish short, medium and long term plans for the development of an identified area of responsibility;**

l) **implement and evaluate strategies designed to contribute to improving and sustaining a high standard of professional performance;**

m) **review professional evidence, including unexpected evidence, for unintended outcomes.**

Intended learning outcomes for the second stage of the programme.

Participants will acquire and develop knowledge and understanding of:

a) **key areas for improvement within a specific area of professional responsibility;**

b) **a range of strategies for improving and sustaining high quality within a specific area of professional responsibility;**

c) **how evidence and guidance from various sources (inspection reports, research, LEA, DfES for example) can be used to support strategies for improvement;**

d) **the principles underlying work based research designed to evaluate impact.**

Participants will also be able to:

e) **plan, implement, review and evaluate strategies for improving quality;**

f) **carry out work based research;**

g) **review evidence (including the unexpected) for unintended outcomes.**

Intended learning outcomes for the third stage of the programme.

These outcomes will largely be dependent on the choice of individual topics for research. However, they will, for all participants, include:

knowledge and understanding of:

a) **appropriate methodologies for school based research, including ways of identifying areas for improvement relating to own professional responsibility;**

b) **specific areas of policy and practice related to the participant's own area of responsibility and reflecting the school's needs and interests;**

c) **methods of using research and inspection findings to directly impact on improvement;**

d) **current literature;**

ability to:

e) **identify areas for improvement;**
f) **critically reflect upon strategies designed to effect improvement;**
g) **engage with appropriate literature;**
h) **make well supported recommendations;**
i) **review evidence (including the unexpected) for unintended outcomes.**

Literature base (for all stages of the programme).

All literature will fall within each of three broadly defined categories.

- Theoretical/academic. **This will, generally, be published academic articles and books that provide theory that can be tested in, or used to explore, a professional context.**
- Regulatory/official/inspection. **This will include documentation issued by government or agencies that seeks to define and control areas such as teaching, learning, assessment organisation, management and professional development. It will also include school, LEA and other inspection reports as relevant.**
- Practical/professional. **This will include materials such as school and LEA development plans, policy documents and schemes of work. Some of this is unlikely to be available in published form.**

Assessment requirements (for the first two stages of the programme).

The modes of assessment may vary and they may be focussed upon any combination or permutation of subject specialisms and role enhancement. They may also combine traditional essays set after attendance on campus-based courses and school negotiated action research. They will, however, include, as a separate item, the kind of overarching critical commentary described in the UCET principles. This will help to give coherence to each stage of the programme and to ensure that, no matter what the form of evidence in the portfolio might be it will be interrogated as part of a strategic approach to continuing professional development. I suggest the following assignments for the first stage of the programme. **They are designed to make use of the three perspectives outlined in the UCET Principles** (see Annexe Three) **and to reflect the three kinds of literature described above.**

1. **A professionally informed critique of one or more agreed, relevant academic work(s).**

2. **A theoretically informed critique of one or more agreed, relevant example(s) of official documentation.**

3. **A theoretically informed critique of one or more agreed, relevant example(s) of professional material.**

4. **Compilation of a Record of Continuing Professional Development, with a particular focus on analysis of personal professional needs and the relationship between these and school needs and impact.**

For the second stage of the programme **I suggest the following assignments.**

1. **A plan for the implementation of strategies designed to generate sustained improvement.**

2. **A case study describing and critically reflecting upon the implementation of the strategies outlined in 1. above.**

3. **Further compilation of the Record of Continuing Professional Development.**

For the third stage of the programme **I suggest a dissertation that addresses the intended learning outcomes designed for this stage plus further compilation of the Record of Continuing Professional Development.**

And please note **what I wrote earlier: that many HEIs have models of such programmes.**

ANNEX THREE: Professional Development Portfolio Evidence at Masters Level

During 2002 UCET adopted a set of principles to underpin the way in which professional development portfolio evidence could be assessed within masters level work. I think that the principles actually work at more than one level. As usual with such principles emanating from UCET each member is entitled to adopt, adapt or to reject them. Nevertheless, they have been well received and I present them here in the form in which they were presented to UCET members, complete with reference to the Escalate funded research that made it possible to develop them. The full Escalate report contains, by the way, an activity called "Relating Professional Needs to Professional Impact". For those interested in needs analysis this activity might be useful.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO EVIDENCE AT MASTERS LEVEL

The last two years (2001/2002) have seen a growing interest in the use of portfolio evidence produced by teachers and offered for evidence within masters frameworks. Interest has developed further because the DfES has produced guidance for teachers on the compilation of portfolios (or Records as they are now called by the DfES). This guidance is clearly designed to support teachers as they thread their way through Threshold, Performance Management and all other government sponsored initiatives that can be connected to National Standards.

The further development of initiatives such as Best Practice Research Scholarships, Sabbaticals and Networked Learning Communities has added to the need to articulate professional learning in a variety of professional contexts. And the announcement of the Government's CPD Strategy indicates recognition that teachers are in need of support if they are to navigate their way through a sometimes confusing set of potentially supportive professional initiatives.

Meanwhile, Higher Education Institutions offering accredited CPD have been actively engaged in blending the imperatives of the professional lives of teachers with the knowledge and perspectives to be gained by embarking upon masters level programmes.

The principles set out below have been designed to meet the needs of different stakeholders. But specifically they address the problem of how to reconcile the immediate professional demands of teachers with the requirements of higher education for critical reflection, the use of literature based insights and a sound approach to evidence. They are targeted at masters level because that is the level set for accredited CPD for teachers. They will also, I believe, work at other levels and in other professional contexts with the minimum of alteration.

Members of UCET, the DfES and the NCSL have responded positively to these principles; and it has been suggested that they form a set of criteria that can be referred to by different bodies when bidding for funds or when preparing for inspection. They are not intended to impose a uniform, sterile and safe approach to CPD. They are designed to allow for a variety of systems reflecting different approaches, values and traditions; and they encourage a more professionally confident and wide-ranging perception of the concepts of need and impact. They also provide a template or filter for the transfer of credit obtained from programmes provided by the National College into programmes provided by HE.

Responses to the draft of the principles distributed for consultation included the following. (I take responsibility for any errors arising from my paraphrasing).

- Better reflection requires that we allow for different types of criticality rather than for one shared understanding of it.
- We need to examine the notion of reflective teaching (not the same as thinking about teaching).
- Professional curiosity and interest are to be encouraged.
- It might be valuable to include a philosophical perspective that would allow a meta-theoretical and polemical treatment of the perspectives listed below.
- Theoretical perspectives are not confined to the academic world. They operate also in the practical and professional world.
- Stakeholders can be individuals and groups and groups can coalesce around different initiatives and change shape so that the concept of stakeholders is not as straightforward as it might seem.
- Reviewing evidence for impact implies measurement of what is easy to measure. We must remember that the concept of impact has more to it than it might seem.

In the light if these and other responses some changes have been made to the principles. They have, however, been kept to a minimum because all of the feedback was very supportive. The principles are intended to be a guide and will, therefore, be approached intelligently rather than rigidly. I suggest that the points summarised above provide further insights into the business of interrogating professional learning and that colleagues using the principles bear them in mind.

For colleagues interested in reading the background paper ("The Use of a Professional Development Portfolio within a Masters Framework") from which the principles were generated it is available by email (cliffj@liv.ac.uk). The paper is a report for Escalate on a funded Thematic Initiative. It includes an exercise called Relating Professional Needs to Professional Impact. It is used in Liverpool as a precursor to the compilation of our Record of Continuing Professional Development. The findings of this paper are also summarised below. I have also included a list of potential stakeholders and the three perspectives that are used to engage with the principles.

A number of HEIs are working at providing guidance for teachers and related professionals compiling records and portfolios and they play an important part in Initial Teacher Training. The DfES is presently thinking about how to improve the transition between ITT and CPD. For the moment the mechanism for this involves the Career Entry Profile. Whatever documentation is used in future to ease the transition its purpose will be bound up with national imperatives to recruit and retain. This places accredited CPD at the heart of policy because it provides high quality support, recognition and acknowledgement for teachers at a crucial stage in their professional lives. And the use of portfolios and records by HE also allows us to support teachers as they further progress through the Standards Framework, particularly as they encounter Threshold and Performance Management.

THE KEY FEATURES OF THE FINDINGS OF AN ESCALATE THEMATIC INITIATIVE: "THE USE OF A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO WITHIN A MASTERS FRAMEWORK".

They are:

satisfying both academic and professional demands is possible and can produce a benefit for teachers and teaching;

criticality operates in both academic and professional fields, although establishing a shared understanding of the concept and its application may not be easy;

awareness and understanding of context helps to support reflection;

plans for professional development may be good things but should be tentative because the conditions of professional life are not always stable and development often changes understanding;

listening to other voices is an aid to reflection;

continuing professional development involves opportunity cost and takes place within what are often conflicting value frameworks, not all of which leave much room for an individual agenda;

the handling of evidence is crucial: it is important to recognise and acknowledge the value of the unexpected and to avoid simply looking for predetermined evidence that targets have been met;

interrogating and reflecting upon personal professional development are skills that may have to be taught;

engagement with literature is better than learning and describing it;

at some point professionals have to take ownership of the process of making sense of their professional lives;

the professional development loop should not quite close: there should be an element of "what next?" and, perhaps, "next time I will do it differently".

NINE POTENTIAL STAKEHOLDERS WHO CAN BENEFIT FROM AGREED PRINCIPLES UNDERPINNING PROFESSINAL DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO EVIDENCE PRESENTED AT MASTERS LEVEL

1. The **individual educational professional** who may be subject to performance
management, threshold and targets in general.

2. Schools and clusters of schools working to development plans, action plans, etc.

3. Local Education Authorities (and EAZs, Beacons, etc.) devising Education Development Plans, responding to government initiatives such as the CPD strategy.

4. Government in conjunction with the Teacher Training Agency attempting to link its priorities with the CPD strategy.

5. The **General Teaching Councils** encouraging teachers to engage in CPD.

6. The **National College for School Leadership** concerned to establish a bridge between its programmes and awards and those of Higher Education.

7. Ofsted looking for a language in which to relate CPD to impact (we are all doing this).

8. Higher Education frustrated by a financial regime for accredited CPD which threatens the maintenance of standards and the maintenance of provision.

9. Pupils in schools who will be taught by more confident teachers secure enough in their professionalism to reflect critically upon what they do and what they are part of.

THREE PERSPECTIVES TO BE USED IN THE INTERROGATION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO EVIDENCE AT MASTERS LEVEL

The **academic/theoretical** perspective which has the capacity to enlighten, challenge and make sense of professional practice and policy in unexpected ways.

The **regulatory/official/inspection** perspective which not only embodies public priorities but also enforces a rigorous approach to the assurance of quality.

The **practical/professional** perspective which starts with the personal position of the teacher, working in context, engaging with and making sense of the demands and opportunities of professional life. A confident use of this perspective can also form the basis for a professional challenge to or

questioning of theory.

Note: these perspectives also represent a blend of the kind of literature with which professionals might engage.

THE PRINCIPLES

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO EVIDENCE PRESENTED AT MASTERS LEVEL SHOULD BE BASED UPON:

(looking forward)

analysis of needs relating to personal professional baselines and context;

an outline of **intended professional outcomes** arising from the analysis;

preliminary action planning making clear the links or otherwise with institutional planning, arrangements for sharing plans, resource implications and an indication of how engagement with CPD from the three perspectives will take place;

description of **expected evidence** or initial ideas about potential impact, including an appreciation that some evidence may be intangible and some may be under the control of or largely generated by others;

 (monitoring)

collection of evidence without disregarding or discarding unexpected items of evidence before they are examined for value and significance;

(reviewing)

reviewing of evidence for impact following a procedure which allows full consideration of unexpected evidence for unintended professional outcomes, takes note of intangible evidence relating to, for example, self-esteem, confidence and motivation, and ensures that each perspective is employed;

outcome claiming making clear the nature and strength of evidence;

follow on action planning arising out of the process just completed

Cliff Jones, Liverpool
June 2002

ANNEX FOUR: Accrediting NPQH at Masters Level

During 2001/02 The National College for School Leadership and UCET had tried on a number of occasions to reconcile NPQH and masters level work. What was in danger of becoming deadlocked was resolved when the National College proposed that UCET devise a means of accrediting prior learning. This would address the "deficit" of NPQH in terms of critical reflection and theory. I enclose the bridging assignment together with a paper outlining the proposal to UCET members.

The significance of this, and the principles for the accreditation of professional development portfolio evidence at masters level, may be that they demonstrate means by which academic masters can connect with other programmes of professional development. In particular I am thinking of the various strategies, including the forthcoming Key Stage Three and Four Strategies.

Without thinking through how connections may be made like this we are in danger of losing a great deal now that government has, by removing earmarking from initiatives, weakened the extent to which the CPD culture was growing naturally.

6 January 2003

Dear Colleague,

Accrediting NPQH at masters level

The enclosed/attached document concerns arrangements by which applicants to masters programmes might be given credit for successful completion of NPQH. It includes an outline of a bridging assignment and suggested assessment criteria designed to address the academic and theoretical deficits of NPQH. It is in the form in which it was presented to the UCET Executive meeting in December 2002, where it was approved.

There are currently seven thousand participants attending NPQH programmes and there are many HEIs who are funded to provide masters level programmes in Leadership and Management. It is the intention of the National College for School Leadership, with whom UCET has been negotiating on this issue, to inform all regional centres and NPQH offices of HEIs that are willing to consider awarding prior credit for masters programmes in this way.

Please note that this document in no way prescribes an admissions procedure for institutions. However, I believe that there are advantages in making use of it. In particular, NPQH candidates will be likely to generate better quality evidence for prior learning if they have clear and early notification of what is required. And, I guess, better quality NPQH work may result from an understanding of how useful the academic and theoretical insights can be in a professional context.

Although you may wish to make your own arrangements on this matter, it will be helpful if UCET could be informed of your response to the document. This will mean that we shall be able to ensure that the National College has an up-to-date list of HEIs willing to award prior credit for NPQH in this way. It will also provide further evidence of the professional relevance of masters provision. As you are aware, government is currently reviewing the funding of accredited CPD for the teaching profession. UCET has repeatedly argued to government that the work of HEIs is crucial to the CPD Strategy of the DfES and that it is of great value to the teaching profession. Any reinforcement of these arguments will, therefore, be helpful.

If your institution is willing to consider awarding prior credit in this way, please contact Martin Coles at the National College for School Leadership (martin.coles@ncsl.org.uk), telephone: 0870 001 1155.

If you wish to discuss any of the above my email address is cliffj@liv.ac.uk and I can be contacted at Department of Education, 19 Abercromby Square, Liverpool, L69 7ZG, or on 0151 794 2497.

If you wish to inform UCET of your intentions regarding this method of awarding prior credit for NPQH please contact Mary Russell by email: m.russell@ioe.ac.uk; by telephone: 020 7580 8000.

Cliff Jones Chair, UCET CPD Committee

U C E T

Universities Council for the Education of Teachers   A Registered Charity (No 275082)

Accrediting NPQH at Masters Level

1. The National College have proposed that HEIs admit participants to Masters programmes in Leadership and Management with 33% credit (60 points at M level), providing that they hold an NPQH certificate and produce for assessment by the HEI to which they have applied an appropriate piece of written work.

2. Each member of UCET remains in a position to operate its own policies concerning admission.

3. There are, however, advantages to be gained from arriving at some agreement about the subject matter of the piece of written work and about how it might be assessed.

4. What follows was distributed in draft form for consideration by the CPD Committee at its meeting on 24 October 2002. It is a draft assignment together with a suggestion of the kind of assessment criteria that might be used to examine the work when submitted. The criteria are intended to relate to QAA descriptors for a qualification at M level and also to connect with those used by individual HEIs for M level work undertaken by professionals in the field of education. It is not intended to encompass all the assessment criteria that we might use because the size of the work being asked for is no more than five thousand words. I am grateful for colleagues who contributed to the negotiation with the National College and to members of the committee who gave me feedback prior to the meeting. The current draft (enclosed below) incorporates changes suggested before and during the meeting of the CPD Committee.

5. There are considerable advantages to be gained by all parties if participants embarking upon NPQH programmes are made aware at the outset of opportunities for the accreditation of prior learning.

    A critical commentary of four to five thousand words upon the professional development undertaken for and during the NPQH programme.

    Note: the critical commentary shall engage not only with evidence of professional development generated during the NPQH programme but also, where appropriate, with other relevant professional development. In other words, although the commentary is between only four and five thousand words, it will interrogate an evidence base much larger that has been generated by the participant on the NPQH programme. That

evidence base is likely to include the School Improvement Project /Work carried out for NPQH.

The proposed structure of the commentary is as follows.

- The **background and professional purpose** lying behind the decision to undertake the NPQH programme. This might, for example, outline the personal, professional and national environments that provide individuals with reasons for embarking upon this kind of professional development; and it might include the intended personal professional outcomes of the participant at the outset.
- Description of the **key features** of the programme and **critical factors** affecting its completion.
- Identification of **relevant literature**. This might include: regulatory, official and inspection literature such as the National Standards and OfSTED frameworks; and professional literature such as school policy documents; **but it must include academic literature** in order to gain the kind of insights that HEIs would expect a participant to have if being awarded prior credit. (This approach to literature reflects the different perspectives outlined in the UCET principles for examining portfolio evidence at Masters level).
- Evidence of **engagement with literature** rather than a simple listing of the views or statements of authors. In other words an applicant should be able to gain insight to the NPQH programme by the use of academic and other relevant literature and also be able to make use of professional experience to challenge such literature when appropriate.
- Identification of **key concepts and general principles based upon evidence and the use of academic and other literature**. The ability to examine the nature, strength and significance of evidence is likely to be crucial for all participants on Masters programmes.
- Discussion of and critical reflection upon what has been learned. This should allow for **consideration of unexpected evidence for unintended outcomes.** It should also employ the insights gained from literature and demonstrate an awareness of the limitations of the professional development undertaken.
- Reference to how what has been learned from the programme will lead to **future professional action and further study.**
- **A list of sources** used in the assignment.

Assessment criteria

I suggest that the above will make it possible to employ assessment criteria such as:

    1. systematic understanding of relevant knowledge;

2. critical awareness of and insight to the current professional environment;
3. use of academic techniques of enquiry;
4. communication of well grounded conclusions to an appropriate audience;
5. a personal professional voice;
6. independent learning and potential for further development.

Cliff Jones
Chair, UCET CPD Committee

Nov 2002

ANNEX FIVE: Report on a meeting between David Milliband and UCET on 27th May 2003

I think that the report, prepared for the UCET Executive but since circulated to all members of the CPD Committee, speaks for itself. Since that meeting the TTA has been given responsibility for devising the new bid specification for accredited CPD in England and UCET is invited to play a full part in the process.

David Milliband also spoke at the GTC(E) conference on Recruitment and Retention on 24th June 2003. It was interesting to hear him respond to a question about initiatives and the earmarking of funds. Clearly he realises there is an issue. In the body of this paper I used the word "ironic" to describe what it felt to have lost initiatives that at first we had complained about but eventually learned to make effective. Milliband used the same word to describe the same thing. I hope for a slight rethink.

Report on the meeting with David Miliband, 27th. May 2003

1. **UCET was represented by Mary, Peter and Cliff.**

2. **David Milliband was not accompanied by civil servants.**

3. **As a result he was not in a position to refer to DfES experts, particularly in relation to the Report on the funding of accredited CPD, but this meant that he did his own thinking and we were more able to develop points.**

4. **We made reference to option F in the Report (we had received a letter from the DfES saying that he accepted the Report so we felt confident that since F was the most highly recommended option it would be the one chosen by him) and made three major points:**

    - **some of the unspent money in the grant could be used to increase the unit of resource, thereby making bidding more attractive to HE;**
    - **UCET would be prepared to develop principles for partnerships and consortia styles of working and would organise the involvement of other stakeholders if he was prepared to fund us;**
    - **in the long term there could be considerable benefits (including cost effectiveness) in making it easier to work across ITT, CPD and research (we mentioned, among other things, differing bidding and inspection regimes that prevent easy planning across the three components).**

5. **He responded positively to each point and, in particular, asked for a proposal from UCET for the DfES to fund the development of principles for consortia and partnerships for accredited CPD. This is particularly important because it features very strongly in the Report. The UCET CPD Committee has actually already begun the process of developing such principles and discussed a draft at its last committee meeting. (It is not, by the way, intended that partnerships and consortia should be the exclusive way of working in accredited CPD).**

6. **The proposal is that UCET shall draft principles, together with some models of how they might be implemented, circulate them for comment by the CPD Committee and Executive, modify as a result of the consultation then invite representatives of other stakeholders (GTCE, unions, LEAs, Regional CPD Advisers etc,) to a Friday/Saturday residential conference. It is hoped that this could be accomplished prior to the UCET National Conference at which a session could be devoted to it; and it is also intended that what is learned can inform the writing of the bid specification for the next**

round of funding. Based on previous years the bid specification should be made public before the end of July 2004. (The proposal is to go directly to him).

7. **It seems wise to include in the proposal a short section reiterating the three points listed at 4 above.**

8. **He also responded positively to our argument that we should be involved in the process of writing the bid specification.**

9. **Other points upon which we seemed to agree include:**

    - **Performance Management is unsatisfactory;**
    - **it is not good enough for teachers to collect all their schemes of work, for example, and expect automatic credit;**
    - **the need for culture change if CPD is to reach more teachers more effectivly;**
    - **the need to develop the "thinking professional" (his phrase).**

10. **We also spent some time ensuring that he understood the financial fragility of accredited CPD at £552 per participant per year and how each component of our work (ITT/E, CPD and Research) can be weakened by too much pressure upon or loss of another. We made sure that he was aware that some HEIs had already decided that the entire enterprise of developing educational professionals in the UK was not worth continuing.**

11. **I shall draft the proposal as early as possible.**

Cliff Jones
June 1st. 2003