



SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE

**FIRST STAGE REVIEW OF INITIAL
TEACHER EDUCATION**

ACTION PLAN

NOVEMBER 2001

CONTENTS	PAGE
A. Introduction	1
Background	1
Overall Response to Report	2
SEED Overall Approach	3
Review Implementation Group	4
B. Process Mapping of Initial Teacher Education	4
C. Partnerships	4
D. Placements	6
E. Experience of TEI Staff	7
F. Information & Communications Technology	8
G. Behaviour Management	10
H. SEN in Mainstream Schools	11
I. Health Education	12
J. Second Stage of Review	13
Future Options for ITE Programmes	13
Teacher Development Partnerships	14
Funding of ITE	15
Strategic Oversight and Direction	15
K. Summary of Recommendations and Action Points in date priority order	17
Annex A – List of Respondents to Consultation Paper	
Annex B – Summary of Abbreviations	

If you would like to contact us about this Action Plan, please contact: Robin McKendrick, Scottish Executive Education Department, Teachers and Schools Division, Area 2 A (North), Victoria Quay, Edinburgh, EH6 6QQ, or call 0131 244 0998.

A. INTRODUCTION

This paper is a plan for implementation of changes as a result of the first stage of the review of initial teacher education.

Background

1. As a result of the negotiations consequent to the McCrone report an *Agreement on a Teaching Profession for the 21st Century* was concluded between the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED), local authorities and teacher organisations. One part of the agreement was that SEED would review initial teacher education (ITE). However, there was concern about the timing of such a review. It was not felt to be appropriate to conduct a wholesale re-examination of ITE without having a clear picture of what will be required of teachers in the 21st century, and, in particular, it would be premature to redesign ITE before outcomes from the National Debate to commence next year. It was therefore decided that this review would take place in two stages; the first stage would be an examination of a few specific areas in need of attention, while the second stage would be a full-scale review of ITE. The second stage will develop with, follow on from and be informed by the National Debate.

2. The remit for the first stage of the review of ITE was;

- Examine issues identified as being capable of review at this stage, and make specific recommendations for improvement as part of an actionable report. This first objective will be the principal area of work. The 7 topic areas to be covered are;
 - **Student Placements in Schools.** As a result of a 1997 report by the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) on placements, and a survey of the cost of placements by Deloitte & Touche on behalf of SEED and GTCS, it is clear there is much that is unsatisfactory about current provision. A first stage review would produce recommendations capable of enactment prior to the start of 2001-02 session.
 - **Partnership Arrangements.** Currently in place between Education Authorities and Teaching Educational Institutions in order that localised needs can be taken into consideration when decisions are being taken on the numbers in specific courses are determined. The extent to which the aforementioned actually happens is a matter of debate and as such an analysis of the current partnership agreements currently in place, with recommendations being made as to future arrangements would be a useful contribution.
 - **ITE teaching staff.** The McCrone report makes specific mention of the lack of recent classroom experience of ITE staff. During the consultations newly qualified teachers highlighted this as a particular problem. A review would recommend action for giving regular classroom experience to ITE teaching staff.
 - **ICT.** SEED has carried out an investigation of the use of ICT in Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) and has produced guidelines. It was noted that some institutions are using ICT better than others. Many lecturers, while using computers for their own notes and coursework, do not use ICT well in teaching, and while the students are

taught how to teach ICT to some extent their own learning is not particularly ICT based. The first stage review will identify how TEIs could best utilise emerging technology to improve learning and teaching and make recommendations regarding action, and TEIs will be required to implement these.

- **Classroom behaviour management.** While this is also an issue for a later review in the sense that it is dependent on the nature of class organisation, it was an aspect of ITE that recently qualified teachers have identified for criticism. McCrone also recommended that more attention be given to issues of pupil management. In light of the current perceptions regarding pupil behaviour the first stage review would look at how TEIs prepare students in this area and propose immediate improvements.
 - **Special Educational Needs (SEN).** Current policy is to mainstream as far as possible SEN pupils within ordinary schools. This creates issues for teachers, who must be capable of teaching and integrating SEN children with the rest of the class. It is essential that newly qualified teachers be adequately prepared to cope with the additional pressures mainstreaming brings.
 - **Health Education.** The report will contain recommendations for the implementation of the relevant parts of the *Report of the Working Group on Sex Education in Scottish Schools* and the *Final Report of the School Drug Safety Team*. The Scottish Executive Education Department has agreed to review the initial training teachers receive in these two areas.”
- Map current programme structures and practice. The Scottish Executive requires a clear picture of how teachers are educated at present to enable informed decisions to be made.
 - Prepare the ground for the second stage of the review. This will mean identifying the priorities and areas for concern and considering what structural and strategic changes should be made.

3. The contract for the review was awarded to Deloitte & Touche, who commenced work in April 2001, with the final report being published in June 2001. It can be accessed on-line at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library3/education/tefs-00.asp>.

4. A consultation paper was issued to all stakeholders along with the report, and the consultation period closed in September 2001.

Overall Response to Report

5. Thirty-two (32) responses to the Consultation have been received, and in general they are very positive. Many respondents noted the tight timescale given to the consultants, but most note that this has not prevented the production of a useful report. Concerns were also raised about the timing of the consultation, coming as it did over the summer holidays. While we accept that this was not ideal, five weeks were allowed for after the start of term, all late responses were accepted, and given the tight timescale for implementation of *The Agreement on a Teaching Profession for the 21st Century* there was little alternative.

6. The significant proposal for Teacher Development Partnerships was widely approved, and although there were questions around specifics and improvements suggested, the core

recommendations were accepted and will be implemented. It was recognised that arrangements must be flexible enough to incorporate current good practice.

7. Placements, as an essential element of partnerships, were recognised universally as of fundamental importance in ITE. The need for quality, structured placements was not disputed, and clearly, with the significant increase in ITE intake it is imperative that standards do not fall. Together with partnerships, placements were seen as an essential starting point for improving ITE.

8. A list of all respondents to the Consultation Paper is attached at Annex A.

SEED Overall Approach

9. SEED have decided to prioritise sections and recommendations from the report to ensure that the key, structural basis is in place for session 2002-03. It is essential that the necessary structures are in place to underpin any other improvements. In particular, this means that a national network of Teacher Development Partnerships (TDPs) must be in place, and they must be supporting an improved system of placements. These two aspects are SEED's main priorities, as they will have the greatest impact on the system and will facilitate the effective implementation of all other recommendations. Only through partnership arrangements can the employers and TEIs ensure that the right numbers are trained in the right subjects, and in the right places. With a significant proportion of ITE spent in schools, there can be no doubt that any improvements in ITE require a corresponding consolidation to placements. That is not to say that we do not consider other sections of the report to be important; as will be seen below, practical plans have been made for introduction of recommendations here too. However, it is essential that TDPs are in place to support any other changes to ITE, and there is no question that TDPs have been widely accepted as needed.

10. Our priority in placements is based on two aspects; that Service Level Agreements (SLAs) need to be in place to describe roles and responsibilities, and that guidance on, and a matrix mapping, the assessment criteria of each TEI. This will be done within the context of a national framework for TDPs.

11. The implementation will thus be done in two overlapping phases. Phase 1 will be the TDP and placement development and is expected to be entirely in place for Session 2002-03. Phase 2, meanwhile, will pick up on all other aspects of the review. We will immediately ask the TEIs to tell us which of the recommendations in these areas they intend to implement forthwith, and we will ask them to report on progress made towards these goals in June 2002. Time to look at other, more difficult recommendations will only become available once Phase 1 is completed.

12. The number in brackets after each recommendation in the text following relates to where that recommendation can be found in the Deloitte & Touche Report.

13. REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

14. Implementation of changes will require substantial input from the key stakeholders. As a result we intend to form an Initial Teacher Education Review Implementation Group (ITERIG), incorporating SEED (who would chair), the Scottish Teacher Education Committee (STEC), the Association of Directors of Education in Scotland (ADES), CoSLA, GTCS, and the National Union of Students. This group will be required to meet at least monthly from December 2001 to March 2002, and will also have an important meeting in June 2002 to ensure implementation of the relevant sections of the Action Plan for session 2002-03.

B. PROCESS MAPPING OF INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION

Recommendation

- Process maps for ITE programmes in Scotland should be made freely available to researchers, policy-makers and others in digital form on an appropriate web-site so that they may be periodically updated as a resource for the sector. Intending students should be directed to the process maps so that they can explore the course contents and approaches of the various programmes to the depth that they wish in order to inform their choice of programme. (3.3)

Consideration

There is considerable merit in the above recommendation and this was reflected in a number of responses to the report. Not only would it be an extremely useful reference document it would, as the report suggests, provide valuable information to intending students. As potential students are being directed to the “teachingonscotland.com” web site it would make sense to locate the Process Maps in a section of that site.

Action

1. SEED will investigate the implications of providing access to the Process Maps on the teachinginscotland.com web-site by June 2002.
2. The regularity of updates to the information will be considered and discussions will take place between SEED and number of our Educational partners about the practical implications of such a development by June 2002.

C. PARTNERSHIPS

Recommendations

- A common framework for establishing partnership agreements should be introduced to place the arrangements on a more formal and consistent basis across Scotland. Such a framework should be flexible enough to incorporate existing local good practice and in particular should be framed in terms which are not onerous to those TEIs and Education Authorities which already work well in this respect. (4.4.1.)

- Those elements of a wider partnership framework which specifically address placements and forward resource planning should be agreed by January 2002, with the overall partnership framework agreed and in place for the start of the Session 2002/03. (4.4.1.)
- The formal agreements, or Teacher Development Partnerships, should take the form of service level agreements between the parties. The TDP would clearly articulate the roles and responsibilities of each party to the agreement, expected service delivery methods and outcomes. (4.4.1.)
- SEED should take lead responsibility in drafting a framework TDP agreement, but involve the other major stakeholders closely in doing so. (4.4.1.)
- The parties to each TDP should be:
 - Education Authorities;
 - TEIs;
 - schools;
 - teaching staff (as a body, not as individuals); and
 - students (as a body, not as individuals). (4.4.1.)
- The model TDP should incorporate the advice on roles and responsibilities of the parties provided by the earlier GTCS Working Group on Partnership in Initial Teacher Education. (4.4.2.)
- SEED should consider, with the full involvement of the partners in ITE, their respective roles in implementing a model of best practice in ITE partnership across Scotland. (4.4.2.)

Consideration

These recommendations were widely welcomed by consultation respondents, and SEED agrees with all of them in principle. The main recommendation is that SEED lead the development of a national framework for Teacher Development Partnerships (TDPs), and this is entirely accepted.

Action

3. The national framework for TDPs will be expedited through the implementation group, ITERIG, with SEED leading, with a target of early 2002. This will be based on the recommendations above, and will particular emphasis on teacher recruitment, supply and placements.
4. The TEIs, local authorities and schools will then be responsible for creating TDPs between them by June 2002. TDPs are to be lodged with SEED by this date.
5. All Local Authorities will be covered by TDPs.

D. PLACEMENTS

Recommendations

- Formal arrangements to introduce greater consistency of organisation of school placements, and to raise the threshold standards, should be introduced as a matter of some urgency within our earlier proposal for the development of a framework for partnerships, led by SEED. (5.4.1.)
- Such formal arrangements should take the form of a service level agreement between the interested parties, which are:
 - Education Authorities;
 - TEIs;
 - schools;
 - teachers (individually for those involved in the placement activities); and
 - students (individually). (5.4.1.)
- The contents of a 'model' TDP should include:
 - responsibility to guarantee placement volumes;
 - responsibility to guarantee placement periods;
 - responsibility to guarantee placement quality, as defined by -
 - level of support from qualified teachers;
 - level of support by TEI staff;
 - level of input by student to activities outside of the classroom;
 - level of exposure of the student to particular curriculum areas during the placement;
 - curricular expectations and areas of professional practice; and
 - assessment process, roles and responsibilities. (5.4.1.)
- TEIs should work with their partner schools to define respective roles and responsibilities for placement induction. (5.4.1.)
- The placement identification and management elements of TDPs, and arrangements for allocating 'training year' teachers, should be agreed by January 2002. (5.4.1.)
- Assessment processes for students on placement should be considered in the light of the national profile of professional experience which is currently being introduced throughout Scotland and will take effect from June 2002. (5.4.2.)
- In order to assist schools in achieving consistency of assessment of student teachers across TEIs, STEC should be invited to develop a matrix to show how the various TEI assessment scales - benchmarked on the pass/fail point in each case — map on to each other. (5.4.2.)
- Clear, unambiguous and timeous guidance should be issued to all schools, TEI staff and students on the processes of assessment. Training for supervising teaching staff in schools should be made available by the TEI within a CPD framework to ensure consistency of application of the process. As indicated previously, attention should be given to develop

this aspect of professional activity within the framework of the recommended TDP. (5.4.2.)

- Further research and consultation is undertaken, once partnership frameworks are widely established, to determine how support might be given- perhaps better targeted- to those schools which provide student placements and how placements might be most effectively planned and organised (5.4.3)

Consideration

SEED considers all of these recommendations to be useful, and insofar as they relate to placements we intend to implement them in full.

Elements relating to the training year are being developed by the Induction Implementation Group (IIG), comprising SEED, GTCS, ADES, COSLA, SHEFC and teacher organisations, and it is felt appropriate that it will be a decision for this group whether training year arrangements should come under TDPs. However, this recommendation has merit and we will pursue the connection of induction arrangements to TDPs with key stakeholders.

Action

6. The national framework for TDPs will detail what should be included in Service Level Agreements (SLAs) covering placements. This should be based on the recommendations above, but should also include coverage of the National Priorities.
7. SLAs are to be put in place between TEIs, LAs, schools, students and teachers. They are to form part of the higher-level TDP and must be in place by June 2002 to ensure availability for Session 2002-03.
8. STEC are to be asked to lead the production of guidance on assessment, and a matrix showing how each TEIs' assessment criteria map on to each other. They should include the GTCS and QAA in development. This must be prepared by June 2002. They should in the course of this development consider how far they can homogenise assessment processes and gradings.
9. STEC should identify how best to train teachers in the assessment procedures they are to use to evaluate students on placements.
10. SEED will ensure that further work on research and consultation is undertaken in due course and once partnership frameworks are in place on how support might be targeted to those schools which provide student placements and how placements might be most effectively planned and organised

E. EXPERIENCE OF TEI STAFF

Recommendations

- Current good practice in secondments and classroom-based research should be encouraged and extended where possible. (6.4.1.)

- CPD courses and self-directed learning for TEI staff should be focused on the changing competency requirements for student teachers. (6.4.2.)
- SEED should give active consideration, with other stakeholders, to the scope and best means of achieving an extension of serving teacher inputs into ITE through secondments, linked to emerging competences and CPD requirements for Chartered Teachers, and should implement such an extension as appropriate. (6.4.3.)

Consideration

This element of the review has its roots in the McCrone report, which enunciated the concerns of students and newly qualified teachers who felt that ITE staff were not sufficiently familiar with the current environment in schools and classrooms. However, it was not universally agreed that there was legitimate cause for concern about the experience of ITE staff, and SEED had to balance these perspectives. During the course of the review it emerged that there is a body of opinion to support the contention that ITE staff could have more relevant experience.

Nonetheless, there are also barriers to tackling this issue. The divergence between the pay of most teachers that of ITE staff mean that there are difficulties for TEIs in seconding, or even recruiting, from the teaching profession. It was also generally agreed that it is not necessarily of any utility to immerse ITE staff in the classroom at intervals. Also, due to the emphasis on publishable research to secure funding now that TEIs are all in, or imminently will be in, the HE sector, there is a disincentive to having ITE staff undertaking ‘action’ research work.

The recommendations above were made within these constraints, and are accepted as such.

Action

11. TEIs are to investigate how current good practice in secondments and classroom-based research can be encouraged and extended where possible, and how CPD courses and self-directed learning for TEI staff can be focused on the changing competency requirements for student teachers. They should detail how they envisage such development at the first meeting of ITERIG, and report on progress made in June 2002.
12. SEED will raise with the Ministerial Strategy Committee on CPD the extension of secondments of teachers into TEIs, especially in the context of the Chartered Teacher programme.

F. INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY

Recommendations

- Consideration should be given to the extension of the successful ‘computers for teachers’ programme of supported purchase to student teachers who are undertaking an approved ITE course, to support their familiarisation with personal computer usage. (7.4.1.)

- The Minister should write to TEIs asking them, wherever possible at this stage, to shift the balance of ICT consideration in their ITE programmes away from generic skills development and discussion and more exclusively towards the consideration of the professional and pedagogic implications of ICT and the likely impacts on the future roles of the teacher of emerging models of digital learning environments. (7.4.1.)

(The following recommendations are made within this review but phased for implementation from session 2002-03 to allow the essential time for planning and introduction.)

- A less prescriptive statement of teacher competence and programme requirement in the area of ICT should be developed which would facilitate continual review and updating of ITE programmes to reflect the change elements identified here. (7.4.2.)
- There should be a shift of focus in all TEIs away from concern with students' generic ICT skills and towards appropriate ICT resource selection, best practice in implementing ICT approaches in school education and the understanding of digital learning environments and their likely impacts on teachers' professional roles and required skills. (7.4.2.) Feb 2002
- There should be an entry requirement or, failing which, an early-programme assessment that students can demonstrate core ICT skills and understanding to an appropriate (we would suggest 'European Union Driving Licence') standard, with remediation where appropriate through self-directed study or corporate support. The objective should be to clear basic ICT skills and generic issues from the ITE curriculum to facilitate a clearer focus on professional issues. (7.4.2.)
- All student teachers should be exposed to best practice in the rapidly-evolving application of ICT to school education by visits to appropriate demonstration sites and by the incorporation of sessions on the practical application of learning environments from competent practitioners, and that the adequacy of ICT use in a school is given greater weight in deciding on placements. (7.4.2.)
- Guidance on ICT-related competences and the linked framework for future collaborative review of TEIs should be reviewed to encourage TEIs to revise the treatment of ICT — as an issue area, set of competences and practical working environment for student teachers — in ITE programmes as part of their annual review and programme planning cycle. (7.4.2.)

Consideration

The Minister for Education, Europe and External Affairs has recently announced a Review of Entry Requirements to ITE. The recommendations in this section relating to ICT would more appropriately be dealt with by the review group, although SEED accept the principle that such a requirement should exist.

Action

13. SEED will consider this recommendation on the shift away from generic skills in discussion with the TEIs by August 2002
14. Consideration will be given to extending 'Computers for Teachers' to students in the context of any future round of this scheme.
15. In the longer term all the recommendations in 7.4.2 will be considered with the TEIs.
16. SEED will consider the introduction of an ICT element to the entry requirements for ITE, or an early-programme requirement in ICT, through the Review of Entry Requirements who will report on developments in February 2002.

G. BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT

Recommendations

- A forum for the identification and disseminate of good practice in behavioural management in schools should be established, including TEI and Education Authority staff, senior teachers, advisors and policy makers in its membership. (8.4.1.)
- TEIs should assimilate specific examples of, and advice on, 'best practice' in behaviour management in schools into appropriate courses, where that does not already happen. (8.4.2.)
- TEIs should set their treatment of behaviour management in ITE in the context of ongoing teacher development, so that students understand that the ITE 'survival pack' is merely the start of life-long learning in this as in other areas. (8.4.3.)
- TEIs should work with their partner schools to define respective roles and responsibilities for placement induction, which is particularly significant for behaviour management. This links with our recommendations for partnerships and placements in sections 4 and 5. (8.4.4.)
- Within this, placement induction packs containing information on school behavioural management and discipline policies should be prepared and made available to students in advance of the placement. (8.4.4.)

Consideration

SEED fully accept and understand that this is a complex area creating considerable pressure for students and new teachers. There are no easy and obvious answers, however the recent work of the Discipline Task Group showed possible ways forward for teachers at all stages of their career. For example, much may be gained by reflecting upon the relationship between behaviour and learning and teaching. Working with parents/cares may promote more positive relationships and the reflection of pupils' and teachers views makes revealing reading. We will return to behaviour management in the second stage of the review of ITE.

In any case, SEED feel that the recommendations above are helpful and can contribute to increasing the competence and confidence of new teachers.

Action

17. TEIs should draw together specific examples of, and advice on, 'good practice' in behaviour management in schools into appropriate courses, where that does not already happen. In doing so should be aware that Discipline Task Group made recommendations on the establishment on a national mechanism for identifying, evaluating and disseminating good practice which when implemented will provide a relevant resource of practical information.
18. The TEIs should also set their treatment of behaviour management in ITE in the context of ongoing teacher development, so that students understand that the ITE 'survival pack' is merely the start of life-long learning in this as in other areas. How TEIs intend to do this should be explained at the first meeting of ITERIG, and a report on progress should be made in June 2002.
19. This issue will be reconsidered during the second stage of the review.

H. SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

Recommendations

- Students should be provided by their overall ITE programmes with clear models of best practice in collaborative approaches which can benefit children with SEN, and which can support classroom teachers in a better understanding of their own role. (9.4.1.)
- TEIs should offer to all students short visits to appropriate learning environments where addressing SEN is a significant consideration. This exposure to SEN issues and environments should be in addition to that which may be found in ITE placements and elective studies of SEN. (9.4.1.)

Consideration

Most children with special educational needs are already in mainstream schools. It is, therefore, important that new teachers have an understanding of the range of special educational needs, feel confident working with these children, and know what to do when they need support. Within ITE it is not possible, nor desirable, to attempt to prepare teachers to work effectively across the full range of special educational needs. However, that does not mean that there are not options available to increase competence and confidence. The recommendations made above are felt to be useful measures in achieving these goals.

Action

20. Students should be provided by their overall ITE programmes with clear models of best practice in collaborative approaches which can benefit children with SEN, and which can support classroom teachers in a better understanding of their own role.

21. TEIs should offer to all students short visits to appropriate learning environments, which need not necessarily be schools, where addressing SEN is a significant consideration. This exposure to SEN issues and environments should be in addition to that which may be found in ITE placements and elective studies of SEN.
22. TEIs should detail how they plan to action the above recommendations at the first meeting of ITERIG, and a progress report made in June 2002.
23. This issue will be reconsidered during the second stage of the review.

I. HEALTH EDUCATION

Recommendations

- Development of the partnership agreements should *inter alia* address the roles and responsibilities of the TEI, the school, the supervising teacher and the student with regard to placement experience in the field of health education, particularly in the areas of sex and drugs. (10.4.1.)
- The Ministerial Committee for CPD should consider a 'mapping' of the development of core competences and skills (including those in health education) across ITE, the probationary year and CPD. (10.4.2.)

Consideration

The purpose of this section of the review was to consider the response of the Scottish Executive to the relevant parts of the *Report of the Working Group on Sex Education in Scottish Schools* and the *Final Report of the School Drug Safety Team*. It was felt more appropriate to consider these issues together within the context of health education.

Health education cannot simply be regarded as a stand-alone subject, in which pupils are to be taught. Rather, healthy lifestyles and choices are more the product of self-respect than instruction. This implies that it is for all teachers in all subjects and at all levels to consider how their teaching encourages self-respect in their pupils, and thus for TEIs to ensure that teachers understand the correlation between happiness and confidence, and healthy lifestyles.

It was clearly not possible to tackle in depth the issues here, but the recommendations can help students at least gain an appreciation of the health education in practice.

The second recommendation made is of some significance and, although it is raised in the context of health education, it covers the full gamut of ITE. SEED feel that this is a very useful way of tying the various stages of development in the teaching profession together. However, it is for the Ministerial Strategy Committee to decide if they wish to undertake this work and so a decision on

This issue will be reconsidered during the second stage of the review.

Action

24. Development of the partnership agreements should *inter alia* address the roles and responsibilities of the TEI, the school, the supervising teacher and the student with regard to placement experience in the field of health education, particularly in the areas of sex and drugs. TEIs should address this within the context of the service level agreements on placements.
25. The Ministerial Committee for CPD will be invited to consider 'mapping' the development of core competences and skills (including those in health education) across ITE, the probationary year and CPD.
26. This issue will be reconsidered during the second stage of the review.

J. SECOND STAGE OF THE REVIEW

The purpose of having the review in two stages was to allow time for a fuller picture of what would be required of the teacher in the 21st century to develop, and the first stage of the review has allowed some concepts to coagulate into the recommendations found below.

When the consultants were engaged the Scottish Executive had not declared how it intended to clarify the vision for the teacher in the 21st century. However, we now know that we will be facilitating a “National Debate” on education, which will be informed by, incorporate, and inform the second stage of the review. This is due to get underway in the new year and it will be the catalyst for sharpening the vision of the future.

The consultants were invited to scope issues for the second stage of the review, and their recommendations, with our comments, are detailed below. It is also important to note that we will be revisiting some of the more complex issues arising from the first stage report to ensure that we do all that can be done in these fundamental areas.

Future Options for ITE Programmes

Recommendations

Fundamental consideration should be given to the ways in which the ITE curriculum, especially in post-graduate programmes, can focus more on equipping student teachers with skills and competences for life-long-learning — ‘learning how to learn’ - rather than with proximate skills and knowledge which will become redundant. (11.1.1.)

Following logically from that should be a review of options for the implementation of that revised curriculum. (11.1.2.)

The review of options for ITE programmes should not be restricted to structural matters, but should incorporate new styles of learning as appropriate. (11.1.2.)

The second stage review of ITE should monitor and report on the progress made in implementing our recommendation (at 6.4.3.) that consideration be given to extending the

practice of secondments into ITE programmes of senior serving teachers, and linking this to CPD requirements for Chartered Teachers. (11.1.3.)

The review we suggest of 'best practice' in styles and modes of learning should specifically incorporate research and review to clarify the disputed issue of how best to articulate ITE course content with changing classroom experience. (11.1.3.)

The curricular content of the placement experience in respect *inter alia* of health education should be reviewed as part of a wider stage 2 review of the ITE curriculum. (10.4.1.)

Comments

SEED recognises that there is a huge amount for students to learn, and that both the PGCE and BEd courses have to carry a mass of content. As more and more is expected of teachers in topics not normally expected of them such as languages, sports, personal development and legal background, it will not be possible to simply add courses. Instead, ITE must create the foundations for a career of reflective professionalism and continuous development. To do this students must not only learn the essentials; they must, as the report states, learn how to learn.

The principles of the above recommendations are accepted, but at this stage we cannot say with any great certainty what specific steps will be taken. The course outlined above will nonetheless act as a starting point.

Teacher Development Partnerships

Recommendations

Consultancy support should be given in stage 2 to reviewing progress in the establishment of these partnerships across Scotland and assisting in completing the task of compiling guidance on core elements of teacher development partnerships. (11.2.)

This guidance on TDPs should incorporate the 'best practice' lessons of partnership implementation across the public sector from the wider advisory literature on partnerships. (11.2.)

The consultancy support in stage 2 of this review should specifically incorporate a review of emerging best practice in assessment and reporting in ITE. (11.2.3.)

Review of partnership roles in assessment should include consideration of appropriate roles and responsibilities in assessment, should the Training Year be more closely integrated with TEI-based ITE programmes. (11.2.3.)

The consultancy support to partnership development in stage 2 of this review should specifically incorporate empirical review of emerging best practice in placements, including advice on which elements of early teacher development should be addressed through a more consistent placement experience and which through other activities. (11.2.1.)

Stage 2 of this review should develop a comprehensive 'mapping' of student teacher recruitment, placement and first appointment by TEI. (11.2.2.)

This could be extended, if the Minister so wishes, to a consideration of the most efficient locational pattern for the future provision of ITE programmes in Scotland. (11.2.2.)

Comments

The introduction of TDPs will be a major innovation in ITE and teacher supply in Scotland. There is no doubt that evaluations will be required, adjustments made and best practice shared around the country. ITERIG will consider how to ensure that the potential of TDPs is maximised.

As with the section on Future Options for ITE Programmes, it is too early to say for sure how we will achieve our aims for ensuring TDPs are of the highest possible quality and utility. Nevertheless the recommendations made above will very much inform our planning for revisiting TDPs in the second stage.

Funding of ITE

Recommendations

Funding of existing and potential options for ITE programmes will be an essential consideration within any 'stage 2' options appraisal of efficient and effective patterns of ITE for the future. (11.3.)

It would be helpful in particular to address the issue of the comparative financial treatment of the 'Concurrent Degree' model. (11.3.)

Stage 2 should incorporate a review of the support which Education Authorities give to schools which are active in offering placements, and develop 'best practice' advice on how support might be given - perhaps better targeted - to those schools which provide student placements, and how placements might most effectively be planned and organised in future within TDPs. (5.4.3. and 11.3.)

Comments

Funding is largely an issue for the Scottish Higher Education Funding Council (SHEFC), an executive non-departmental public body under the sponsorship of the Scottish Executive Enterprise and Lifelong Learning Department (ELLD). While SEED are key stakeholders in ITE, ELLD have responsibility for policy on funding for the higher and further education sectors. Any examination of funding would be lead by ELLD in partnership with SHEFC and SEED.

Strategic Oversight and Direction

Recommendation

Overall governance of ITE should be considered within 'stage 2' of this ITE review to ensure that there are no unnecessary duplications or impediments to policy modernisation in future, and recommendations made where appropriate to clarify agency responsibilities.

Comments

There are various stakeholders within ITE with differing roles and responsibilities. Scottish Ministers only have power to make directions regarding the content, nature and duration of courses. They also have the power of approving new courses. It is intended that the new quality assurance procedure of collaborative review encompass SEED, HMI, the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, the GTCS and other key stakeholders. SHEFC, an executive non-departmental public body, are responsible for financing ITE, and have recently conducted a review of funding structures.

It should also be borne in mind that TEIs themselves are no longer independent institutions, with Northern College scheduled to merge with the Universities of Aberdeen and Dundee before the end of the year.

The practical effect of all of this is that it may not be possible in all cases to ensure that a vision for the future modernisation of ITE can be put in place. Consideration needs to be given to the extent to which responsibilities can be, at least, better co-ordinated. Preferably, any vision of ITE for the teachers of the 21st century should be capable of realisation, and this can only be achieved through the enthusiastic support of all stakeholders.

The strategic oversight of ITE along with the legislative and practical framework of governance will be considered in the second stage of the review.

K. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS IN DATE PRIORITY ORDER

Recommendations	Action	Timescale	Responsibility
Common Framework for Partnership Arrangements			
<p>A common framework for establishing partnership agreements should be introduced to place the arrangements on a more formal and consistent basis across Scotland. Such a framework should be flexible enough to incorporate existing local good practice and in particular should be framed in terms which are not onerous to those TEIs and Education Authorities which already work well in this respect.</p> <p>Those elements of a wider partnership framework which specifically address placements and forward resource planning should be agreed by January 2002, with the overall partnership framework agreed and in place for the start of the Session 2002/03. (4.4.1.)</p> <p>The formal agreements, or Teacher Development Partnerships, should take the form of service level agreements between the parties. The TDP would clearly articulate the roles and responsibilities of each party to the agreement, expected service delivery methods and outcomes. (4.4.1.)</p> <p>SEED should take lead responsibility in drafting a framework TDP agreement, but involve the other major stakeholders closely in doing so. (4.4.1.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The national framework for TDPs will be expedited through the implementation group, ITERIG, with SEED leading, with a target of early 2002. This will be based on the recommendations in the report paragraphs 4.4.1, and 4.4.2. TDPs will particular emphasis on teacher recruitment, supply and placements. • The TEIs, local authorities and schools will then be responsible for creating TDPs between them by June 2002. TDPs are to be lodged with SEED by this date. • TDPs will cover all Local Authorities. 	Feb 2002	SEED in partnership with TEIs, L/As, and Schools.

<p>Common Framework for Partnership Arrangements (cont)</p> <p>The parties to each TDP should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Education Authorities; ➤ TEIs; ➤ schools; ➤ teaching staff (as a body, not as individuals); and ➤ students (as a body, not as individuals). (4.4.1.) <p>The model TDP should incorporate the advice on roles and responsibilities of the parties provided by the earlier GTCS Working Group on Partnership in Initial Teacher Education. (4.4.2.)</p> <p>SEED should consider, with the full involvement of the partners in ITE, their respective roles in implementing a model of best practice in ITE partnership across Scotland. (4.4.2.)</p>			
--	--	--	--

Recommendation	Action	Timescale	Responsibility
<p>Formalisation of Placement Arrangements</p> <p>Formal arrangements to introduce greater consistency of organisation of school placements, and to raise the threshold standards, should be introduced as a matter of some urgency within our earlier proposal for the development of a framework for partnerships, led by SEED. (5.4.1.)</p> <p>Such formal arrangements should take the form of a service level agreement between the interested parties, which are:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The national framework for TDPs will detail what should be included in Service Level Agreements (SLAs) covering placements. This should be based on the recommendations in the report, but should also include coverage of the National Priorities. 	<p>Feb 2002</p>	<p>SEED in partnership with TEIs, LAs schools students and teachers.</p>

<p>Formalisation of Placement Arrangements (cont.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Education Authorities; ➤ TEIs; ➤ schools; ➤ teachers (individually for those involved in the placement activities); and ➤ students (individually). (5.4.1.) <p>The contents of a 'model' TDP should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ responsibility to guarantee placement volumes; ➤ responsibility to guarantee placement periods; ➤ responsibility to guarantee placement quality, as defined by – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • level of support from qualified teachers; • level of support by TEI staff; • level of input by student to activities outside of the classroom; • level of exposure of the student to particular curriculum areas during the placement; • curricular expectations and areas of professional practice; and • assessment process, roles and responsibilities. (5.4.1.) <p>TEIs should work with their partner schools to define respective roles and responsibilities for placement induction. (5.4.1.)</p> <p>The placement identification and management elements of TDPs, and arrangements for allocating 'training year' teachers, should be agreed by January 2002. (5.4.1.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLAs are to be put in place between TEIs, LAs, schools, students and teachers. They are to form part of the higher-level TDP and must be in place by June 2002 to ensure availability for Session 2002-03. • Issues relating to the Induction arrangements for the “Training Year” Teachers are being considered by an Induction Implementation Group being led by SEED. 		
--	---	--	--

Recommendation	Action	Timescale	Responsibility
Information & Communications Technology			
There should be an entry requirement or, failing which, an early-programme assessment that students can demonstrate core ICT skills and understanding to an appropriate (we would suggest 'European Union Driving Licence') standard, with remediation where appropriate through self-directed study or corporate support. The objective should be to clear basic ICT skills and generic issues from the ITE curriculum to facilitate a clearer focus on professional issues. (7.4.2.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEED will consider the introduction of an ICT element to the entry requirements for ITE, or an early-programme requirement in ICT, through the Review of Entry Requirements. 	Feb 2002	SEED
Health Education			
The Ministerial Committee for CPD will be invited to consider 'mapping' the development of core competences and skills (including those in health education) across ITE, the probationary year and CPD. (10.4.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issues identified will be referred to the Ministerial Group on CPD for consideration 	Feb 2002	SEED

Process Mapping of Initial Teacher Education			
Process maps for ITE programmes in Scotland should be made freely available to researchers, policy-makers and others in digital form on an appropriate web-site so that they may be periodically updated as a resource for the sector. Intending students should be directed to the process maps so that they can explore the course contents and approaches of the various programmes to the depth that they wish in order to inform their choice of programme. (3.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEED will investigate the implications of providing access to the Process Maps on the teachinginscotland.com web-site. The regularity of updates to the information will be considered and discussions will take place between SEED and number of our Educational partners about the practical implications of such a development by June 2002. 	<p>June 2002</p> <p>June 2002</p>	<p>SEED</p> <p>SEED</p>

Recommendation	Action	Timescale	Responsibility
<p>Student Placement: Consistency of Assessment Processes and Documentation</p> <p>Assessment processes for students on placement should be considered in the light of the national profile of professional experience which is currently being introduced throughout Scotland and will take effect from June 2002. (5.4.2.)</p> <p>In order to assist schools in achieving consistency of assessment of student teachers across TEIs, STEC should be invited to develop a matrix to show how the various TEI assessment scales - benchmarked on the pass/fail point in each case — map on to each other. (5.4.2.)</p> <p>Clear, unambiguous and timeous guidance should be issued to all schools, TEI staff and students on the processes of assessment.</p> <p>Training for supervising teaching staff in schools should be made available by the TEI within a CPD framework to ensure consistency of application of the process. As indicated previously, attention should be given to develop this aspect of professional activity within the framework of the recommended TDP. (5.4.2.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STEC are to be asked to lead the production of guidance on assessment, and a matrix showing how each TEIs' assessment criteria map on to each other. They should include the GTCS and QAA in development. This must be prepared by June 2002. They should in the course of this development consider how far they can homogenise assessment processes and gradings. • STEC should identify how best to train teachers in the assessment procedures they are to use to evaluate students on placements. 	June 2002	STEC
<p>The Experience of ITE Teaching Staff</p>			
<p>Current good practice in secondments and classroom-based research should be encouraged and extended where possible. (6.4.1.)</p> <p>CPD courses and self-directed learning for TEI staff should be focused on the changing competency requirements for student teachers. (6.4.2.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIs are to investigate how current good practice in secondments and classroom-based research can be encouraged and extended where possible, and how CPD courses and self-directed learning for TEI staff can be focused on the changing competency requirements for student 	June 2002	TEIs

<p>Student Placement: Consistency of Assessment Processes and Documentation (continued)</p>	<p>teachers. They should detail how they envisage such development at the first meeting of ITERIG, and report on progress made in June 2002.</p>	<p>By June 2002</p>	<p>SEED</p>
<p>SEED should give active consideration, with other stakeholders, to the scope and best means of achieving an extension of serving teacher inputs into ITE through secondments, linked to emerging competences and CPD requirements for Chartered Teachers, and should implement such an extension as appropriate. (6.4.3.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEED will raise with the Ministerial Strategy Committee on CPD the extension of secondments of teachers into TEIs, especially in the context of the Chartered Teacher programme. 		

Recommendation	Action	Timescale	Responsibility
<p>Behaviour Management</p>			
<p>A forum for the identification and disseminate of good practice in behavioural management in schools should be established, including TEI and Education Authority staff, senior teachers, advisors and policy makers in its membership. (8.4.1.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEIs should draw together specific examples of, and advice on, ‘good practice’ in behaviour management in schools into appropriate courses, where that does not already happen. In doing so should be aware that Discipline Task Group made recommendations on the establishment on a national mechanism for identifying, evaluating and disseminating good practice which when implemented will provide a relevant resource of practical information. 	<p>June 2002</p>	<p>TEIs</p>
<p>TEIs should assimilate specific examples of, and advice on, ‘best practice’ in behaviour management in schools into appropriate courses, where that does not already happen. (8.4.2.)</p>			
<p>TEIs should set their treatment of behaviour management in ITE in the context of ongoing teacher development, so that students understand that the ITE ‘survival pack’ is merely the start of life-long learning in this as in other areas. (8.4.3.)</p>			

<p>Behaviour Management (cont.)</p> <p>TEIs should work with their partner schools to define respective roles and responsibilities for placement induction, which is particularly significant for behaviour management. This links with our recommendations for partnerships and placements in sections 4 and 5. (8.4.4.)</p> <p>Within this, placement induction packs containing information on school behavioural management and discipline policies should be prepared and made available to students in advance of the placement. (8.4.4.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TEIs should also set their treatment of behaviour management in ITE in the context of ongoing teacher development, so that students understand that the ITE ‘survival pack’ is merely the start of life-long learning in this as in other areas. How TEIs intend to do this should be explained at the first meeting of ITERIG, and a report on progress should be made in June 2002. • This issue will be reconsidered during the second stage of the review. 	June 2002	TEIs
--	---	-----------	------

Recommendation	Action	Timescale	Responsibility
<p>Health Education</p> <p>Development of the partnership agreements should <i>inter alia</i> address the roles and responsibilities of the TEI, the school, the supervising teacher and the student with regard to placement experience in the field of health education, particularly in the areas of sex and drugs. TEIs should address this within the context of the service level agreements on placements. (10.4.1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This issue will be reconsidered during the second stage of the review. • The responsibilities of each party, in regard to the issues identified in the report, will be addressed within the context of SLAs 	June 2002	TEIs

Recommendation	Action	Timescale	Responsibility
<p>Special Educational Needs</p> <p>Students should be provided by their overall ITE programmes with clear models of best practice in collaborative approaches which can benefit children with SEN, and which can support classroom teachers in a better understanding of their own role. (9.4.1.)</p> <p>TEIs should offer to all students short visits to appropriate learning environments where addressing SEN is a significant consideration. This exposure to SEN issues and environments should be in addition to that which may be found in ITE placements and elective studies of SEN. (9.4.1.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students should be provided by their overall ITE programmes with clear models of best practice in collaborative approaches which can benefit children with SEN, and which can support classroom teachers in a better understanding of their own role. • TEIs should offer to all students short visits to appropriate learning environments, which need not necessarily be schools, where addressing SEN is a significant consideration. This exposure to SEN issues and environments should be in addition to that which may be found in ITE placements and elective studies of SEN. • TEIs should detail how they plan to action the above recommendations at the first meeting of ITERIG, and a progress report made in June 2002. • This issue will be reconsidered during the second stage of the review. 	<p>From August 2002</p>	<p>TEIs</p>

Recommendation	Action	Timescale	Responsibility
Information & Communications Technology			
<p><u>Recommendations for Immediate Consideration:</u></p> <p>Consideration should be given to the extension of the successful ‘computers for teachers’ programme of supported purchase to student teachers who are undertaking an approved ITE course, to support their familiarisation with personal computer usage. (7.4.1.)</p> <p>The Minister should write to TEIs asking them, wherever possible at this stage, to shift the balance of ICT consideration in their ITE programmes away from generic skills development and discussion and more exclusively towards the consideration of the professional and pedagogic implications of ICT and the likely impacts on the future roles of the teacher of emerging models of digital learning environments. (7.4.1.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration will be given to this recommendation in the context of any future round of this scheme. • SEED will consider the recommendation on the shift away from generic skills in discussion with the TEIs. 	August 2002	SEED
<p><u>ICT Recommendations for Session 2002/03 and onward:</u></p> <p>A less prescriptive statement of teacher competence and programme requirement in the area of ICT should be developed which would facilitate continual review and updating of ITE programmes to reflect the change elements identified here. (7.4.2.)</p> <p>There should be a shift of focus in all TEIs away from concern with students’ generic ICT skills and towards appropriate ICT resource selection, best practice in implementing ICT approaches in school education and the understanding of digital learning environments and their likely impacts on teachers’ professional roles and required</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the longer term all the recommendations in 7.4.2 will be considered with the TEIs. 	Autumn 2002	SEED/TEIs

<p>skills. (7.4.2.) ICT (continued)</p> <p>All student teachers should be exposed to best practice in the rapidly-evolving application of ICT to school education by visits to appropriate demonstration sites and by the incorporation of sessions on the practical application of learning environments from competent practitioners, and that the adequacy of ICT use in a school is given greater weight in deciding on placements. (7.4.2.)</p> <p>Guidance on ICT-related competences and the linked framework for future collaborative review of TEIs should be reviewed to encourage TEIs to revise the treatment of ICT — as an issue area, set of competences and practical working environment for student teachers — in ITE programmes as part of their annual review and programme planning cycle. (7.4.2.)</p>		Autumn 2002	SEED/TEIs
---	--	-------------	-----------

Recommendation	Action	Timescale	Responsibility
Support for Schools Offering Placements			
<p>Further research and consultation is undertaken, once partnership frameworks are widely established, to determine how support might be given - perhaps better targeted - to those schools which provide student placements and how placements might be most effectively planned and organised (5.4.3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEED will ensure that further work on research and consultation is undertaken in due course and once partnership frameworks are in place on how support might targeted to those schools which provide student placements and how placements might be most effectively planned and organised 	Early 2003	SEED

The Report of the First Stage Review of Initial Teacher Education identified issues for Stage 2 Review of ITE. The recommendations contained in the report are included in the later stages of this document. The recommendations will be considered in terms of their appropriateness when scoping the remit for the Stage 2 Review. In the meantime an initial reaction to the recommendations is included in this paper.

LIST OF RESPONDENTS TO CONSULTATION PAPER

Universities

Northern College
Open University
University of Edinburgh
University of Glasgow
University of Paisley
University of Strathclyde

Local Authorities

Aberdeen City Council
Aberdeenshire Council
Argyll & Bute Council
Dundee City Council
East Ayrshire Council
East Lothian Council
East Renfrewshire Council
Edinburgh Council
Falkirk Council
Glasgow City Council
Moray Council
North Lanarkshire Council
Renfrewshire Council
South Lanarkshire Council
West Lothian Council

Unions

Association of Head Teachers in Scotland
Association of University Teachers (Scotland)
Educational Institute of Scotland
Headteachers' Association of Scotland
Professional Association of Teachers
Scottish Secondary Teachers' Association

Other Stakeholders

Catholic Education Commission
General Teaching Council for Scotland
Learning & Teaching Scotland
St. Margaret's Academy
Church of Scotland

SUMMARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADES	Association of Directors of Education in Scotland
COSLA	Convention of Scottish Local Authorities
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
ELLD	(Scottish Executive) Enterprise and Lifelong Learning Department
GTCS	General Teaching Council for Scotland
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspectorate
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
ITE	Initial Teacher Education
ITERIG	Initial Teacher Education Review Implementation Group
LAs	Local Authorities
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency (for Higher Education)
SEED	Scottish Executive Education Department
SEN	Special Educational Needs
SHEFC	Scottish Higher Education Funding Council
SLA	Service Level Agreement
STEC	Scottish Teacher Education Committee
TDP	Teacher Development Partnership
TEI	Teacher Education Institution