

## **Reviewing Scottish Teacher Education for the 21st Century: Let Collaborative Partnership Flourish<sup>1</sup>**

**Ian Smith**

University of the West of Scotland

---

### **ABSTRACT**

At the time of writing, the Donaldson Review of Teacher Education in Scotland is being undertaken for the Scottish Government, covering the continuum from Initial Teacher Education (ITE) through Induction onto Continuing Professional Development (CPD). This paper focuses on ITE, but considers some possible implications for CPD. The paper argues the current Review must take a broader and deeper approach than recent national reviews of ITE, avoiding recommendations which narrow long-term possibilities. The future development of ITE should be based upon a fuller partnership between universities and the teaching profession than currently exists, with a collaborative 'inquiry as stance' approach to the knowledge-practice relationship within teacher learning, and with collaborative models of ITE partnership replacing outdated duplication models. The paper considers issues to be addressed, including within universities, if such partnership is to be developed. The potential for creative innovation within this partnership is illustrated through the importance of breadth in any new framework of ITE qualifications as these relate to professional development. Challenges are highlighted in achieving support for innovation from other stakeholders involved in the governance of Scottish ITE. However, the paper concludes that stimulating possibilities may follow for CPD, as well as ITE, if the type of ITE envisaged creates the basis for a truly activist teaching profession.

### **INTRODUCTION: REVIEWING SCOTTISH TEACHER EDUCATION**

In recent years, those involved in Scottish teacher education have been very familiar with 'national reviews' of the sector undertaken for the Scottish Executive/Scottish Government<sup>1</sup> (see Menter 2008 and Christie 2008a;b for useful summaries of recent developments in Scottish teacher education). A 'First Stage' Review of Initial Teacher Education (ITE), commissioned from the external consultants Deloitte and Touche, was completed in 2001 (Deloitte and Touche 2001). A 'Second Stage' Review, undertaken by an appointed Review Group of senior stakeholders, reported in 2005 (Scottish Executive 2005). At various times, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (HMIE) has also completed 'Aspect Reviews' of ITE, such as the report on Student Teacher Placements in 2005 (HMIE 2005). I have

---

1. The devolved Scottish administration in Edinburgh, established with the Scottish Parliament in 1999, was known as the Scottish Executive until 2007, when it was renamed the Scottish Government.

argued elsewhere, particularly on the issue of partnership within ITE, that these reviews have had limited impact in stimulating fundamental and creative innovation (Smith *et al.* 2006a; Smith *et al.* 2006b; Menter *et al.* 2006: 26-28, 58, 72). As Menter and Hulme (2008: 325) emphasise, the Scottish ITE reviews have not met the aspirations to develop evidence-based policies which tackle causes not symptoms. For example, Menter and Hulme (p. 326) contrast these unfavourably with reviews produced recently for the USA (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner 2005) and Wales (Furlong *et al.* 2006). I would add another example of a broader and deeper review which I will draw upon significantly, the report 'Learning To Teach And Its Implications For The Continuum Of Teacher Education: A Nine-Country Cross-National Study', produced for The Teaching Council, Ireland, by a research team from University College, Cork (Teaching Council, Ireland 2009).

At the time of writing, the Scottish Government's current Review of Teacher Education in Scotland, led by Graham Donaldson, the former Senior Chief Inspector at HMIE, is progressing through its collection and analysis of evidence (see the website Review of Teacher Education in Scotland 2010). Aspects of this current Review process appear more inclusive than previous reviews. For example, online techniques have been used, inviting all interested individuals and organisations to submit formal responses and contribute to interactive debates. An academic research team has been commissioned to inform the Review by completing a comparative literature review of approaches to teacher education in the 21st. Century. Crucially, the Review is considering the full continuum of teacher education from ITE through Induction<sup>2</sup> onto Continuing Professional Development (CPD). This contrasts positively with the exclusive concentration of previous Scottish reviews on ITE.

On the other hand, these potentially encouraging features of the current Review need to be set against possible areas of concern. Since Humes' seminal work (Humes 1986), analysis of Scottish education has often suggested the influence of a leadership class maintaining hierarchical control of policy. There are familiar anxieties that leadership class consensus will produce conservative policy outcomes from the Review, especially given the appointed nature of the Review Leader, Review Team and Review Reference Group<sup>3</sup> (see Humes [2008: 73-74], and Humes and Bryce [2008: 101-102], for the continuing wider conservative influence of this leadership class consensus in Scottish education, and Menter and Hulme [2008: 328] for its continuing presence in ITE specifically). More particularly, in announcing the Review, the then Education Secretary, Fiona Hyslop, linked the Review with the current Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) initiative<sup>4</sup> (Scottish

---

2. All Scottish ITE graduates are guaranteed a one-year Induction post in a local authority school. Successful completion of this leads to Full Registration as a teacher with the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS).

3. See the Review of Teacher Education in Scotland website [www.reviewofteachereducationinScotland.org.uk](http://www.reviewofteachereducationinScotland.org.uk) for the membership of the Review Team and Reference Group.

4. The Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) initiative has been developed by the Scottish Executive/Government since 2004, and is ongoing. It is presented by politicians and officials as the most major reform of curriculum and assessment in Scotland's schools for a generation. Not all academics, schoolteachers and other commentators necessarily share this view.

Government 2009b). At one level, this is not problematic, where the link merely leads to generally worded aims on meeting ‘the needs of pupils in the 21st. Century’ and developing ‘the flexible, creative and learner centred teaching profession we need’. However, a narrower language is also used on specifically meeting the needs of Curriculum for Excellence and ‘the flexibility in the profession that Curriculum for Excellence requires’. This more prescriptive connection with CfE raises the concern that Review outcomes may be too closely linked to what is increasingly being critiqued as a problematic general initiative. For example, Priestley and Humes (2010: 15) accuse the architects of CfE of ‘historical amnesia and lack of theoretical sophistication’. Apart from such specific concerns about the conceptual weaknesses of CfE, there is the more general concern that the naive evangelical enthusiasm which many detect in CfE may transfer to the Review the same excessive belief in specific reforms, suggested at one moment in time, as being both uniquely innovative and ‘mandating the future’ in a way which is, in fact, impossible (see Edwards 2007 on the general impossibility of such mistaken ‘fundamentalist enthusiasms’).

Conscious of the insights of Edwards, I would suggest the outcomes of the current Review should be judged by the extent to which they establish broad frameworks for appropriate long-term creativity in teacher education, rather than attempt over-prescriptive recommendations too specific to one particular moment in time and one particular policy context. Given that another paper in this edition addresses the Review largely from the CPD perspective, the current paper will focus upon ITE, although possible implications for CPD will also be highlighted briefly. The paper is particularly concerned with the place of the universities within ITE, and will suggest the Review should conceptualise ITE as based upon a collaborative approach between universities and the teaching profession to the knowledge-practice relationship, leading to innovation in collaborative models of ITE partnership. The potential for innovation within such partnership will then be illustrated through proposed new breadth in the framework of ITE qualifications and how these may relate to teacher development. The paper will recognise the challenges of ITE governance in achieving stakeholder support for proposed innovations, but will conclude that stimulating possibilities may follow for CPD, as well as ITE, if such challenges can be overcome.

## **CONCEPTUALISING (INITIAL) TEACHER EDUCATION FOR PARTNERSHIP**

### *Reflective Practice, An Inquiry/Research Stance, and The Role of the Universities*

I anticipate the Review is likely to identify with a model of teacher education which bases learning to teach upon reflective practice, increasingly complemented by an emphasis on an inquiry/research stance. For example, this model of teacher education is consistently advocated at the level of European policy by organisations such as the European Commission (EC), the European Trade Union Committee For Education (ETUCE) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (EC 2007a: 5,14, 2007b: 2-4; ETUCE

2008: 8,17; OECD 2005: 10-11). The Review is unlikely to diverge from such points of reference. However, neither of the terms 'reflective practice' and 'inquiry/research stance' are uncontested. As Forde *et al.* (2006: 66-79) discuss, the term reflective practice is widely used but open to many interpretations. The relationship between schoolteachers and research during their education and development is complex. As Munn and Baron (2008: 866-7, 871) emphasise, it may be more straightforward to expect teachers to engage critically with educational research by familiarising themselves with research findings, and evaluate the implications of these findings for their teaching. However, it can be more problematic to overcome the constraints of time etc. so that teachers can themselves become researchers, even on relatively limited definitions of action research. More fundamentally, Holligan (2008) highlights the dangers in directing teachers towards an over-simplified discourse of research which may inappropriately devalue their practitioner knowledge. These complexities make it preferable to characterise teaching with the more conditional term 'inquiry/research stance', rather than less nuanced terms such as a research-based or research-informed profession. However, despite such complexities, as Dana and Yendol-Hoppey (2009) have emphasised, teacher inquiry (a broader term which can incorporate action research) can play a critical role in professional development from ITE onwards (see, *inter alia*, pp.1-7 for definitions, and pp.14-15 for the connection with ITE). Others have emphasised the importance of collaborative action research (CAR) in the development of teacher identity (Feldman and Weiss 2009; Goodnough 2010), including in ITE (Mule 2006) and from ITE into the beginning teacher's career (Mitchell *et al.* 2009). Of course, there are connections between action research and reflection (see Mitchell *et al.* 2009: 347). Although Dana and Yendol-Hoppey (2009: 11-12) argue that teacher inquiry is more developed than reflection because it is more intentional and visible, they emphasise both are important for teacher development.

Therefore, I would still identify ITE with developing reflective practice and an inquiry/research stance. It will not be sufficient for the Review simply to state this as an almost self-evident mantra. The Review should communicate that this approach will only be meaningfully progressed if a full partnership between the universities and the teaching profession is established. In doing this, the Review should present a deep argument to secure long-term recognition from other stakeholders, especially practicing schoolteachers, that university staff have a distinctive role within ITE. This is necessary to end definitively the continuing inappropriate criticisms that university staff only bring unhelpful theory disconnected from practice, and that their contribution is invalid unless based on 'recent and relevant' schoolteaching experience.

On reflective practice, it is hard to envisage a rich and well-developed model, such as Korthagen's (Korthagen *et al.* 2006: 1027-1029), functioning appropriately without the involvement of university staff. Korthagen *et al.* state the second of their 'fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices' as 'Learning about teaching requires a view of knowledge as a subject to be created rather than as a created subject' (p. 1027). This

involves student teachers creating knowledge for themselves, rather than simply being taught knowledge, such as the findings of researchers. It is based on the Action/Looking back on the action/Awareness of essential aspects/Creating alternative methods of action (ALACT) model of reflection. However, for Korthagen *et al.* this will be 'a process of guided reinvention' (p. 1027), in which 'the university supervisor can offer small theoretical notions fitting in with the process' (p. 1028). Therefore, in drawing upon the ALACT model, others such as Jones (2008: 62) stress the importance of ideas, strategies and theories discussed by university staff in contributing to student teacher development, even in initiatives which focus on partnership between student teachers and school staff. Pedro (2005: 58-59) also found ITE students identifying university staff, including the theories provided by them, as contributing significantly to the development of their reflective practice .

On the inquiry/research stance, university involvement again seems essential to achieve what is desired. It is clear that well-developed approaches to teacher inquiry/collaborative action research are achieved most strongly within school-university partnerships. Feldman and Weiss (2009) emphasise the role of university academics as action research facilitators within partnership. Goodnough (2010) highlights the role of the university researcher and research assistants in providing support to teachers in action research (see especially p.171 and p.178). Mitchell *et al.* (2009) explicitly approach collaborative action research through school-university partnerships. An extensive treatment of approaches to teacher inquiry, such as Dana and Yendol-Hoppey (2009), in itself perfectly illustrates the indispensable guidance and structure which university academics can provide for teacher practitioner inquiry.

The role of the university in teacher education stretches beyond support for practitioner inquiry. The Irish Teaching Council Report (Teaching Council Ireland 2009: 29-30) emphasises teacher education should engage with a variety of interacting types of teacher knowledge. This has led the Irish Teaching Council to insist that ITE programmes include the 'foundation disciplines' of curriculum and assessment theory, philosophy of education, sociology of education, educational history, psychology of development and learning. Similar university inputs would also seem essential if Scottish ITE programmes are to meet the requirements of the Standard for Initial Teacher Education (SITE)<sup>5</sup> that ITE programmes 'draw on a wide range of intellectual resources, theoretical perspectives and academic disciplines to illuminate understanding of education' (GTCS and QAA Scotland 2006: 14). I would not expect the Review to diverge from this.

---

5. The Standard for Initial Teacher Education (SITE) is one of a suite of four Standards for Scottish schoolteaching. The other Standards are the Standard for Full Registration (SFR), the Standard for Chartered Teacher and the Standard for Headship. Currently, the Scottish Government retains 'ownership' of the Standard for Headship, with the GTCS essentially 'owning' the others, although other stakeholders can be involved, such as the higher education Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Scotland for SITE. These Standards are available at the GTCS website [www.gtcs.org.uk](http://www.gtcs.org.uk).

However, again following the Irish Teaching Council Report (Teaching Council Ireland 2009: 31-33), I think it is crucial to draw upon Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) to emphasise that these university contributions should be within a conceptualisation of teacher knowledge based on the holistic partnership concept of 'knowledge of practice'. This is contrasted with both 'knowledge for practice' and 'knowledge in practice'. 'Knowledge for practice' is typically based on research and generated within the universities, and commonly described as formal knowledge (Cochrane-Smith and Lytle 1999: 254). The problem is when such knowledge is viewed as superior to 'knowledge in practice'. 'Knowledge in practice' is expressed in experienced teachers' artistry of practice, in teachers' reflections on practice, and in teachers' narrative accounts of practice (p. 262). The problem here is the dichotomy between this practical knowledge and the formal knowledge of 'knowledge for practice', and the retention of a dualism which tends to maintain the hegemony of the latter (pp. 264, 265, 289). 'Knowledge of practice' is more than simply an amalgam of 'knowledge for practice' and 'knowledge in practice'. Rather, acknowledging the importance of knowledge generated by researchers as well as teacher-generated knowledge, it suggests new synergies between university-based and school-based staff through an integrative and holistic 'inquiry as stance', which is progressed through inquiry communities involving new kinds of collaborations among teachers and others, including universities (pp. 250, 281). Crucially for the role of universities within such collaborations, 'what goes on inside the classroom is profoundly *altered* and ultimately transformed when teachers' frameworks for practice foreground the intellectual, social, and cultural contexts of teaching' (p. 276). It will be important for the Review to emphasise this partnership approach to the development of teacher knowledge so we can move beyond the perennial circular argument from school staff that there is a dichotomy between 'useful' practice offered by schools and the 'irrelevant' inputs of theory by university staff who are divorced from the realities of practice.

The persistence of such criticisms about 'theory' does require universities to examine continually the appropriateness of their contribution to ITE. For example, Gary Thomas raises many interesting issues in *Education and Theory: strangers in paradigms* (Thomas 2007). One interpretation of Thomas might lead other stakeholders to argue that, if 'educational theory' is as unsatisfactory as he suggests, then there is no place for its university proponents in ITE. This argument might reject 'educational theory' as too abstract and unhelpful, not only if brought to ITE in Cochran-Smith's and Lytle's 'knowledge for practice' sense, but even if offered within their 'knowledge of practice'. Certainly, in criticising 'theory', including 'grand theory' and personal/practical theory, Thomas does accuse educational theory of leading educational practice 'into wild-goose chases and culs-de-sac' (p.3). However, my interpretation of Thomas is that he would only reject certain forms of theory which he regards as ill-conceived, particularly certain types of social science theory which inappropriately aspire to the status of natural science theory (pp. 7-8).

He would still maintain a place for university study based on 'discussion about how values, evidence and ideas can more straightforwardly guide

educational practice' (p.17). He is certainly not arguing for a 'descent into unbridled subjectivity or nescience' (p. 109). On this interpretation, Thomas's views can be seen as confirming appropriate university contributions within Cochran-Smith's and Lytle's 'knowledge of practice'.

In addition to presenting the positive case for ITE requiring a partnership between universities and the profession, we should look to the Review recognising the limitations of ITE without university involvement. Alternative models do exist in other systems, especially for ITT in England (significantly, the English system refers to initial teacher training, not initial teacher education). However, relevant research suggests that English models such as School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITTs), and Employment-Based Routes, not necessarily involving universities, contain problems over consistency of student teacher experience, and intellectual depth of the student teacher experience (Menter *et al* 2006: 29-33, 69-71). Furlong *et al.* ( 2008: 317) present a wider English context where 'the contributions of higher education to professional formation – the consideration of research, of theory and of critique' are no longer seen as essential, leading to 'an almost entirely practically oriented' ITE. Internationally, there has been particular criticism of short-term, 'teach first' employment-based routes (Hargreaves and Shirley 2009: 89; Zeichner 2006: 331-2).

In contrast to these narrower approaches, I would look for the Review to present University involvement in ITE as ensuring broader and richer approaches. For example, Cochran-Smith (2008: 273, 276-277) cautions us against the simple and circular 'test score gains' view of teacher quality and the associated 'outcomes trap' approach to teacher education. These approaches assume the subsequent quality of ITE graduates as teachers is only to be judged by their impact on raising pupils' 'test scores', narrowly defined, because teachers are viewed exclusively as the determining factor in boosting pupils' achievement, and their role is simply seen as preparing a workforce for competitive global society. This ignores the need for investment in economic and social improvement to address the classroom and school contexts in which teaching and learning occur, and the wider role of teachers in preparing future citizens to participate in democratic society. The Review should position university ITE as presenting a broad view of teaching, one which resonates with Malm's (Malm 2009: 84-85, 88) emphasis on the decisive role of beliefs and emotions in being and becoming a teacher, drawing, *inter alia*, on Hargreaves' (1998: 835) view of teaching as an 'emotional practice'.

### *The Obligations upon Universities within Partnership*

Arguing for University involvement in ITE also requires us to recognise the obligations which this brings for universities. As Zeichner (2006: 331) has emphasised, it is ultimately the quality of teacher education programmes which matters. Universities are obliged to demonstrate the appropriateness and quality of their provision to other stakeholders. Zeichner specifically

argues that universities must take teacher education seriously. For example, he cautions against teacher education functioning as a 'cash cow' where teacher education tuition income is funnelled into other areas of university activity (p. 335). Brennan and Willis (2008: 297-299) also highlight three particular threats to teacher education in universities: the disappearance of education faculties into larger 'divisions' within increasingly corporate and managerialist forms of university governance; the comparative inability of teacher education to engage with the internationalisation of university strategising and student recruitment because of government preference for reproduction of local/national culture within teacher education; teacher education's comparatively limited access to large-scale sources of public and other funding for research. All of these issues from the USA and Australia apply to Scotland. If university involvement in Scottish ITE is guaranteed, the Review should call upon universities to recognise fully the obligations associated with the privilege of this guaranteed role. Picking-up on some of the themes from Zeichner, and Brennan and Willis, Scottish universities are being specifically funded for what is a great public project, the preparation of high-quality teachers for Scotland's schools, with everything this implies for the aspirations of Scotland's pupils, parents, and the wellbeing of Scottish civic society. There are other stakeholders, including local authorities and schools themselves, who may argue for access to these funds for models of ITE which do not involve universities. Universities should participate in genuinely open accountability processes to demonstrate that public funding provided for teacher education is utilised as fully as possible for this specific purpose. Universities should recognise there may be special circumstances involved in offering ITE provision, which mean targets for international business and external research income, applicable to many other disciplines, may have to be adjusted for teacher education. Given the recent trend for specialist Scottish Schools/Faculties of Education to be merged into larger units within their universities, these universities should be asked to demonstrate that the particular needs of teacher education have been enhanced and not damaged. Finally, given issues around critical mass for research and for viability of ITE programmes with reduced student intakes, it is reasonable for the Review to ask questions on possible rationalisation of teacher education provision, and for universities to consider these from the interests of the Scottish education system as a whole, not principally the interests of specific universities<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> In a paper of this length, it is not possible to consider fully the issues around possible rationalisation of teacher education provision. On research, all seven of the Scottish teacher education universities achieved recognition of 'world leading' research at RAE 2008. However, Ozga (2008: 190) has questioned the overall strength of Scottish educational research and Humes (2007: 83) has suggested some smaller Schools of Education lack capacity. Christie and Menter (2009) emphasise the recent value of AERS collaboration across centres, but this initiative has now ended. On ITE intakes, the vulnerability of smaller Schools of Education can be seen in the reduction of 2010-11 Scottish ITE intakes by 40% overall from 2009-10, and by 70% in PGDE (Primary).

## IMPLEMENTING PARTNERSHIP FOR (INITIAL) TEACHER EDUCATION

### *Models of ITE Partnership, especially the Collaborative Model*

While it is crucial to argue for university involvement in ITE, it is equally vital to argue this is progressed through an appropriate partnership with other stakeholders. Indeed, this follows from my earlier advocacy of ITE based upon Cochran-Smith's and Lytle's collaborative 'knowledge of practice' approach. I have written previously on approaches to partnership within ITE, principally with former colleagues (Brisard *et al.* 2005; Brisard *et al.* 2006; Menter *et al.* 2006: 55-72; Smith *et al.* 2006a, 2006b; Smith 2008). Much of this analysis can be usefully summarised by referring to the models of ITE partnership in the typologies of John Furlong *et al.* (Furlong *et al.* 2000). Furlong identified four models of partnership, and I briefly wish to recap on their main features:

#### 1. *HEI-based/Integration Model*

In this model, HEI (university) staff seek to integrate the students' training experience in university with the world of the school. University tutors focus on campus-based sessions which are oriented to practical preparation for the student teachers' placement teaching. They spend very significant time visiting schools simply to assess the classroom practice of student teachers, when partner school staff are also being asked to observe this on an ongoing basis during placements. The HEI-based model was described in Scotland by Margot Cameron-Jones as a 'duplication' model (Cameron-Jones and O'Hara 1993: 37), i.e. the roles and responsibilities assumed by university tutors overlapped with those which could be assumed by teachers within partner schools.

#### 2. *Complementary(Separatist) Model*

This model looks to establish distinctive roles and responsibilities for university and school staff. For example, within campus-based delivery, university staff give greater emphasis to the delivery of theoretical and research perspectives, rather than sessions on the more practical preparation for placement teaching. This preparation is now the responsibility of partner school staff, who also assume more formal responsibility for the assessment of students' classroom teaching. On assessment, university staff only make 'troubleshooting' or 'moderating' assessment visits to observe student teachers, or perhaps none at all. In these ways, the duplication of roles between university staff and partner school staff is removed.

#### 3. *HEI-led Model*

In this model, partner school staff have agreed formally to accept specified roles and obligations, but the university reinvigorates its overall leadership for both HEI-delivered and school-delivered elements of programmes. The university's leadership will tend to function through

the use of a relatively small strategy group covering the university's overall partnership. This leadership will look to ensure coherent overall planning of the relationship between campus-delivered and school-delivered elements of courses.

#### 4. *Collaborative Model*

This model emerged as an important 'ideal type' aspiration in England from the late-1980s/early-1990s, and has also been highly influential in a range of overseas systems (in other writing, I have particularly used Australian examples to illustrate the collaborative model in practice – see Brisard *et al.* 2005: 75-78; Smith *et al.* 2006b: 150; Smith 2008: 11-12). In this model, the aim is to encourage a form of reflective practice in the student teacher which draws upon the different forms of professional knowledge contributed by university and school staff, both seen as equally legitimate for the professional teacher to function successfully. The contributions of university staff are based upon 'research and theory-based knowledge and perspectives', with the contributions of partner school staff based upon 'situated knowledge of teaching and schooling and practical perspectives' (McIntyre 1997: 5). This recognition of different inputs from university and school staff ensures progress from the 'duplication' of the HEI-based model. The model requires regular opportunities for university and school staff to meet for small group planning of programmes and for collaborative work and discussion in schools. This collaboration progresses from the dualism of the complementary/separatist model, and can include activity beyond ITE on research, curriculum development and staff development. The collaboration will involve wider, more ongoing contacts with a broader range of school staff, in contrast to the more restricted contacts with smaller strategic planning groups involved in the HEI-led model. The collaborative model's approach to partnership mirrors Cochran-Smith's and Lytle's 'knowledge of practice' approach to the knowledge-practice relationship.

I would continue to argue strongly for the move to collaborative partnership as the preferred model for ITE partnership between the universities and other stakeholders. In doing so, I am drawing particularly upon my publications produced c.2006, with associated research principally c.2002-2005. However, my literature review of academic writing on partnership since 2006 suggests the earlier analysis and its broad policy implications still stand for 2010. Certainly, some recent work may elaborate different terminology and additional theoretical refinements around thinking on partnership, and I now consider examples of these. However, I suggest these examples are consistent with the aspiration towards collaborative partnership. Edwards and Mutton (2007), using CHAT (Cultural Historical Activity Theory), including work on boundary zones and boundary objects, argue for partnership in terms of 'networks of distributed expertise', in contrast to closed systems and restricted patterns

of identity formation. They suggest university staff and school staff share a focus on the longer-term development of student teachers. This achieves a 'network of distributed expertise' through the focus on this 'boundary object' at the 'boundary zone' outwith the 'closed systems' and 'restricted patterns of identity formation' of individual schools and universities. This analysis seems consistent with the collaborative model of ITE partnership. Anagnostopoulos *et al.* (2007) also use activity theory and boundary objects. They describe university staff and school staff generating 'horizontal expertise' through the co-creation of boundary objects (the specific example they develop is the creation of a 'discussion rubric' for secondary English teaching). This prevents student teachers falling into the 'two worlds pitfall' of a university theory/school practice dichotomy, which again seems consistent with the collaborative model of partnership. Haugalokken and Ramberg (2007) make specific use of Korthagen's concept of 'realistic' teacher education (where theory and practice are integrated) in presenting a collaborative model of ITE partnership based on socio-cultural and situated perspectives on learning, the reflective teacher metaphor, and developing student teacher autonomy not reproduction in ITE. The Irish Teaching Council Report (Irish Teaching Council 2009: 118-119) draws upon Maandag *et al.* (2007) to identify five models of partnership in the context of a comparative study. These are the workplace/host model, the co-ordinator model, the partner model, the network model, and the training school model. Of these, the workplace/host model largely corresponds to Furlong *et al.*'s HEI-based/duplication model. The co-ordinator model is very similar to Furlong *et al.*'s complementary (separatist) model, while the partner and network models contain elements of the collaborative model. Mandaag *et al.* themselves favour the potential for collaboration in the co-ordinator, partner and network models (p. 170).

The examples given so far relate the collaborative approach to ITE specifically. In the USA, we find specific support for the form of collaboration incorporated within Professional Development Schools (PDSs), where university staff engage deeply with partner schools, not only over student teacher learning on ITE, but also over school staff CPD, research and pupil learning initiatives (Castle *et al.* 2006; Zeichner 2006: 334; see also earlier analysis in Brisard *et al.* 2005: 78-89). The attraction of the PDS approach extends beyond the USA. In England, Mutton and Butcher (2008: 56) call for the re-examination of partnership as 'multi-level partnerships', involving ITE, CPD and research and development work, and specifically link this to PDSs in the USA. In arguing for similar developments in Australia, Walkington (2007: 290-291) makes specific use of a PDS example from the USA.

Of course, those attracted to collaborative partnership as an 'ideal type' may contrast this with a more disappointing reality. I have already noted the conclusion of Furlong *et al.* (2008) that partnership in England is now intellectually superficial. This general conclusion is shared by Ellis (2010), who identifies 'an impoverished understanding of experience that underpins how beginning teachers are intended to learn in schools' (p. 105). She finds this even in the Oxford Internship Scheme (OIS), often regarded as the

strongest example of the collaborative model in England. However, I interpret Ellis as arguing for further innovation to enhance collaborative approaches, such as through her Developing English Teaching and Internship Learning (DETAIL) project within the English programme of the OIS, rather than abandoning the aspiration to the collaborative model. Others continue to develop collaborative approaches further, such as Burn (2006), who refers to work on the respective roles of university and school within collaboration in one curricular area on the OIS.

### *Scotland and Models of Partnership: The Need for Change and Challenges in Achieving It*

As my wider writing indicates, my essential argument is that Scottish ITE has largely remained trapped in a duplication (HEI-based/integration) model of partnership, and must move forward from this. This move should be to collaborative partnership (although even a move to complementary/separatist, or HEI-led, partnership would be significant progress from the continuation of duplication models). It is necessary to move from duplication so that university staff are able to concentrate on their distinctive research-based contribution to ITE, and so that school staff confidently assume full responsibility for the distinctive contributions which their practitioner expertise makes them best placed to deliver. Moving to the collaborative model will enable university and school staff to achieve 'knowledge of practice' through the 'inquiry as stance' approach to the knowledge-practice relationship, as advocated by Cochran-Smith and Lytle. The Review must call for this move to the collaborative model.

Of course, reluctance to move to a collaborative model may be encountered from partner school staff and some university staff. It is the responsibility of teacher educator leaders in the universities to address any such issues with university staff. The Review must also now address any reluctance of partner school staff to assume fuller and more formal responsibilities within ITE. Partly, this will involve a public discourse which celebrates the enhanced professionalism involved if a mature profession assumes such responsibilities for supporting and assessing student teachers, e.g. in the same way it has undertaken such roles within the internationally-praised Induction Scheme. Such a discourse will move us forwards from the continuing conservatism of those school staff who comment that supporting and assessing student teachers is a task for university staff, not them. Provided that any workload concerns are addressed, the Review must persuade school staff this conservative approach is not consistent with their actual high-quality capacity to meet the needs of student teachers within partnership.

Previously, e.g. with the 'Mentor Teacher Initiative' of the early/mid 1990s, attempts at such progress have also foundered on resource issues, specifically the view from teachers that they needed additional resources to underpin any more formalised roles within ITE (Smith *et*

al. 2006a: 26). Scottish administrations have previously taken the view that resources were already within local authority budgets to cover work with student teachers, and universities have generally argued there is no financial slack in their ITE funding which would allow them to consider any transfer from their funds to schools. The Review could address the resource issue by asking the Scottish Government to restate the position that local authorities are already funded for school support of ITE, but identify a more transparent separate funding stream for this. However, if this does not resolve the resource issue, hard questions may have to be addressed around identifying specific funds to resource school involvement in ITE. Given the general context of public finances, this may not be new money as such, but reallocation of existing funds. This difficult area is likely to include consideration not only of local authority funds, but also university funding. Consideration of university funding may require discussion with the Scottish Funding Council<sup>7</sup> on the per capita funding levels for ITE students, and whether current levels are adequate. It may also require a more rigorous and transparent accountability of universities on how top-line ITE funding is then actually spent, e.g. between general institutional expenditure and ITE-specific expenditure. We should not rule out the possibility that this accountability may require the universities to transfer funds to partner schools. This possibility would require central university managements to focus their thinking on issues such as the balance in allocating ITE funds to central university and ITE-specific costs, and possible economies of scale in rationalising provision across universities. My underlying point is that such difficult resource issues must finally be addressed directly by the Review, if this is necessary to achieve much-needed progress on models of partnership.

### *Collaborative Partnership with all Scotland's Schools, or Only Some?*

The issues around achieving school staff support and resources for truly collaborative partnership with universities may come together in the debate over whether all schools should be involved in such partnership, or whether such partnership can only be achieved with a restricted number of schools. As already indicated, there is powerful evidence from the USA for the success of Professional Development Schools (PDSs) in achieving more collaborative partnership with universities over the CPD continuum, as well as ITE. This would suggest similar benefits if Scotland were to restrict involvement in ITE to a limited number of schools able to meet fully the demands of collaborative partnership. On the other hand, it may be important to establish that staff in all schools should be prepared to accept enhanced roles within collaborative partnership, and avoid this narrowing of approach. I would suggest the Review should not be prescriptive, but allow universities to develop their own balance of approach on this issue.

---

<sup>7</sup> The Scottish Funding Council (SFC) is the body responsible for distributing government funding to Scotland's universities and further education colleges.

## FRAMEWORK OF ITE QUALIFICATIONS, PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION AND RECOGNITION

### *Developing Scotland's Approach to Teaching Qualifications, Professional Registration and Professional Recognition*

It will be important for the Review to give universities a broad framework for the future development of teaching qualifications. The overall Scottish framework for ITE qualifications has remained static for many years, based for the school sector on either generalist primary qualifications (to an extent also covering the pre-school sector), or a fairly restricted range of subject-specific secondary qualifications (from a subject list which itself has not changed for some time) (Scottish Government 2009a). Essentially, a teacher's initial Registration category with the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) corresponds to their ITE qualification<sup>8</sup>. ITE qualifications are generally available as 4-year undergraduate degrees or 1-year Professional Graduate Diplomas (PGDEs). The GTCS Framework for Professional Recognition/Registration (GTCS 2007) has provided an encouraging basis for some innovation in serving teachers adding to their initial teaching qualifications, e.g. primary teachers gaining qualifications to teach into lower secondary. However, a more fundamental debate is needed about establishing a new breadth of approach on the relationship between ITE and the framework of teaching qualifications, professional registration, and professional recognition. In a sense, the dominant pressure on the universities simply to meet greatly-increased intake targets for existing teaching qualification programmes has left no space for this type of debate in recent years.

### *Possible Introduction of a New Range of ITE Qualifications*

If a new flexibility is established, one approach would be for universities to propose a whole new range of ITE qualifications. For example, thinking of the stages and the levels within Curriculum for Excellence<sup>9</sup>, ITE programmes could be based upon qualifications for the CfE Levels, or some combinations of these. Qualifications based upon a particular 'curricular area' specialism at Second, Third and Fourth Levels would produce teachers able to work across the current primary/secondary divide. New qualifications at Third and Fourth Levels and the Senior phase could produce 'teachers/educators'

---

8 Scottish schoolteachers cannot teach in local authority schools without being Registered with GTCS. In broad terms, Registration is either primary (which can also cover teaching in pre-school) or secondary for a specific subject(s). The GTCS Framework for Professional Recognition/Registration indicates how a primary teacher can become Registered for secondary, and how a secondary teacher can become Registered for another secondary subject, or for primary. The more recently-introduced Professional Recognition enables the GTCS to confirm a teacher's expertise in a curricular area, cross-curricular area, or an area such as supporting student teachers, but this does not amount to formal Registration.

9 Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) identifies five Curriculum Levels, which correspond to the current stages of school education as indicated: Early Level (pre-school and primary 1); First Level (to the end of primary 4); Second Level (to the end of primary 7); Third, Fourth Level (secondary 1 to secondary 3); Senior phase (secondary 4 to secondary 6). Numerous CfE documents are available at the website [www.curriculumforexcellencescotland.gov.uk](http://www.curriculumforexcellencescotland.gov.uk).

able to work in new ways at the secondary stage, e.g. by broadening the curricular area covered in a Third and Fourth Level qualification, or defining new specialisms at Senior phase, including approaches drawn from the current college sector. Other proposals may suggest further moves towards Master's Level as the benchmark for ITE qualifications. These could include more 5-year Master's undergraduate degrees (at the time of writing, one university has introduced these for secondary science), and PGDEs fully credit-rated at Master's level (currently, only partial M-level credit has been granted, and only by some universities). Some may also wish to follow the Irish approach and extend the length of the Primary PGDE to 18 months.

### *Importance of ITE Qualifications Providing a Broad Base for Future Professional Development*

The complex permutations of potential new ITE qualifications is evident, and one approach is simply for the Review to encourage as many future proposals as possible. This is certainly preferable to the Review opting for an approach which, even if innovative, is too narrow. However, I would argue that simply increasing variety in the ITE qualifications framework is less important than the Review confirming the principle that ITE programmes and teaching qualifications should provide as broad a base as possible for future professional development. As the Irish Teaching Council report emphasises:

it is now widely recognised that ITE cannot give teachers all they need for a demanding career spanning a number of decades. Rather, the focus of initial teacher education ought to be on providing teachers with a set of high-level beginning competences rather than preparing fully-formed teachers (Irish Teaching Council 2009: xiv).

In arguing for a broad approach to ITE, I see this as continuing my previous emphasis on the inquiry stance within teacher education and development. The emphasis would be on developing the capacity for professional inquiry within ITE, which could then be applied to mastering curricular content on an ongoing basis within career development.

Without wishing to appear over-prescriptive in constraining variety further, I would also argue for two points of consistency from the Review in any broad approach to ITE. Firstly, Scotland should move towards an all-Master's level teaching profession (see ETUCE 2008: 8 for the increasing European emphasis on this). However, this should be achieved as part of CPD, and Master's level credit-rating should be deferred until after ITE, so that smooth and consistent progression can be achieved through CPD. Secondly, PGDE routes into primary and secondary teaching should be retained to ensure potential teachers are drawn from the widest possible talent pool, but the length of these programmes should not be extended, even for primary, partly in recognition of the current funding environment, and partly on the principle that ITE should not be overloaded.

On breadth of approach, I would argue the Review should emphasise secondary ITE qualifications much more as generic preparation for career-long deployment across the full work of a secondary teacher, including personal pupil support, inter-disciplinary learning, and curricular area learning & teaching within a constantly evolving curriculum, all based upon an inquiry stance. It would be a step too far to propose in the short term that secondary teaching qualifications and GTCS registration simply become generic. However, while the generic preparation described may be linked to required qualification in a specific subject, the selection of candidates for secondary ITE should explicitly address dispositions towards the generic aspects of the job, and the ITE process should fully reflect this generic emphasis. If a secondary teacher is then secondary Registered, albeit initially as a teacher of a specific subject, additional qualifications associated with career development, e.g. the acquisition of a new subject expertise, could be based on GTCS Professional Recognition, in as flexible a way as possible, rather than requiring additional Registration as such. Such flexibility could be linked to a teacher's ongoing PRD<sup>10</sup>. More radically, there could be a debate for the long-term on whether even the concept of formal GTCS Professional Recognition is actually needed to confirm aspects of a secondary teacher's career-long development.

Regarding primary, there is a continuing danger of curriculum overload in primary ITE. If a broadly generic approach to primary ITE is retained, the Review will need to identify robustly what is core for primary student teachers as they enter Induction. I have already argued ITE should include appropriate engagement with 'foundation disciplines' such as curriculum and assessment theory, philosophy of education, sociology of education, educational history, psychology of development and learning. In terms of curricular areas, I would then suggest English & Literacy and Mathematics & Numeracy for core emphasis. This would also help address the concerns of those wishing to deepen the intellectual mastery of these areas by primary ITE students (see Henderson and Rodrigues 2008 for such concerns on mathematics). This approach is not intended to belittle the importance of other curricular areas. However, much more of a 'taster' or options approach could be taken to other curricular areas within primary ITE, so that curriculum overload is avoided. Given that I have argued to retain a PGDE (Primary) pathway, but not extend its length beyond one session, it is particularly important to avoid curriculum overload in primary ITE. Of course, this more selective approach to content coverage is again based upon the key importance of student teachers using identified content work to develop their underlying capacities for practitioner inquiry. If this approach is taken to primary ITE, the Review must call for a robust, but flexible, approach to CPD entitlement if primary teachers are to have genuine opportunities to develop specialisms during their careers. Ideally, all primary teachers would

---

<sup>10</sup> PRD refers to the framework of Professional Review and Development established for Scottish schoolteachers from 2002. Under PRD, all teachers must agree an annual CPD plan with their immediate manager.

acquire a specialism in at least one other curricular area through CPD, in addition to the in-depth coverage of English & Literacy and Mathematics & Numeracy already suggested for ITE. This use of CPD, rather than ITE, could be seen as the Scottish system's way of addressing the issues raised in England around the need for more specialism in primary staffing generally (Cambridge Primary Review 2009: 36-37; UCET 2010: 19, 22), and in primary mathematics specifically (Williams Report 2008: 4). GTCS Professional Recognition could be very important here, provided, as with secondary, this did not introduce unhelpful new rigidities. This could include use of the more flexible Professional Recognition, rather than Professional Registration, to enable a primary teacher operating in a curricular area at Second Level to extend their teaching into the equivalent secondary curricular area and associated subjects at Third and Fourth Levels. Again, the underlying point is that primary teachers would achieve their professional development through the use of their capacities for practitioner inquiry.

## **THE GOVERNANCE OF SCOTTISH (INITIAL) TEACHER EDUCATION**

Earlier analysis has already indicated the support of other stakeholders will be necessary if universities are to progress innovation within ITE. Schoolteachers, especially their professional associations, must support enhanced roles within collaborative partnership. Local authorities must also be involved in partnership. All relevant stakeholders must endorse any broader approach to teaching qualifications (particular issues may arise with the professional associations representing secondary teachers).

### *The Role of the GTCS*

Many of these issues will come together in stakeholder contributions to GTCS debates, and the role of the future independent GTCS will be crucial within the governance of Scottish teacher education (see Maclver 2008 and the GTCS website [GTCS 2010] for overviews of the current GTCS). At the time of writing, the Scottish Government (Scottish Government 2010) intends to enhance the relevant powers of the GTCS by giving the Council lead responsibility for the Standards in relation to Scottish teaching, for ITE entry requirements, and for approval as well as accreditation of ITE courses. It will be crucial for the Review of Teacher Education to reinforce the Scottish Government's own requirement for the GTCS to exercise these powers in partnership with key stakeholders, including teacher education universities, employers, teacher unions, and Scottish Government itself.

The question then arises as to whether the Review should recommend the GTCS effectively becomes the locus for governance of Scottish ITE. While recognising the major importance of the GTCS to teacher education, it would be overstretching the Council's position to give it a sole overarching governance role. Such a role would compromise the Council's independent status, since the Scottish Government must surely be involved explicitly in any governance body (for example, the role of Scottish Government as the ultimate custodian of

the public funds for Scottish education must be recognised). Currently, it will also not be possible for the GTCS to cover fully as a governance body all aspects of the continuum of teacher education through to CPD, given the Scottish Government's intention not to extend existing prescribed GTCS powers on CPD (Scottish Government 2010: 38). There are also issues with the dominant position of teacher professional associations within the GTCS (Menter *et al.* 2006: 25-26), and consequently an excessive concentration of power over teacher education in their hands, if overall governance passed to the GTCS.

### *A Strategic National Governance Group for Scottish Teacher Education?*

In addition to rejecting the GTCS as an overall governance body, many university teacher educators may argue it will be unhelpful to suggest any kind of national governance group for Scottish teacher education. There are always risks in suggesting additional 'committees' of this sort (particularly the possibility of barriers and delays to creative innovation through over-formal processes, and the threat of 'leadership class' capture to ensure outcomes which preserve or enhance the control of existing powerholders). However, there are difficult issues here, particularly if we wish the Review of Teacher Education to lead to fundamental change, such as on roles of school staff within partnership. The universities will need support in achieving innovation. It may be necessary to ensure parallel progress of relevant issues through the Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers (SNCT)<sup>11</sup>. One view may be that the Review itself can establish outcomes which Scottish Government will then mandate on all relevant stakeholders, with no need for any ongoing governance group. This may be preferable, if universities are then assured of appropriate stakeholder agreement within local partnerships. However, if a formal national body is required to drive through change, this would have to be a more powerful and inclusive group than the stakeholder meetings currently held by the Scottish Teacher Education Committee (STEC, i.e. the Heads of the Scottish Schools of Education). The group could be chaired by a Minister. Its membership could include Scottish Government officials, Universities, GTCS, Association of Directors of Education in Scotland (ADES), Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA), representatives of headteachers and teachers (through their professional associations), and HMIE. Of course, it would be important for any such national group to set a liberating framework for creative innovation within the teacher education system, rather than attempting to micro-manage change in a constraining way, and it would be crucial to resist traditional 'leadership class' conservative outcomes.

---

<sup>11</sup> The Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers (SNCT) is a tripartite body representing teachers' professional associations (i.e. unions), local authorities and Scottish Government. The SNCT is responsible for national negotiations and agreements on teachers' pay and conditions of service.

## **CONCLUSION: PROVOCATIVE POSSIBILITIES FOR THE CONTINUUM BEYOND ITE?**

In briefly considering how Scottish education could move from my preferred ITE approach into the continuum beyond ITE, I hope to stimulate debate by suggesting some possibilities which other stakeholders may regard as provocative. If the Review of Teacher Education can establish stakeholder support for the type of ITE proposed here, the basis will be laid for a genuine partnership between the universities and the teaching profession to continue through Induction and CPD. If Scotland is to achieve a Master's level teaching profession, with all Scottish teachers reaching a Master's level qualification, I do not think this should be through the Finnish model of a 5-year Master's ITE degree, but through full university partnership continuing with the profession over CPD. This could be based on a version of the current Chartered Teacher Scheme, but altered in some radical and fundamental respects. Having met the Standard for Full Registration, all teachers would be expected to reach the career benchmark of a new Chartered Teacher status, still largely based on the 'accomplished and extended professional' model of the Standard for Chartered Teacher (GTCS & Scottish Government 2009), and reached through a Master's degree provided by one of the Scottish teacher education universities, working in partnership with other stakeholders. The continuing importance of university involvement should be stressed here. Although other stakeholders have advocated alternative CPD routes for the Standard for Headship which appear to require no university involvement, detailed research suggests that in practice such routes will be strengthened by university involvement (Davidson *et al.* 2008: 15,51), and this should continue for Chartered Teacher. This approach also presupposes a guaranteed role for the universities in the Induction year, unlike now (McNally 2002; O'Brien & Christie 2008). However, universities would be expected to show maximum flexibility in linking their Master's experiences to the needs of teachers, schools and teachers' employers, especially to reflect the collaborative approaches to CPD recommended by research (see Kennedy 2008: 843). Teachers would be able to commence working towards their Master's Chartered Teacher status immediately on completing Induction, thus giving Scottish teachers the opportunity for early professional development which other systems, such as England (House of Commons Children, Schools and Families Committee 2010: 5-6, 43-44, 52-53), are offering, and which research suggests new Scottish teachers have an interest in (Hulme *et al.* 2008: 8, 43-44, 47, 120). A profession structured upon this universal enhanced Chartered Teacher status would provide the basis for Judith Sachs' activist teacher profession, involving transformative and democratic teacher professionalism, and moving beyond managerial professionalism (Sachs 2003).

Of course, such a vision raises major issues for other stakeholders. It would actually implement collegiality, distributed/distributive leadership, and the idea that 'all teachers are leaders', as called for by other stakeholders (EIS 2010; HMIE 2007). A long-term vision of a profession in which all

teachers are Master's level Chartered Teachers on an enhanced salary would mean these teachers could be asked to undertake a rich variety of leadership roles in flexible and creative ways, including for fixed-term periods, on a rotation basis etc.. This could include the use of fixed-term headships, particularly in small and medium-size primary schools. The teachers' professional associations would have to develop their thinking on such possibilities, balancing the potential for all teachers to attain an enhanced salary scale against the likely disappearance of a range of current types of permanent promoted posts, and the requirement that all teachers would be expected to undertake meaningful distributed leadership roles. Scottish Government and teachers' employers would have to assess the cost increases of an enhanced 'maingrade salary scale' for the all-Master's profession of the future against savings from the removal over time of a range of permanent promoted posts. Decisions would also have to be made about the funding of Chartered Teacher course costs.

As I have outlined earlier, the focus for this paper is ITE, not CPD. It would require another paper to work fully through the CPD possibilities which I am suggesting can flow from the type of partnership between the universities and the profession proposed for ITE. I would look for the Review of Teacher Education to engage with these CPD possibilities, as well as ITE reforms. I ask for the Review to create the framework for genuinely collaborative partnership between the universities and the teaching profession over ITE and CPD. This could produce reflective practitioners with an inquiry stance, able to progress through Induction and CPD into an activist teaching profession which will best meet the needs of Scotland's young learners in constantly evolving, stimulating and unpredictable ways.

## REFERENCES

- Anagnostopoulos, D., Smith, E.R. & Basmadjian, K.G. (2007) Bridging the University-School Divide: Horizontal Expertise and the 'Two-Worlds Pitfall', *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(2), 38-152.
- Brennan, M. & Willis, S. (2008) Sites of contestation over teacher education in Australia, *Teachers and Teaching*, 14(4), 295-306.
- Brisard, E., Menter, I. & Smith, I. (2005) *Models of Partnership in Programmes of Initial Teacher Education. Full Report of a Systematic Literature Review Commissioned by the General Teaching Council for Scotland, GTCS Research, Research Publication No. 2*, Edinburgh: General Teaching Council for Scotland.
- Brisard, E., Menter, I. & Smith, I. (2006) Discourses of partnership in initial teacher education in Scotland: current configurations and tensions, *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 29(1), 49-66.
- Burn, K. (2006) Promoting critical conversations: the distinctive contribution of higher education as a partner in the professional preparation of new teachers, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32(3), 243-258.
- Cambridge Primary Review (2009) *Introducing The Cambridge Primary Review*. Online at [http://www.primaryreview.org.uk/Downloads/Finalreport/CPR-booklet\\_low.res.pdf](http://www.primaryreview.org.uk/Downloads/Finalreport/CPR-booklet_low.res.pdf) (accessed 27/8/10).
- Cameron-Jones, M. & O'Hara, P. (1993) *The Scottish Pilot PGCE(Secondary) course 1992-1993*, Edinburgh: Moray House Institute/Heriot-Watt University.
- Castle, S., Fox, R.K. & O'Hanlan Souder, K. (2006) Do Professional Development Schools (PDSs) Make a Difference? A Comparative Study of PDS and Non-PDS Teacher

- Candidates, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(1), 65-80.
- Christie, D. (2008a) Professional Studies in Initial Teacher Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.) *Scottish Education (Third Edition): Beyond Devolution* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Christie, D. (2008b) Benchmarks and Standards in Teaching. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.) *Scottish Education (Third Edition): Beyond Devolution* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Christie, D. & Menter, I. (2009) Research capacity building in teacher education: collaborative approaches, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 35(4), 337-354.
- Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (1999) Relationships of Knowledge and Practice: Teacher Learning in Communities, *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249-305.
- Cochran-Smith, M. & Zeichner, K. (eds.) (2005) *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2008) The new teacher education in the United States: directions forward, *Teachers and Teaching*, 14(4), 271-282.
- Dana, N. F. & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2009) *The Reflective Educator's Guide to Classroom Research*, Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin.
- Davidson, J., Forde, C., Gronn, P., MacBeath, J. et al. (2008) *Towards a "Mixed Economy" of Head Teacher Development. Evaluation Report to the Scottish Government on the Flexible Routes to Headship Pilot*, University of Glasgow and University of Cambridge. Online at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/239767/0066145.pdf> (accessed 20/5/10).
- Deloitte and Touche (2001) *Report of the 'First Stage' Review of Initial Teacher Education*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS) (2010) *The EIS & Leadership in Schools*, Edinburgh: Educational Institute of Scotland. Online at <http://www.eis.org.uk/images/pdf/eis%20leadership%20policy%20document%20%202nd%20edition%20march%2010.pdf> (accessed 20/5/10).
- Edwards, A. & Mutton, T. (2007) Looking forward: rethinking professional learning through partnership arrangements in Initial Teacher Education, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(4), 503-519.
- Edwards, R. (2007) Education – An Impossible Practice?, *Scottish Educational Review*, 40(1),4-11.
- Ellis, V. (2010) Impoverishing experience: the problem of teacher education in England, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(1), 105-120.
- European Commission(EC) (2007a) *Improving the Quality of Teacher Education, Communication From The Commission To The Council And The European Parliament*, Brussels: European Commission. Online at <http://ec.europa.eu/education/com392> (accessed 19/5/10).
- European Commission(EC) (2007b) *Common European Principles for Teacher Competences and Qualifications*, Brussels: European Commission. Online at [http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/principles\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/principles_en.pdf) (accessed 20/5/10).
- European Trade Union Committee for Education(ETUCE) (2008) *Teacher Education in Europe – An ETUCE Policy Paper*, Brussels: European Trade Union Committee For Education. Online at [http://etuce.homestead.com/Publications2008/ETUCE\\_PolicyPaper\\_en\\_web.pdf](http://etuce.homestead.com/Publications2008/ETUCE_PolicyPaper_en_web.pdf) (accessed 20/5/10).
- Feldman, A. & Weiss, T. (2010) Understanding change in teachers' ways of being through collaborative action research: a cultural-historical activity theory analysis, *Educational Action Research*, 18(1), 29-55.
- Forde, C., McMahon, M., McPhee, A.D. & Patrick, F. (2006) *Professional Development, Reflection and Enquiry*, London: Paul Chapman
- Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C., et al. (2000) *Teacher education in transition - reforming professionalism ?*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Furlong, J., Hagger, H., Butcher, C. & Howson, J.(2006) *Review of Initial Teacher Training Provision in Wales, A Report to the Welsh Assembly Government*. Online at <http://wales.gov.uk/topics/educationandskills/publications/reports/1412101113?lang=en> (accessed 20/5/10).

- Furlong, J., McNamara, O., Campbell, A., Howson, J., *et al.* (2008) Partnership, policy and politics: initial teacher education in England under New Labour, *Teachers and Teaching*, 14(4), 307-318.
- General Teaching Council for Scotland(GTCS) & Quality Assurance Agency(QAA) Scotland (2006) *Guidelines and Standards: The Standard for Initial Teacher Education*, Edinburgh: General Teaching Council for Scotland.
- General Teaching Council for Scotland(GTCS) (2007) *Framework for Professional Recognition/Registration: Advice and Guidance for Teachers*, Edinburgh: General Teaching Council for Scotland.
- General Teaching Council for Scotland(GTCS) & The Scottish Government (2009) *The Standard for Chartered Teacher*, Edinburgh: General Teaching Council for Scotland.
- General Teaching Council for Scotland(GTCS) (2010) *Website* at [www.gtcs.org.uk](http://www.gtcs.org.uk) (accessed 7/10/10).
- Goodnough, K. (2010) The role of action research in transforming teacher identity: modes of belonging and ecological perspectives, *Educational Action Research*, 18(2), 167-182.
- Hargreaves, A. (1998) The Emotional Practice of Teaching, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(8), 835-854.
- Hargreaves, A. & Shirley, D. (2009) *The Fourth Way: The Inspiring Future for Educational Change*, Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin.
- Haugalokken, O. & Ramberg, P. (2007) Autonomy or control: discussion of a central dilemma in developing a realistic teacher education in Norway, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 33(1), 55-69.
- Henderson, S. & Rodrigues, S. (2008) Scottish student primary teachers' levels of mathematics competence and confidence for teaching mathematics: some implications for national qualifications and initial teacher education, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 34(2), 93-107.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education(HMIE) (2005) *Student Teacher Placements Within Initial Teacher Education*, Livingston: Her Majesty's Inspectorate
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (HMIE) (2007) *Leadership for Learning: The challenges of leading in a time of change*, Livingston, HMIE. Online at <http://www.hmie.gov.uk/Publications.aspx> (accessed 20/5/10).
- Holligan, C. (2008) Deconstructing research discourses: an analytical enquiry, *Education 3-13*, 36(1), 39-49.
- House of Commons Children, Schools and Families Committee (2010) *Training of Teachers, Fourth Report of Session 2009-10, Volume 1*, London: The Stationery Office. Online at <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmchilsch/275/275i.pdf> (accessed 20/5/10).
- Hulme, M., Elliot, D., McPhee, A. & Patrick, F. (2008) *Professional culture among new entrants to the teaching profession, Report to the General Teaching Council for Scotland and the Scottish Government*. Online at [http://www.gtcs.org.uk/Research/\\_publishedresearch/\\_ProfessionalCulture/professional\\_culture.aspx](http://www.gtcs.org.uk/Research/_publishedresearch/_ProfessionalCulture/professional_culture.aspx) (accessed 20/5/10).
- Humes, W. (1986) *The Leadership Class in Scottish Education*, Edinburgh: John Donald.
- Humes, W. (2007) The infrastructure of educational research in Scotland, *European Educational Research Journal*, 6(1), 71-86.
- Humes, W. (2008) Policy Making in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W. M. Humes (eds.) *Scottish Education (Third Edition): Beyond Devolution*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Humes, W. & Bryce, T. (2008) The Distinctiveness of Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.) *Scottish Education (Third Edition): Beyond Devolution* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Jones, M. M. (2008) Collaborative Partnerships: A Model for Science Teacher Education and Professional Development, *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(3), 61-76.
- Kennedy, A. (2008) The Professional Development of Teachers In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.) *Scottish Education (Third Edition): Beyond Devolution* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Korthagen, F., Loughran, J. & Russell, T. (2006) Developing fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(8), 1020-1041.
- Maandag, D.W., Deinum, J.F., Hofman, A.W.H. & Buitink, J. (2007) Teacher education in schools: an international comparison, *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 30(2), 151-173.
- MacIver, M. (2008) The General Teaching Council for Scotland. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.) *Scottish Education (Third Edition): Beyond Devolution* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Malm, B. (2009) Towards a new professionalism: enhancing personal and professional development in teacher education, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 35(1), 77-91.
- McIntyre, D. (ed.) (1997) *Teacher education research in a new context: the Oxford Internship Scheme*, London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- McNally, J. (2002) Developments in Teacher Induction in Scotland and Implications for the Role of Higher Education, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 28(2), 149-164.
- Menter, I., Brisard, E. & Smith, I. (2006) *Convergence or Divergence? Initial Teacher Education in Scotland and England, Policy and Practice in Education Series*, Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.
- Menter, I. (2008) Teacher Education Institutions. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.) *Scottish Education (Third Edition): Beyond Devolution* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Menter, I. & Hulme, M. (2008) Is small beautiful? Policy-making in teacher education in Scotland, *Teachers and Teaching*, 14(4), 319-330.
- Mitchell, S.N., Reilly, R.C. & Logue, M.E. (2009) Benefits of collaborative action research for the beginning teacher, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(2), 344-349.
- Mule, L. (2006) Preservice teachers' inquiry in a professional development school context: Implications for the practicum, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(2), 205-218.
- Munn, P. & Baron, S. (2008) Research and Practice. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.) *Scottish Education (Third Edition): Beyond Devolution* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mutton, T. & Butcher, J. (2008) 'We will take them from anywhere': schools working within multiple initial teacher training partnerships, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 34(1), 45-62.
- O'Brien, J. & Christie, F. (2008) A role for universities in the induction of teachers? A Scottish case study, *Professional Development in Education*, 34(2), 147-163
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development(OECD) (2005) *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers*, Paris: OECD Publications. Online at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/39/47/34990905.pdf> (accessed 20/5/10)
- Ozga, J. (2008) Governing Knowledge: A Perspective from the Centre for Educational Sociology. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.) *Scottish Education (Third Edition): Beyond Devolution* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Pedro, J.Y. (2005) Reflection in teacher education: exploring pre-service teachers' meanings of reflective practice, *Reflective Practice*, 6(1), 49-66.
- Priestley, M. & Hulmes, W. (2010) The development of Scotland's Curriculum for Excellence: amnesia and déjà vu, *Oxford Review of Education*, 36(3), 345-361.
- Review of Teacher Education in Scotland (2010) *Website* at <http://www.reviewofteachereducationinscotland.org.uk> (accessed 7/10/10).
- Sachs, J. (2003) *The Activist Teaching Profession*, Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Scottish Executive (2005) *Review of Initial Teacher Education Stage 2*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Government (2009a) *Memorandum on Entry Requirements to Courses of Initial Teacher Education in Scotland*, Edinburgh: The Scottish Government. Online at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2010/03/10112435/0> (accessed 27/8/10).
- Scottish Government (2009b) *Review of Teacher Education – Press Release*. Online at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/News/Releases/2009/11/20103407> (accessed 22/06/10).
- Scottish Government (2010) *Towards an Independent General Teaching Council for Scotland*, Edinburgh: The Scottish Government.

- Smith, I., Brisard, E. & Menter, I. (2006a) Partnership In Initial Teacher Education In Scotland: Unresolved Tensions, *Scottish Educational Review*, 37, Special Issue on Teacher Education and Professional Development, 20-31.
- Smith, I., Brisard, E. & Menter, I. (2006b) Models of partnership developments in initial teacher education in the four components of the United Kingdom: recent trends and current challenges, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32(2), 147-164.
- Smith, I., (2008) Partnership between Universities and the Profession – Perspectives from Scotland and Beyond, *Journal of the International Society for Teacher Education*, 12(1), 9-14.
- The Teaching Council, Ireland (2009) *Learning To Teach And Its Implications For The Continuum Of Teacher Education: A Nine-Country Cross-National Study*, Maynooth: Teaching Council, Ireland. Available online at: [http://www.teachingcouncil.ie/\\_fileupload/Publications/LearningToTeach-ConwayMurphyRathHall-2009\\_10344263.pdf](http://www.teachingcouncil.ie/_fileupload/Publications/LearningToTeach-ConwayMurphyRathHall-2009_10344263.pdf) (accessed 27/8/10).
- Thomas, G. (2007) *Education and Theory: strangers in paradigms*, Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers(UCET) (2010) *The Cambridge Primary Review and Initial Teacher Education, Occasional Paper No. 21*, London: UCET.
- Walkington, J. (2007) Improving partnerships between schools and universities: professional learning with benefits beyond preservice teacher education, *Teacher Development*, 11(3), 277-294.
- Williams, P. (2008) *Independent Review of Mathematics Teaching in Early Years settings and Primary Schools*, London: Department for Children, Schools and Families. Online at <http://publications.education.gov.uk/eOrderingDownload/Williams%20Mathematics.pdf> (accessed 27/8/10).
- Zeichner, K. (2006) Reflections of a University-Based Teacher Educator on the Future of College- and University-Based Teacher Education, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(3), 326-340.