

# FROM DEVELOPMENT TO IMPROVEMENT – A STEP TOO FAR? THE EVOLVING CONTRIBUTION OF QUALITY IMPROVEMENT OFFICERS TO THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AGENDA IN SCOTTISH LOCAL AUTHORITIES

BRIAN BOYD AND FIONA NORRIS

---

## ABSTRACT

Since the re-organisation of Local Government in 1996 in Scotland and the establishment of the Scottish Parliament in 1999, the role of Advisers in local authorities has changed significantly. *Improving our schools* (SEED, 1999) placed an expectation on local authorities to support and challenge schools. Performance monitoring became a key function of local authorities. At the same time, *A Teaching Profession for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (2001) put Continuing Professional Development (CPD) at the heart of the improvement process. Increasingly, the emphasis on quality improvement has meant that former advisers now facilitate CPD rather than deliver it. This paper analyses the issues in the light of two recent surveys of local authority advisory staff and explores the impact on those charged with ‘quality improvement’ at Council level. It examines the increased burden on local authority staff, their role in CPD for teachers and their changing relationship with HMIE as part of the quality improvement process.

## FROM DEVELOPMENT TO IMPROVEMENT - A STEP TOO FAR?

“...it is only in the last few years that teacher development as a concept has come under scrutiny. In so doing, it has become clear that previous assumptions about linking staff development and effective change confined to specific innovations were too limited. We now begin to see that comprehensive career-long teacher development and institutional reforms in faculties of education and school systems is the real agenda. Teacher development is thus positioned to take a central role in educational reform in the 1990s.” (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1993: 8)

## INTRODUCTION

Since the re-organisation of Local Government in 1996 and the establishment of the Scottish Parliament in 1999, the role of Advisers in local authorities has changed significantly. *Improving our Schools* (SEED, 1999) placed an expectation on local authorities to support and challenge schools and performance monitoring became a key aspect of the work of advisers. At the same time, *A Teaching Profession for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (2001) put Continuing Professional Development (CPD) at the heart of the improvement process.

In 2005, the present authors, under the aegis of the Association of Educational Development and Improvement Professionals, Scotland (AEDIPS), conducted two surveys of local authority staff to try to ascertain the extent to which quality improvement has produced change in the role of former advisers. We wanted to find out their role in relation to CPD generally and whether this, traditional, role was seen as part of school improvement. Finally, we wanted to know whether the growing emphasis on quality improvement had been accompanied by a changing relationship with HMIE for whom inspection remains a key function.

The paper considers the shift in the relationship advisers in Scotland have had with teachers in schools. Traditionally, advice was the key function with CPD as

the main vehicle for such advice. The move to quality improvement now locates the work of the advisers in the area of accountability. This paper begins by looking at the growing body of literature which highlights the tension between a notion of improvement as a collaborative process with CPD at its centre and the tendency towards the creation of national *standards* and *competences* governing teachers' roles. It considers the data from the two surveys of local authority staff in terms of changes of role, participation on the quality improvement process and relationship with the HMIe school inspection regime. Finally, the authors argue that the contribution of local authority quality improvement personnel is often understated, that their CPD function is a critical element in school improvement and that greater collaboration among schools, QIOs and HMIe may lead to a reduction in pressure on schools and a better balance of challenge and support.

#### CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (CPD): AN ENTITLEMENT?

In Scotland, it is now both an entitlement and a requirement for every teacher to engage in at least 35 hours CPD over and above the 5 in-service days and any other in-service carried out within the school day. Every teacher must maintain a CPD portfolio, and must discuss it with a line manager within the school. In so doing, *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century* has established a new contractual context for professional review and development. It requires that "teachers shall have an ongoing commitment to maintain their professional expertise through an agreed programme of continuing professional development". The acronym CPD was introduced early in the report and has become the shorthand which everyone uses: "...every teacher will have an annual Continuing Professional Development (CPD) plan agreed with her/his immediate manager and every teacher will be required to maintain an individual CPD record."

Purdon (2003) has argued that "much of the consultation on CPD-related matters provides evidence that the majority opinion supports the development of a CPD 'framework'. She suggests that:

"Through CPD, teachers have the opportunity to become even better at what they do, to try new approaches, to develop and to share new ideas about the nature and purpose of teaching." (p.951)

Christie (2003) links the concept of "professional standards" with accountability and argues that the recommendation of the McCrone committee represent a "recognition of the importance of continuing professional development (CPD), both as a professional entitlement and as a professional obligation" (p.958). He also describes the elaborate consultation process, involving questionnaires to 60,000 teachers, which accompanied the development of the Standard for Chartered Teacher (a new post created by the McCrone committee) and which resulted in general agreement on nine forms of "professional action", including "evaluate practice and reflect critically on it", "improve professional performance" and "ensure that teaching is informed by reading and research". (p.960)

In a 20-page pull-out supplement on CPD in May 2004, (21.05.04), the Times Educational Supplement Scotland documented the way in which five teachers used their 35 hours CPD in the previous school session. They ranged from a second year class teacher to one who had been teaching for 30 years. The range was impressive, from subject-based in-service, to initiatives such as Assessment is for Learning, to personal interests such as digital photography, to be used to record pupils' work. Some had taken part in local authority working groups or pilot projects, while others had embarked on national schemes such as the General Teaching Council Scotland (GTCS) teacher researcher programme. Some of the teachers reported favourably on the process of maintaining their CPD folder, arguing that:

“it makes you appreciate how much you’ve been doing and encourages you to recognise that a lot of the reading that you do on teaching and learning ideas is relevant valued and adding to your professionalism”.

For others, involvement in a single project can take up the whole 35 hours, working with colleagues, with pupils and attending courses. Finally, the opportunities offered by the local authority are key elements of the CPD experience. Many authorities offer a wide range of courses from twilight, to weekend to vacation mode. The fact that most of these courses are free for the school makes it easier for them to support staff. Absence cover is not required and the school CPD budget is not compromised.

#### STANDARDS TO THE LEFT OF US: TECHNIQUES OF CONTROL?

In his critique of the OECD approach to the measurement of educational systems, Kuehn argues that:

While the OECD was pursuing its number-based approach to describing reality, other researchers were moving away from narrow, quantitative approaches. A considerable share of education research in the current decade has moved to qualitative approaches. Qualitative research is imbedded in the particular social and cultural context in which learning is taking place. The teacher may be involved in the research, looking at education from the inside out. Indeed, in action research, the teacher may be the researcher. This qualitative research can have significant positive impact in helping the teacher adjust to meet the needs of the particular students in the particular classroom. (p.2)

Kuehn quotes Eisner’s dictum, “what’s counted, counts” and this resonates with the shift in emphasis in the work of advisers. While ‘development’ as part of CPD was their traditional function, ‘improvement’ now has a harder, more quantitative edge. Nelson (1997) has argued that the concentration on ‘standards’ has often acted as a smokescreen to divert attention from “the big ideas and constructs” in education particularly those facing schools in areas of disadvantage. The application of a single set of indicators, irrespective of the context of the school, is suspect, he argues and the attention paid by advisers when in quality *improvement* mode to these measurable outcomes, detracts from the *development* role they used to play.

If policy is “the authoritative allocation of values” then it becomes necessary to enquire about what counts as knowledge and whose values are being validated through policy. In the move from *development* to *improvement*, the danger is that not only the nomenclature has changed but there has been a change of paradigm which has not been accompanied by any meaningful debate. Thus while the role of advisers was changing, there was also the introduction of a range of *standards* governing the crucial stages in the professional lives of teachers.

The Standards in Scotland’s Schools etc. Act of 2000 introduced the term ‘career development’ and made statutory provision for the General Teaching Council for Scotland to have national responsibility in this area. The first set of competences for newly qualified teachers was issued in 1993 in “Conditions for Teacher Training Courses”. They were introduced in 1998, with revised guidelines, setting out some 24 ‘benchmarks’, each beginning with the phrase ‘the programme of initial teacher education will enable students to...’ (Menmuir, 2003)

The Standard for Full Registration emerged in 2001 after a review of the probationary period carried out by GTC(S) and was designed to be compatible with the ITE standard. Then, in the wake of the McCrone agreement, Standards for Continuing Professional Development formed part of the emerging CPD ‘framework’. As part of the Scottish Qualification for Headship (SQH), a set of competences was devised and a framework for professional development set out (Lennon, 2003)

which emphasised values. Finally, to complete the set, the Standard for Chartered Teacher was published in 2002. In all of these publications, there is a consistency of language which suggests an attempt to ensure that from ITE to retirement, teachers, in classrooms and in management, will be expected to engage in CPD.

McBer (1992) has outlined “professional characteristics”, defined as “deep-seated patterns of behaviour which outstanding teachers display more often, in more circumstances and to a greater degree of intensity than effective colleagues” (p.202). The model of professional characteristics advanced includes five ‘clusters’, professionalism, thinking, planning and setting expectations, leading and relating to others, but within professionalism the key elements are:

- respect for others: the underlying belief that individuals matter
- challenge and support: commitment to enable all pupils to be successful
- confidence: belief in one’s ability to take on challenges
- creating trust: being consistent and keeping one’s word.

Munro (2001) suggests that “it is reasonable to expect a strong nexus between teacher effectiveness and school effectiveness.” (p.210) He cites Scheerens and Bosker (1997) who support the view that “teacher knowledge about learning may influence the effectiveness of a school.” Munro’s own research, involving 32 teachers in Melbourne schools, traced the teachers’ “effective learning behaviours” after a programme of staff development and found, interestingly, that variables such as age, gender, level of qualifications or experience did not appear to be correlated with success. He concludes that there can be a positive link between professional development programmes and teacher behaviour in classrooms and argues that that this is more likely to happen when the teachers are able to develop their own explicit theories of learning.

Thus, the imperative for professional developments seems to revolve around making teachers more reflective about their own theories and practice, improving their performance in the classroom and so contributing to school improvement. At the same time, schools are seen as collectives, where teachers, and others, work together, have a moral obligation (Fullan, 2001) to share good practice and where high expectation of all pupils is the aim.

The word ‘development’ has been around in this context for sometime. Does it simply imply ‘change’ or is there a sense in which ‘improvement’ is assumed? Certainly, not all teachers in the past would have agreed with Munro’s conclusions. For them, development was something done *to* them, at someone else’s behest, with little follow-up to ascertain whether anything had changed in the classroom as a result. Fullan (2001) has argued that “change is needed because many teachers are frustrated, bored and burnt out” and suggests that “if teaching becomes neither terribly interesting nor exciting to many teachers can one expect them to make learning interesting and exciting to students?” (p.75)

This definition of development as change links the personal job satisfaction of teachers with the effectiveness of pupil learning. Fullan stresses the collective nature of schools but is at pains to point out that consensus and conformity is not the aim of professional development. He stresses the need to preserve the individuality of teachers and suggest that an effective school would have a “network of people working on similar problems” (p.76). His suggestion that “multiple focussed collaborative networks” enable schools to make the most of the talents of individual teachers, is a challenging one in an age where headteachers are encouraged to try to focus all staff on a small number of “whole-school” issues.

#### CPD: THEORY INTO PRACTICE

The new concept of CPD seems to presuppose that teachers are capable of being reflective, that change should be the result of a process of “argument, consultation, debate, dialogue” and that individuals will be more committed to organisational goals if they have played a part in shaping them.

However, Fullan (1995) has argued that:

“Professional development of teachers has a poor track record because it lacks a theoretical base and coherent focus.” (p.253)

Adey (2004) has offered three kinds of theory which might underpin professional development, namely general notions of how change takes place, the idea of the reflective professional and the concept of teachers’ intuitive knowledge, and suggests that CPD should explicitly examine the inter-relatedness of these theories as they attempt to explain the learning and teaching process.

The current view is that a teaching force which becomes used to high quality CPD, from entry to exit, so to speak, is also one which will be more capable of being more reflective (Schon, 1987) and of questioning policy.

Adey, *et al.* (2004) suggest that since “the nature of professional development for teachers relates directly to the nature of teaching” (p.143), the notions which underpin teacher education at any one time reflect the dominant view of what teaching is. They cite the age-old debate as to whether teaching is an art or a science (Gage, 1978) and suggest that ideas such as theory-driven action, simple apprenticeship, the unguided reflective practitioner and craft-skill to scholastic rationality, all stem from belief systems along the art-science continuum. At one end of the continuum is the notion that teaching is too complex to be susceptible to training or regulation by competences to the opposite technical-rational view that teaching is a set of skills based on sound theory and supported by well-tested methods. Stoll and Fink (1996) have echoed Hartley’s concern about the idea of teacher as quasi-professional ‘practitioner’ (Roger and Hartley, 1990) and have suggested that it is based on a narrow “transmission sequential notion of knowledge”.

Adey has pointed out that there are pitfalls in all of the above positions and supports the view that:

“the postmodernist relativist interpretation of learning as a reflective practitioner (*sic*) falls into a trap similar to that of the old apprenticeship model, by under-representing what is known about teaching and placing too much reliance on the subjective truths of the individual without reference to external evaluation.” (p.144)

Adey makes the counter-balancing point that too much reliance on an “evidence-based” approach “may place too much faith on the reliability of objective truth.” (p.144)

In their foreword to Sachs’ *The Activist Teaching Profession* (2003), Hargreaves and Goodson assert that “teaching today is increasingly complex work, requiring the highest standards of professional practice to perform it well.” (p.ix) They claim that teachers are the “midwives of [that] knowledge society... Across the developed world, teacher recruitment is struggling to keep up with demand while at the same time Governments are placing more and more hope in the transformational power of education.” (p.x)

#### THE LOCAL AUTHORITY ADVISER AND THE IMPROVEMENT AGENDA – EVIDENCE FROM THE SURVEY

Time was when in-service training and curriculum development were the specialisms of the local authority adviser who, through the medium of CPD, provided support to classroom teachers. Typically a former headteacher (primary) or Principal

Teacher (secondary), the adviser would deliver training, facilitate discussion about the curriculum, lead or set up working parties to produce reports and classroom materials and offer advice to headteachers and others about the delivery of the curriculum in schools. S/he would often be on national bodies such as a Scottish Central Committee on a subject or on a generic issue (e.g. special educational needs or the primary curriculum) or would be the leader of a specialist team of colleagues developing exam-based curriculum packages, such as those to support Standard Grade (Boyd, 2005: 21).

The adviser traditionally worked with teachers, often through the medium of curriculum development and in-service training. For many teachers embarking on their careers, including the present authors, advisers were people who encouraged reflection and engagement with ideas. Publications such as *Teaching English* and the *Glasgow English Magazine (GEM)* were an important source of exploration of ideas and of the critiquing of new approaches and teaching methods. They were journals, not of the conventional academic type, but with serious articles, reviews and creative writing from teachers. They encouraged a collaborative culture, locally and nationally, and were often inspired and encouraged by advisers. The context in which these thrived began to change with successive reviews of the Scottish curriculum development structure as part of the move towards accountability and centralisation of the curriculum. However, the role of advisers continued to be developmental. Only in Strathclyde in the 1990s did a substantial move towards improvement take place with the establishment of Scotland's only local authority inspectorate, the Quality Assurance Unit. It did not survive local Government re-organisation and none of the new Councils established a similar structure.

Nevertheless, since local government re-organisation in 1996, the agenda has continued to shift substantially towards quality improvement and performance monitoring. Advisers' roles have changed radically and the terminology has changed with it. A survey of advisers undertaken in 2005 suggests that this change has been significant. There were 41 respondents, 21 of whom had less than 4 years experience in their present post, 18 of whom had between 5 and 9 years and 2 of whom had more than 10 years experience. The breakdown of previous jobs showed the diversity of experience among advisory staff [Table 1] and replicated the findings of Waxman (2003) that advisory staff with a secondary school background were less likely than their primary school colleagues to have had senior management experience, an issue which only became significant as the advisers' role began to shift from curriculum and CPD towards quality improvement and performance monitoring.

*Table 1: Previous remits of QI personnel (n=41)*

<b>Previous post</b>	<b>number</b>	<b>percentage</b>
PT (secondary)	10	24%
Headteacher/DHT (primary)	12	29%
LA post (Dev. Off; coordinator, etc)	12	29%
Adviser	6	14.6%
Librarian	1	2.5%

The shift in focus within the remits of former advisers is illustrated by the new job titles which have emerged from within the 32 new local authorities [Table 2]. The term Adviser has remained in some but not in others. In most cases, the term "quality" appears, acknowledging the most significant shift in role:

Table 2: Range of current job titles of former advisory personnel (n=41)

Job title	number	percentage
Adviser	10	24%
Quality Improvement Officer	17	41%
Education Officer (1, Quality)	5	8%
Quality Development Officer	5	8%
Early Years Officer	2	5%
Others (Service Improvement, etc)	3	7%

Indeed, when one adds together all the titles which include the word “quality” it comes to 23, some 56%. However, when asked whether their current role had a “quality improvement / assurance element, 38 (93%) said “yes”.

The extent of the change in role comes out most graphically when the performance monitoring and support for school self-evaluation tasks are considered. Most of the authorities represented in this survey used “How good is our school 2” (HMIE, 2003) as the foundation of their quality improvement process. Indeed, the amount of time spent by local authority staff as part of the HMIE inspection process (see below) has become a major issue within the advisory service nationally.

The respondents were asked to indicate whether they carried out a number of tasks associated with quality improvement [Table 3]:

Table 3: Numbers/percentages of LA personnel carrying out QI tasks (n=41)

Task	number	percentage
Writing pre-inspection reports	29	70%
Preparation of HMIE action plans	31	75%
Analysis of performance information	36	88%
Using performance information	36	88%
Verification of improvement plans	30	73%
Verification of Standards and Quality reports	29	70%
Writing follow-through reports	25	61%
Making quality visits to schools	37	90%

The respondents came from a wide range of authorities, with 19 coming from small population areas, 14 from large and 8 from rural or island.

The questionnaire was more extensive than the current paper is able to discuss but two significant issues are worth commenting on here. When asked to list any other quality improvement tasks which they carried out, the respondents generated a further 16, from the evaluation cluster plans to carrying out ‘themed evaluations’, from writing ‘consolidated performance reports’ for the directorate to the development of evaluation frameworks and from self-evaluation training for school staff to the evaluation of specific initiatives such as ICT in learning and teaching.

The longest list of all, some 56 items, was generated by the question “which area(s) are you responsible for?”, some 36 (88%) having indicated that they also had a ‘functional or generic responsibility’. The list included such diverse issues

as anti-bullying, baseline assessment, probationer teachers, university liaison and budget-monitoring as well as individual national initiatives such as Assessment is for Learning. The obvious conclusion to be drawn from these data is that the roles and remits of local authority advisory staff have changed substantially. However, it would appear that while the new emphasis appears to be on the quality improvement process within schools, many of the traditional duties they have carried out, remain. One which appears to have disappeared in many authorities is the *delivery* of what was once called in-service training, now referred to as CPD. It would appear that the people within local authorities most likely to perform this role are seconded staff, recently in the classroom, who have specific remits. The more established advisory staff tend to *facilitate* CPD, by responding to schools' needs analyses, constructing programmes of CPD, supporting probationer teacher induction programmes, Scottish Qualification for Headship and sometimes, Chartered Teacher.

Curriculum development also happens at a local level and the advisory staff are heavily involved. They identify needs, establish, and sometimes chair, working groups. They support the process by allocating budgets, occasionally bringing in external consultants and funding the publication of learning and teaching packs, some of which are 'marketed' outwith the authority. All of this 'development' activity continues alongside the quality improvement work. What is not clear from this survey data is the extent of the shift in role toward quality improvement. How much time is actually spent in supporting schools, pre- and post-HMIE inspection?

#### THE CONTRIBUTION OF LOCAL AUTHORITY STAFF TO THE HMIE INSPECTION PROCESS

A subset of the 41 respondents to the survey was asked to complete a more extensive questionnaire. The sample was selected on the basis of length of service so that we be able to collect reflections of the changes which had taken place in the role of advisory staff, the implications for other roles, particularly CPD, and the relationship between HMIE and local authority quality improvement processes.

24 staff from 23 local authorities responded to the questionnaire, ranging in experience of advisory work from 26 years to 5 years with an average being 12 years. Only three of the sample had not been in post before local government re-organisation. The responses varied in their length and depth and offered more qualitative observations on the issues. There was not unanimity on every issues and we have tried to ensure that no general claims are made on behalf of the 18 respondents which are not justified by the data.

The questionnaire had one quantitative section. Respondents were asked to quantify the amount of time spent on activities in relation to the HMIE inspection process, prior to, during and after the HMIE visit [Table 4]. Of the 24 who completed the questionnaire, 13 quantified the time spent, mainly in days or parts of days, sometimes in hours.

One team member offered a detailed breakdown of the work with one school as an illustration of the process.



Table 4: One QIO's contact with a school as part of improvement process

<b>Before HMIE inspection</b>	
quality visit – half day 4 times per year	2 days
writing up a quality visit	2 hours
health check – half day x 4 visits	2 days
writing up pre-inspection report	6 hours
<b>During:</b>	
feedback meeting – I always ask to attend feedback to staff	2–3 hours
writing up feedback notes	2 hours
<b>After:</b>	
action planning – primary, half day each 6 weeks for 2 years	6 days
action planning – secondary, half day per term	4 days
writing up action planning notes (each visit)	2 hours
writing follow-through report	6 hours

This, according to the respondent, is the official element of the support to schools. In addition, many of the 602 visits made by the team include attendance at SMT meetings, departmental meetings, lesson observation, Pupil Councils, and so on. “Quality checks” on pupils’ work, meetings with parents and looking at school documentation also take place.

This one contribution raises a number of issues. If this is typical of the rest of the local authorities, it represents a huge amount of time, nationally, being devoted to quality improvement. This amount of time and effort almost certainly detracts from their CPD function. Positively, this could be said to be important CPD activity in its own right, for the school and the QIOs. However, as a consequence of the ‘high stakes’, public nature of the Inspection process, there is clearly duplication, and even overkill, in terms of school-focused inspection activity. It would appear from the data that the average time spent by a local authority QIO on supporting schools through the Inspection process is in the region of 8 to 9 days. Interestingly, the smallest amount of time spent was *during* the inspection. It would appear that once HMIE are in the school, there is no role for the QIOs.

There was one area of unanimity in the responses and that was that every member of advisory staff had had some training in their work to support schools from HMIE. Not everyone felt that the training was enough or that it was done on a basis of recognition of “equal but different” contribution, but there had been a number of training opportunities in the last few years.

The comments of experienced advisory staff are indicative of the concerns around curriculum and staff development, and relationships with HMIE. There was a concern among QIOs that they had ‘dumped’ curriculum and learning and teaching and they were now in the hands of “unsupervised and poorly-directed seconded staff. They tended to believe that they have some capacity for supporting schools; they have “the skills and the experience, but lack the time.”

While some Advisers/QIOs felt that they were judged by HMIE on their reports, others would like to work more closely with HMIE in inspections; “we seem to be doing very nearly the same job so it makes sense that we work together.” However such quality-oriented work was often at the expense of the pastoral role, ironically, it was suggested, “at a time of increasing stress for teachers.”

These comments represent a series of concerns around the extent of the focus on

quality improvement, the time and workload implications for local authority staff, relationships with HMIE and the perceived tension between the quality role and the developmental role.

#### DISCUSSION

The quality improvement process has not only come to dominate the national and local governmental education agendas, but it appears to have altered significantly the focus of what were once advisory services as they have become quality improvement services. The questions which sparked this research were concerned with the apparent move from ‘development’ to ‘improvement’, the impact of the quality process on local authority CPD and the changing relationship between the QIOs and HMIE. A related question which emerged from the data was whether in any real sense the quality improvement activity could itself be seen as developmental, at an institutional level, or at a personal level for teachers.

The word *adviser* continues to exist in the system but, significantly, in 2005, the former Association of Educational Advisers, Scotland (AEAS) changed its name to the Association of Educational Development and Improvement Personnel, Scotland (AEDIPS) to reflect the changing focus. The evidence from the larger of our two surveys is that quality improvement of schools now drives much of the agenda within local authorities. The extent of this aspect of the work the staff surveyed emerges in the second survey. Not only are QIOs having to become generalists, cross-sectoral and well as cross-curricular, but they are now working at every level in the schools, from pupils to parents, from teachers to headteachers, a role which in the past only the primary advisers carried out.

However, the most significant change is that while the focus is on quality improvement generally, most of the activities seem to be concentrated around the HMIE inspection. The amount of time spent around this event in some authorities is significant. Indeed, one council has produced a *School Inspections – checklist* which runs to two and a half pages of A4, closely typed, beginning with the “formal notification of Inspection from HMIE” to “Authority/school discussion of Action Plan”, all timed around the inspection, from “Inspection minus 3 weeks” to “Publication PLUS 1 week”. However, in this checklist, as in the data from experienced advisers, there is minimal involvement of local authority staff during the inspection itself.

Therefore, if the inspection itself is clearly an HMIE function, and if so much time is spent before and after by local authority staff, what is the nature of the relationship between the two sets of activities and the two sets of professionals? From the schools’ perspective, where does CPD fit into the process? It seems self-evident from the data that there are two sets of activity, both very time-consuming, each of which plays a part in the quality-improvement process. There is a sense that given comments about the nature of the training and the relationship between HMIE as ‘trainers’ and QIOs as ‘the trained’, and given that local authority staff play no part during the inspection nor has there been, to date much in the way of formal acknowledgement by HMIE of the role of QIOs in the final published report, there needs to be some debate nationally about how the work of QIOs and HMIE can be truly complementary.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The paper began with a quotation from Fullan and Hargreaves which argued that teacher development should lie at the heart of educational reform. The evidence from the surveys suggests that CPD, put at the heart of the improvement process by the McCrone report, is best supported at local authority level by an advisory service working in partnership with providers. The large proportion of time and energy spent supporting the HMIE inspection process not only adds to the pressure felt by

school staff but contributes to an unhelpful separation of the contribution made by CPD and monitoring and evaluation to school improvement.

It would appear, too, that there is conceptual confusion between “improvement” and “inspection”. They are often used as if they are synonymous but from the evidence from local authority staff, inspection should be seen as a subset of improvement. The more important question which arises from the data is whether national inspection of the kind HMIE currently undertake is necessary when so much support and challenge is offered by local authority staff. If the answer is yes, then joint training of QIOs and HMIE could result in QIOs having an enhanced improvement role and HMIE ‘quality assuring’ the local authority staff. Since the schools are the responsibility of the local authorities, then devolution of this function makes sense, with HMIE have a more focused role including training and quality assuring local authority staff.

The debate is an important one. Waxman, in his report, *The Scottish Pathway to Quality Improvement: the evolving role of quality improvement officers in Scottish Local Authorities* (2003), concluded that “there are many positive features of advisory work and the quality assurance framework in Scotland” (p.17) but warned that “Given size and resource limitations, there are few Local Authorities that [can] sustain a large advisory team and offer a comprehensive range of quality assurance, curriculum and staff development to schools.” (p.14)

The real issue may be the extent to which quality assurance, whether through external inspection or not, is conceived as a developmental activity. Fullan and Hargreaves have written extensively on the need for collaborative models of school improvement, both internally within schools and among all of the players in the school improvement game. It would appear that what we have at present lacks this essential ingredient of true (rather than forced) collaboration. QIOs do not feel that they are equal partners with HMIE; schools still find the new role of the former advisory service problematic; and most of the time and energy spent on improvement seems to be narrowly focused on the inspection element of the process.

Can the new manifestation of the traditional advisory service perform both a developmental and an improvement function? The evidence from the surveys suggests that they continue to try to do so, but at a cost. Perhaps, the way forward is for a period of reflection, nationally, on how the improvement agenda itself can move forward collaboratively, building on the experiences and expertise of those who are committed to it. For this to happen, the values which underpin policy need to be made more explicit. At a time when the punitive effect on learning and teaching of high stakes accountability regimes is widely recognised, then changing names and re-assigning roles should be no substitute for a wide-ranging debate:

We need debate and discussion to take place amongst all those with an interest in education... (A Curriculum for Excellence: progress and proposals, p.2)

#### REFERENCES

- Adey, P., Hewitt, G., Hewitt, J. and Landau, N. (2004) *The Professional Development of Teachers: Theory and Practice*, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Boyd, B. (2005) *CPD: Improving Professional Practice*, Paisley: Hodder Gibson.
- Christie, D. (2003) Professional Studies in Initial Teacher Education in Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. (eds) *Scottish Education Second Edition Post-Devolution*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press pp.931–941.
- Fullan, M. and Hargreaves, A. (1993) *Teacher Development and Educational Change*, London: Routledge Falmer.
- Fullan (1995) The limits and potential of professional development in Gusky, T.R. and Huberman, M. *Professional development in education: New Paradigm and Practices*, New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Fullan, M. (2001) *Leading in a Culture of Change*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gage, N.L. (1978) *The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching*, New York: Teachers' College Press.

- General Teaching Council Scotland (2000) *Quality Assurance in Initial Teacher Education: The Standard for Initial Teacher Education in Scotland Benchmark Information*, Edinburgh.
- General Teaching Council Scotland (2002) *Achieving the Standard for Full Registration: Guidance for Schools*, Edinburgh.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (2003) *How good is our school 2?*
- Kuehn, L. (1999) Globalisation and the control of teachers' work, in *Our Schools Our Selves*, British Columbia Teachers' Federation.
- Lennon, F. (2003) Organisation and Management in the Secondary School Institutions in Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. (eds) *Scottish Education: Second Edition Post-Devolution*, Edinburgh University Press, pp.419–428.
- McBer, cited in The Open University (1992) Making Sense of Management Unit 1 of E629 *Managing Educational Change*, Milton Keynes: The Open University.
- McBer, H. (2001) Research into Teacher Effectiveness, in Banks, F. and Mayes, S. (eds) *Early Professional Development of Teachers*, London: David Fulton Publishers pp.193–209.
- Menmure, J. (2003) SCOTCAT and SCQF Arrangements in Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. (eds) *Scottish Education: Second Edition Post-Devolution*, Edinburgh University Press, pp.974–981.
- Munro, J. (2001) Learning more about learning improves teacher effectiveness, in Banks, F. and Mayes, S. (eds) *Early Professional Development of Teachers*, London: David Fulton Publishers, pp.210–225.
- Purdon, A. (2003) The Professional Development of Teachers in Bryce, T.G.K. and Humes, W.M. (Eds) *Scottish Education: Second Edition Post-Devolution*, Edinburgh University Press, pp.942–951.
- Roger, A. and Hartley, D. (1990) *Curriculum and Assessment: a Policy for the 90s*, Professional Issues in Scottish Education, Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Sachs, J. (2003) *The Activist Teaching Profession*, Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Scheerens, J. and Bosker, R. (1997) *The Foundation of Educational Effectiveness*, London: Pergamon.
- Schön, D. (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Scottish Executive Education Department (1999) *Improving our schools*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Scottish Executive (2002) *Continuing Professional Development*, Edinburgh.
- Scottish Executive (2002) *Standard for Chartered Teacher*, Edinburgh.
- Scottish Executive Education Department (2001) *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century* (The McCrone Report), Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Scottish Executive Education Department (2006) *A Curriculum for Excellence: progress and proposals*, Edinburgh: Blackwell.
- Scottish Qualification for Headship (1998) *The Standard for Headship in Scotland*.
- Stoll, L. and Fink, D. (1996) *Changing our Schools: Linking School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Times Educational Supplement, Scotland, 21st May 2004.
- Waxman, D. (2003) *The Scottish Pathway to Quality Improvement: the evolving role of quality improvement officers in Scottish Local Authorities*, NAEIAC.