

## **Re-Visiting the Donaldson Review of Teacher Education: Is Creative Innovation Secured?**

**Ian Smith**

University of the West of Scotland

---

### **ABSTRACT**

This paper evaluates *Teaching Scotland's Future*, the Report of the Donaldson Review of Teacher Education in Scotland, from the perspective of an earlier paper by the author, written in anticipation of the Report's publication. The current paper concludes there is greater depth and breadth to the Report than previous national reviews, particularly in advocating the principles of collaborative partnership. However, the Report does not yet provide the fullest basis for on-going innovation in Scottish teacher education. Attitudinal and resource issues in achieving collaborative partnership could be addressed more directly. Creative possibilities for innovation in ITE will be narrowed by any prescriptive move to a single model of primary undergraduate provision, with a fuller consideration of research and theoretical perspectives on the nature of ITE and education studies desirable. Not all opportunities are taken to achieve the fullest connection between innovation in ITE and the continuum into CPD. Significant work remains to be done by stakeholders within the governance of Scottish teacher education, if long-term creative innovation is to be secured.

### **INTRODUCTION**

In 2010, the Scottish Government established a Review of Teacher Education in Scotland, led by Graham Donaldson, the former Senior Chief Inspector at Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (HMIE) (see Smith 2010, especially p.34, for the background to the Donaldson Review). Writing in autumn 2010 in anticipation of any final report by the Donaldson Review, the present writer argued that the Review must take a broader and deeper approach than recent national reviews of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) in Scotland, and avoid recommendations which narrow long-term possibilities for on-going innovation. I also argued that the future development of ITE should be based upon a fuller partnership between universities and the teaching profession than currently exists, with genuine collaboration in partnership. I suggested that achieving breadth, but combined with flexibility, in any new framework of ITE qualifications would be an important basis for creative innovation within new, fully collaborative partnerships. My earlier paper recognised there would be challenges in achieving the necessary support for innovation from various stakeholders involved in the governance of Scottish ITE, but argued appropriate innovation around ITE could lead to stimulating possibilities for the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) of Scottish schoolteachers, as well as for their ITE (Smith 2010).

*Teaching Scotland's Future: Report of a review of teacher education in Scotland* hereafter 'The Report') was duly published in January 2011 (Scottish Government 2011a). In several respects, the Report seems to meet a number of the approaches called for in my earlier paper.

Certainly, the Report is broader, and in some senses deeper, than previous reviews. The Report contains 50 recommendations, covers the full continuum from ITE through Induction to CPD, and provides some references and a selected bibliography which at least partly reflect the academic *Literature Review on Teacher Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* commissioned by Donaldson (Menter *et al.* 2010).

The Report calls for further developing and strengthening collaborative partnership between universities and schools, local authorities, and the teaching profession (Scottish Government 2011a, p.48 and Recommendations 3,15,16). More specifically within partnership, the Report advocates formalising an enhanced role for school staff in supporting and assessing student teachers on ITE placements (pp. 5, 7, 8, 46, 73 and Recommendations 20, 28 and 39). The Report argues that a role for universities in the Induction Year should be ensured, thus achieving a more integrated approach to ITE and Induction within the early phase of teacher education (pp. 8, 47 and Recommendations 25, 30). The proposal to pursue 'hub teaching schools' as a possible approach can also be seen as an attempt to achieve greater depth to collaborative partnership (pp.7-8, 45 and Appendix 2).

Moving beyond partnership, the Report shows some awareness of the importance of appropriate breadth for ITE, rather than prescriptive narrowness of approach, by recognising that overload should be avoided, stating 'Any expectation that initial teacher education will cover all that a new teacher needs to know and do is clearly unrealistic' (p.34). The Report gives some recognition to the value of Masters-level CPD (pp10, 75-76 and Recommendation 44). On governance, the Report also makes some attempt to emphasise the roles of key stakeholders in implementing reform in Scottish teacher education (Chapter 7).

However, I now wish to argue that, on certain key issues, the Donaldson Report does not yet provide the most complete basis for achieving on-going innovation in Scottish teacher education. In particular, although the Report expresses clear support for general moves to collaborative partnership, I will argue that it needed to address more directly and robustly the likely challenges to achieving full implementation of this partnership. On this point, and others, I will suggest that it was not enough simply to leave such issues to the implementation phase now being taken forward by an 'implementation' National Partnership Group and its various sub-groups under *Continuing To Build Excellence In Teaching: The Scottish Government Response To Teaching Scotland's Future* (see Scottish Government 2011b; c).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Scottish Government Response accepts almost all the Report's recommendations in full, and the others in part or in principle. The National Partnership Group comprises representatives from Scottish Government officials, the universities, the Association of Directors of Education in Scotland (ADES) for local education authorities, Education Scotland (the new body bringing together the work of HMIE and Learning & Teaching Scotland), the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS), head teachers and teachers. There are sub-groups for the early phase of professional learning, career-long professional learning and professional learning for leadership.

Moving on from partnership, I will argue that the Report does not provide a sufficiently broad and flexible basis for future innovation in ITE, but instead threatens some new narrowness. In particular, drawing perspectives from research and theoretical discussion on the nature of teacher education and education studies, I will suggest that the proposal to base primary undergraduate ITE exclusively on a concurrent degree model, with the removal of a B.Ed. model, should be reconsidered. Beyond ITE, I will argue that the Report misses important opportunities to achieve the most creative possibilities for the continuum into CPD. I will also propose that a more definitive position needs to be taken on the long-term governance of teacher education.

## **CHALLENGES IN DEVELOPING PARTNERSHIP**

### *Collaborative Partnership: Support from the Report*

In my earlier paper (Smith, 2010: 41-44), I drew upon previous writings to argue that Scottish ITE must move forward fully to collaborative models of partnership (see also Brisard *et al.* 2005; Brisard *et al.* 2006; Menter *et al.* 2006: 55-72; Smith *et al.* 2006a, 2006b; Smith 2008). My case for collaborative partnership drew initially upon the models of ITE partnership in the typologies of John Furlong *et al.* (Furlong *et al.* 2000), but I also argued that a literature review of more recent writing on partnership indicated continuing support for the collaborative approach (e.g. see Edwards & Mutton 2007; Anagnostopoulos *et al.* 2007; Haugalokken & Ramberg 2007; Maandag *et al.* 2007; Mutton & Butcher 2008; Ellis 2010).

The Report certainly makes general arguments for moving towards collaborative partnership over ITE. Early in the Report, it is stated 'There is now a need to create a new kind of collaborative partnership within which all aspects of the student's development are a shared responsibility and respective roles and responsibilities are clear' (Scottish Government 2011a, p.7). The Report emphasises the need to avoid a divide where 'exploration of theory is most often considered to reside within the on-campus delivery, with "practice" residing within placements'. Instead, the campus-based and school-based components 'should be seen as interlinked, with the connections being the means of developing educational theory through practice' (p.42). Later, the Report re-emphasises 'we need a much more integrated partnership involving universities, authorities and schools' (p.87). These approaches are then followed through in Recommendations 3 and 15 on partnership and Recommendation 16 on theory through practice.

Within collaborative partnership, I have argued in previous work that it is essential for partner school staff to assume fuller and more formal responsibilities within ITE (see Smith 2010: 44). The Report certainly gives considerable emphasis to enhancing the role of teachers within partnership. It emphasises that 'Teachers should see themselves as educators not just of the young people in their charge but of their colleagues' (Scottish Government 2011a, p.5), i.e. 'All teachers should see themselves as teacher educators' (p.73). More specifically, the Report argues 'there is scope to give prime responsibility to school staff' to make assessments of student teachers while in school (p.8), which later becomes the more definitive

'Suitably trained school staff should have the prime role in the assessment of students whilst on placement' (p.46). These approaches are then followed through in Recommendation 20 on the prime role of school staff in assessment, and Recommendation 39 on all teachers seeing themselves as teacher educators.

Within collaborative partnership, I have also argued in previous work that a full partnership between the universities, schools and education authorities requires a confirmed role for the universities in the Induction year<sup>2</sup> (see Smith 2010: 51). The Report emphasises that the Induction year should involve 'a reinforcement of the reflective role and extension of knowledge and technical skills through both theory and practice' (Scottish Government 2011a, p. 8). Later, it specifically argues that 'university-based teacher educators should have a role in the development and delivery of induction schemes' (p. 47). This latter point is repeated formally as Recommendation 25.

The Report also specifically suggests that a deepened collaborative partnership could be progressed through 'hub teaching schools', which would involve 'a more intensive relationship between a university and identified schools', with 'much more direct engagement of university staff in school practice' and 'research as an integral part of this strengthened partnership rather than as something which sits apart' (pp. 7-8). This 'hub teaching school' approach is then amplified in Appendix 2 of the Report, although interestingly there is no actual Recommendation on 'hub teaching schools'. Strong similarities can be seen between the 'hub teaching school' proposal and the Professional Development School (PDS) model in the USA. As I have suggested in previous work, although there may be issues with schools such as PDS schools being a restricted minority of all schools, they do exemplify a collaborative partnership approach (see Smith 2010: 43 and 45).

#### *Implementing Collaborative Partnership: Challenges which Persist*

As discussed, the Donaldson Report identifies with the development of collaborative partnership in a number of ways. However, I would argue the Report could have engaged more robustly with a number of persistent challenges which continue to threaten the full implementation of collaborative partnership.

The Report does not directly address the likely continuing challenge from school staff attitudes which resist an enhanced role in assessing and supporting ITE students on placements. There is a very significant history of this staff resistance in Scotland (see Smith *et al* 2006a). While the Report does call for an enhanced school staff role as an outcome, it could support such a move more robustly by explicitly recognising the conservative school staff attitudes which must be addressed, and the need to challenge these (see Smith 2010: 44).

Similarly, the Report does not directly address the resource issues associated with an enhanced school role within ITE partnership. As I have argued in earlier work, these issues are complex and challenging, involving not only aspects of school and local authority funding, but also university funding (see Smith 2010: 40, 44-45). The Report does not explicitly explore which funding streams may

---

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).

provide the resources for enhanced collaborative partnership activities. Yet, as a recent report on 21<sup>st</sup> Century teacher education by the International Alliance of Leading Education Institutes, covering ten countries (Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, South Korea, Singapore, South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States), emphasises 'Generally, institutional collaborative partnerships require considerable funding', and this is clearly referring to 'the partnerships among university faculties, schools and teachers' over teacher education, rather than inter-university partnerships. (Tan *et al.* 2010: 490).

There will be particular challenges in establishing a guaranteed university role in Induction. Local authorities currently have a highly-developed sense of ownership over arrangements for Induction (see O'Brien and Christie 2008: 159). This may be interpreted as a desire for exclusive control of the arrangements for the Induction year. The Report could have addressed this attitude more directly. Particularly on resources, a specific model will be required to underpin any university involvement in the Induction year, and no such model is identified in the Report.

Similarly, there would be particular challenges in implementing a partnership model based on hub teaching schools. The Scottish teaching profession has traditionally demonstrated a resistance to the identification of elite schools within teacher education (see Smith *et al.* 2006a: 23, 26). Again, the Report could have commented more directly on this. Presumably hub teaching schools will also require enhanced resourcing, but once more the Report does not demonstrate a model for this.

In summary, the Report could have significantly strengthened its support for the development of collaborative partnership by addressing more explicitly the need to overcome likely attitudinal resistance (from school staff on enhanced roles and hub schools, and from local authorities on Induction), and the need to develop clear resource models to underpin partnership (generally, and on Induction and hub schools specifically).

### **AVOIDING A NEW NARROWNESS FOR ITE**

There are aspects of the Report's approaches to ITE which threaten a new narrowness of outcomes, rather than securing the broadest, creative basis for on-going innovation. In particular, the Report could have developed its thinking more fully on the nature and structure of undergraduate primary ITE.

#### *The Structure of Primary ITE Programmes: Replacing the B.Ed. with Concurrent Degrees*

The Report argues for the replacement of the existing Primary B.Ed. degree with new concurrent degrees (see Scottish Government 2011a, pp.6, 24-25, 39-40 and Recommendations 7, 11). Concurrent degrees are defined as degrees which 'combine in-depth academic study in areas beyond education with professional studies and development' and which 'involve staff and departments beyond those in schools of education' (p.40 and Recommendation 11).

The Report presents a number of arguments for replacing the existing B.Ed. with concurrent degrees. Partly, there is the suggestion that B.Ed. students have a mindset which essentially seeks 'narrow training of immediate and direct

relevance to life in the classroom', and they do not sufficiently 'extend their own scholarship' into 'the values and intellectual challenges which underpin academic study' (p.6). According to the Report, the B.Ed.'s 'specificity of purpose can lead to an over-emphasis on technical and craft skills at the expense of broader and more academically challenging areas of study' (p.39).

There is also the specific suggestion that 'opportunities should be created for joint study with colleagues in cognate professions such as social work' (p.6). More widely, there is the general argument that 'Undergraduate student teachers should engage with staff and their peers in other faculties much more directly as part of their general intellectual and social development' (ibid).

The Report also argues that concurrent degrees will enhance the marketability of education degrees beyond the education sector (pp.24-25). More specifically, within the education and public service sector, the Report talks about such degrees perhaps providing the basis for primary teachers' specialist interests during their career, increasing staffing flexibility between sectors, and offering a range of possible pathways into related professions such as social work (p.40).

I wish to argue that the Report's position simply to replace the B.Ed. model with concurrent degrees does not take sufficient account of the complexities involved in providing appropriate, high-quality undergraduate primary ITE.

#### *Concurrent Degrees: Is the Report Clear and Consistent?*

There appears to be a number of internal issues with the Report's arguments on concurrent degrees. Initially, more clarity is needed on exactly what is meant by a 'concurrent degree'. The Report specifically uses the term 'concurrent study' (p.6) and 'Concurrent degrees' (p.88). Reference is then made to 'significant academic study outwith education' (p.40 and p.88) and to 'in-depth academic study in areas beyond education' (p.40 and Recommendation 11). However, the Report makes no attempt to quantify what it means by 'significant' and 'in-depth'. In particular, the Report does not engage with the world of university regulatory frameworks. For example, university frameworks may require a 50%/50% balance between the 'non-education' area and 'education' for a joint honours award, or 30% to the 'non-education' area and 70% to 'education' for an honours award where education is the 'major' subject and the 'non-education' area is the 'minor' subject within a major/minor award. By 'concurrent degrees', I suspect the Report intends to refer to joint honours, but may also be thinking of major/minor awards. I would argue that these are not simply obscure matters of university regulations, but central to whether or not there is appropriate flexibility in any proposed development of primary ITE programmes. In discussing the Report's recommendation on concurrent degrees, I will assume a minimum of 30% allocation to the 'non-education' courses, but more probably 50%.

If future implementation is based on 50% of a primary ITE degree programme being devoted to courses delivered outwith education, this may place very significant additional pressures on what the Report has described as the 'quart into pint pot' issue. This is the potential overload in ITE because of 'the ever-expanding set of expectations of what should be included, particularly in primary education' (p.8). The Report argues that this requires 'all available time be devoted to relevant tasks and

study, together with absolute clarity about priorities for the initial and subsequent stages of a teacher's education' (ibid). This stress upon the time pressures within primary ITE does not seem consistent with 'transferring' c.50% of programme time to areas outwith education under concurrent degree proposals.

This issue of time pressure is also compounded by the Report's assumption that Scottish school teaching will be still be based on 'the generalist teacher.....at the heart of primary education' (p. 89), with the implication that the relevant teaching qualification will remain primary and generalist. The Report does not explicitly explore the possibilities for innovation in the framework for Scottish teaching qualifications, e.g. with curricular area ITE specialisms crossing the traditional primary/secondary divide, or with the use of General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) Professional Recognition<sup>3</sup> specifically as a mechanism for achieving primary 'subject specialism' through CPD (see Smith 2010: 46-49 for suggestions on this). Therefore, the Report essentially remains committed to a model of generalist primary ITE qualification, with everything this implies for potential content overload in covering a range of curricular areas, but in the context of perhaps c. 50% of programme time moving outwith education under concurrent degree proposals. However, there is no explicit attempt to use the concurrent degree model to insist that subjects outwith education deliver a named specialism which corresponds to a key primary school curricular area.

The Report does not appear to recognise that some of these issues associated with prescriptive time constraints could be removed by considering a form of B.Ed. as a continuing future alternative model of undergraduate primary ITE provision. This would not be the conservative retention of precisely the existing B.Ed. structure, but continuing innovation within an overall B.Ed. structure retaining the vocational coherence of a programme for students deeply committed to primary teaching as a career, without the narrowing rigidity of a concurrent degree model which may lock future developments into prescriptive, quantitative requirements on the inclusion of 'non-education' subjects. The Report does not seem to appreciate that it would be possible within a continually innovating, but overarching, B.Ed. to include some courses from other parts of the university. For example, this is the case in Ireland. The Teaching Council Ireland Report (2009) presents no major challenges to the continuation of specific primary B.Ed. degrees as the overarching primary ITE qualification. However, it makes it clear these B.Eds. are 'where students study an academic subject or subjects at the same time as gaining a teaching qualification' (this is actually when defining 'Concurrent ITE', ibid, xxxv). In Scotland, it is also interesting to note that the Aberdeen University Scottish Teachers for a New Era (STNE)<sup>4</sup> primary ITE programme, drawing heavily on U.S. approaches which emphasise the importance of studying subjects outwith education, continues to describe itself to date as a B.Ed. programme (see Sosu *et al.* 2010, especially

---

3 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 – see Framework for Professional Recognition/Registration: Advice and Guidance for Teachers (GTCS 2007).

4 The Scottish Teachers for a New Era (STNE) programme was funded by the Scottish Government, the Hunter Foundation and Aberdeen University, and launched from 2005 as a six-year programme to produce an innovative B.Ed. (Primary), essentially as a national pilot for Scotland.

pp.392-393, for STNE generally, and Livingston 2008, especially pp.861-862, for study of subjects outwith education specifically). Part of my argument will be that such B.Ed.s, in contrast to concurrent degrees, may continue to offer greater overall coherence around teacher development, and more flexibility on the inclusion of courses outwith schools of education. Technically, the Report calls for the phasing out of the 'traditional B.Ed.' (Recommendation 11). Continuing innovation within an overall B.Ed structure would not be conservative retention of the 'traditional'.

There is also a lack of clarity on why exactly the Report thinks concurrent degrees are needed to ensure primary ITE students engage with 'the values and intellectual challenges which underpin academic study'. For example, there are many existing education studies<sup>5</sup> courses, explicitly addressing broader and deeper academic issues, within current B.Ed. programmes, validated at the required Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF)<sup>6</sup> levels, including at least up to Level 10 (Honours degree) (SCQF 2011). Is the Report saying that education is not a challenging academic discipline, and that education courses have been inappropriately validated at the relevant SCQF levels by a range of Scottish universities? Alternatively, the Report may be suggesting that education courses, even if intellectually challenging, are insufficiently broad, and that sufficient breadth for students can only be achieved by studying in departments beyond schools of education. Again, it is not clear exactly what is being said here. Is the Report saying that study of any other discipline is appropriate, regardless of the extent of the discipline's connection to the primary school curriculum, or whether the discipline has any such connection at all? Alternatively, is the Report suggesting that only certain other disciplines are relevant, e.g. those in cognate professions such as social work, or those which prepare for teaching in the secondary sector as well as the primary sector? These questions about which subjects outwith education would be included in concurrent degrees are particularly relevant because of the 'quart into pint pot' pressures which have already been discussed.

It is also not clear that a case has been made for the marketability of proposed concurrent degrees beyond primary teaching. If concurrent degrees are to lead to possible secondary teaching or social work opportunities, then the subjects studied elsewhere need to be specified on this basis. The Report does not do this. The wider marketability of concurrent degrees beyond teaching (and very closely related professions such as social work) may be questioned. The Report itself states 'representatives of the business community have indicated that a teaching qualification is not necessarily seen as an asset in a prospective employee in other employment sectors' (p. 25). Such employers may continue to see concurrent degrees as essentially 'teaching qualifications' because they include a specific focus on education.

---

5 The term 'education studies', or 'education', is used here to refer to those courses within ITE which specifically involve education as a discipline exploring broader and deeper academic issues. Christie (2008) also uses the terms 'professional studies' or 'theory and practice of education' for such courses, and distinguishes them from curricular subject courses.

6 The SCQF includes 'Level Descriptors' for progression in educational attainment through Scottish secondary schools, colleges and universities from Level 1 (Access 1, available at school or college) to Level 12 (Doctoral).

### *The Positive Case for Breadth and Diversity within Future Primary ITE*

Moving from this critique of the Report's internal arguments for replacing the B.Ed. with concurrent degrees, I now wish to present a number of broader arguments for avoiding any narrow prescriptive approach to the future of undergraduate primary ITE in Scotland. I am not conservatively suggesting that B.Ed. degrees should simply be retained in their current form, or that there should only be B.Ed. degrees and no concurrent degrees. However, I am suggesting that the perspectives of wider research and theory on teacher education demonstrate no clear case for the complete replacement of some form of B.Ed. with concurrent degrees. Rather, these perspectives suggest the importance of retaining diversity, and of applying general criteria for the appropriateness and quality of ITE programmes. It may be at least arguable that such criteria can be more easily met by some form of continually innovating B.Ed. programme, and may be more difficult for concurrent degree programmes to meet. In particular, I wish to present the following arguments, all of which can be interpreted as supporting the retention of flexibility in primary ITE provision, including the possibility of some form of B.Ed. A crucial underlying principle in designing ITE programmes is not to be dogmatic about structure. Education studies within a programme such as a B.Ed. can provide broad and deep study, involving connections with other academic disciplines. Subject disciplines can also be progressed appropriately within such programmes, including recognition that ITE students must be prepared to work beyond the constraints of particular subject disciplines. Above all, ITE programmes need to be coherent. This may be more achievable for a form of B.Ed. programme, but more problematic for concurrent degree programmes.

### *ITE Programme Diversity as a Fundamental Principle*

Generally, we should not be dogmatic about ITE programme structure and should not impose a new, prescriptive rigidity on any aspect of ITE. There is clear international support for this avoidance of rigidity. For example, when a number of senior US teacher educators were recently asked the question 'What do you perceive to be the best context for educating and preparing beginning teachers....?', Cochrane-Smith (Boston College) stressed 'It is unlikely that there is any one best context for educating and preparing beginning teachers', and Feiman-Nemser (Brandeis University) emphasised 'Structure is not nearly as important in determining program effectiveness as the quality and coherence of the learning opportunities available to prospective teachers' (The Teacher Educator 2011: 178). Elsewhere, in considering Finnish teacher education, Krokfors *et al.* (2011: 1) draw upon Zeichner and Conklin to adopt the underlying position:

Based on a meta-analysis of teacher education programmes, Zeichner and Conklin (2005, p. 702) state that there is no specific way of organizing teacher education that is better than any other. On the contrary, different programmes serve different purposes, but teacher education units *should make their aims explicit*.

Adopting such a position, it is appropriate to argue that, while there may well be a case for concurrent degrees, there should at least be the possibility also of some

form of dedicated primary B.Ed. degree within a flexible ITE framework, if such degrees can demonstrate key, relevant strengths. Flexibility and diversity are the key messages.

*Intellectual Breadth and Depth through Education Studies, e.g. Curriculum Theory*

Certainly, as Phelan (2011: 207) has argued, it is essential that teacher education avoids 'intellectual, moral and institutional' parochialism. One weakness of teacher education could be that 'teacher candidates and teacher educators remain closeted....rarely connecting with other faculties or professional schools' and 'The institutional separation reflects an intellectual separation' (ibid, p.212). However, intellectual engagement with other disciplines can be achieved within an integrated ITE programme in which education courses themselves connect with the thinking from other disciplines.

It is important to defend the status of education studies as an academic discipline capable of progressing such exciting possibilities with breadth and depth. Biesta (2011) emphasises that the Continental tradition, especially in the German-speaking world, is based upon 'the idea of education as an academic discipline in its own right' (p.176). This contains distinctive forms of theory and theorising, the objects of study 'Erziehung' and 'Bildung' studied through 'Pädagogik' and 'Didaktik', with Biesta focusing on Erziehung and Pädagogik as a normative autonomous academic discipline (pp.183-187). In contrast, English-speaking research in education draws upon theoretical inputs from a range of disciplines, essentially philosophy, history, psychology and sociology. However, even this Hirstian view of educational theory as not autonomous of these underlying disciplines indicates an important normative field of study (pp.181, 182 and 188). Whether we envisage the possibility of applying the Continental approach within Scottish education courses, or hold to the English-speaking approach, both traditions present an area of academic activity which can provide ITE students with an intellectual experience of fully-demanding breadth and depth.<sup>7</sup> Interestingly, based on Tibble (1966) Biesta highlights 'It was particularly the development of a four-year B.Ed. degree in education instead of one-year professional training for teachers that provided the context for the attention to the structure and form of and rationale for the study of education' (p.178). This could continue to be the case in the future.

More particularly within education studies, the study of curriculum theory can illustrate the potential for engaging with wider academic areas of activity.

---

<sup>7</sup> I appreciate there is a significant debate on the current strength, and future prospects, of the disciplines underlying the English-speaking approach to education studies - see Lawn & Furlong 2009, with associated papers in the relevant Special Issue, 35(5), of Oxford Review of Education, and Furlong & Lawn 2011. However, while identifying a range of threats to the disciplines, my overall reading of this debate concurs with the comment of Lawn & Furlong that 'most of the contributors....are optimistic about....what will be achieved in the future in their own specialist areas' (Lawn & Furlong 2009: 543). It is also interesting to note that this discussion of underlying disciplines can move beyond philosophy, history, psychology and sociology, to include other specialisms such as economics, comparative/international studies and geography. On the other hand, I also agree with Lawn & Furlong (pp.542-543) that there are challenges in ensuring there will be sufficient appropriate staff to ensure future delivery of discipline-based courses.

For example, drawing upon Carson *et al.* (2008), Phelan (2011) argues

If teacher education deserves a more complicated conversation that can extend current discussion to concerns about subjectivity (human agency and action), society and historical moment, then the field might well look to curriculum theory for a scholarly foundation for teacher education inquiry (Carson et al 2008) (p.213)

Again, drawing upon Hillis (1999), Phelan continues

What I am imagining for teacher education research is not unlike what William Pinar and Dwayne Huebner (see Hillis 1999) imagined for the field of curriculum studies in the 1970s when new forms of thought from philosophy, history and literary studies were adopted as the means to question, interrupt and re-imagine the curriculum discourses of the day (p.213)

Priestley (2011) has also argued recently that 'A reinvigoration of curriculum theory is necessary' (p.227), and then illustrates how this may be done by applying the critical realism of Margaret Archer to theorising the process of curriculum change and development.

I would suggest that such writers on curriculum theory illustrate the potential for education courses to offer fully challenging academic experiences for students, which will enable ITE students to connect with thinking from other disciplines but in the context of a coherent overall programme. In other words, it is not necessary to go beyond courses based in the schools of education to provide this depth of intellectual experience. Of course, it could be argued that education courses based on such curriculum theory can perfectly well provide the education dimension of a concurrent degree. However, even if this is the case, they can certainly also be embedded within the overall coherence of a form of B.Ed. degree.

#### *Relating Subject Discipline Study to the Wider Needs of Primary ITE*

Specific curricular area subject disciplines must, of course, be included in some way within primary ITE programmes. However, in deciding how to approach subject disciplines within ITE programmes, it is important to emphasise initially that ITE must also take students beyond any one specific narrow subject specialism.

For example, Andreotti and Major (2010) have recently reported on a project on 'Shifting conceptualisations of knowledge and learning in the integration of the New Zealand Curriculum (NZC) in initial and continuing teacher education', based at the University of Canterbury. They focused on developing within teacher education the view that 'The role of an educator.....is as a border-thinker/cultural-broker, who negotiates between discursive systems and who is equipped to displace and disrupt patterns and create new epistemic possibilities' (p.445).

Further support for going beyond subject-specific curricular knowledge can be seen from Townshend (2011: 129-130). In moving teachers and teacher education to 'Think and Act both Locally and Globally', Townsend argues that 'teacher education programmes should focus on expanding the range of teacher capabilities, beyond delivering the basic curriculum, to enable them to face an unknown and increasingly globalised future' (Table 4, p.130). Such capabilities will enable teachers to 'teach in ways that will build student confidence in themselves to be successful learners' (Table 3, p.129).

Again, I would argue moving beyond subject-specific curricular knowledge may be more easily achieved within some form of B.Ed. than within a concurrent degree model, which will inevitably give more emphasis to a specific subject(s).

However, if one then moves on to accepting that primary ITE must also explicitly address specific subject study, one of the challenges is to attempt some clarification of what we may mean by deepening the 'subject knowledge' of primary ITE students. As Harris and Burn (2011: 257) emphasise, drawing upon the social realist theory of Young (2008), there may be a wider debate about the need to "bring knowledge back" into current curriculum policy' because recent developments in school curricula display 'a lack of attention to questions of knowledge'. Harris and Burn argue that the rapid spread of alternative curricular arrangements, implemented in the absence of an understanding of curriculum theory, undermines the value of disciplined thinking to the detriment of many young people. Although they are developing this as an argument for discipline-based experiences within school learning (specifically in the context of history within the secondary school curriculum), there is a general argument here about the place of discipline-based experiences at all levels of education. However, even if this is transferred as an argument for the presentation of discipline-based experiences to primary ITE students, it is not clear precisely how this should be done so that the students are best prepared to teach these discipline-based experiences subsequently to pupils. Should this be by simply undertaking courses in the discipline presented in other parts of the university with no necessary attempt to connect these courses with primary school curriculum applications, or should this be by taking courses in the discipline, possibly still within schools of education, which are carefully structured to relate to the subsequent primary school applications of the discipline?

For example, Rogers (2011) considers such issues more directly in relation to undergraduate ITE for primary school teachers (again, using the example of history). Rogers researched a cohort of primary education students undertaking a 'Primary Education with History' programme, within which 20% of the degree programme comprises six modules in history, including crucially a final year 'specialist curriculum course in the teaching of the subject at primary level' (p.254). His concern is the retention of 'disciplinary study as a component of university-based primary education programmes' and he argues that 'the knowledge students derived from the specialist, disciplinary component of their programme ...deliberately promoted a shift towards more sophisticated epistemological beliefs and subsequent teaching and learning values' (p.264). However, he also emphasises his research 'points to a lack of coherence to the totality of student-teachers' experience in relation to the forging of their own professional identities' (ibid). The perspectives of Rogers appear to suggest that discipline-based courses for primary ITE students may be best presented if they explicitly connect to subsequent teaching in the primary school within a programme which has overall coherence. This seems closer to a model of tailored discipline-based subject courses specifically targeted to the needs of ITE students, as within a form of B.Ed., rather than simply the subject-discipline courses, offered elsewhere in the university, which make no explicit connection with subsequent application to primary school teaching and learning.

In summary, there are arguments for presenting discipline-based subject courses to primary ITE students which ensure connection with the specific requirements of subsequent primary school teaching, and which emphasise the need to move beyond the confines of any particular subject studies. Such approaches may be more consistent with some form of B.Ed. programme, rather than a concurrent degree model.

### *Coherence in ITE*

I wish to argue that achieving coherence is essential to producing appropriate, high quality ITE programmes, and suggest such coherence may well be more easily achieved in some form of B.Ed. programme, and may well be more difficult to achieve in concurrent degree programmes. I appreciate the argument that ultimately coherence in learning must take place in the minds of the learners. However, I am taking the position that staff responsible for designing programmes have an obligation to facilitate this learner process by maximising coherence in programme philosophy and structure. I will illustrate the importance of coherence by referring to a number of recent research perspectives on ITE.

For example, Ure (2010) picks-up on this crucial issue of coherence. Although Ure is specifically considering a 2-year postgraduate ITE programme (leading to a Master of Teaching but with a possible earlier PG Dip exit point), her 'multidimensional model for teacher development' can be applied to undergraduate primary ITE. Ure identifies five dimensions for teacher development. Certainly the first of these, Dimension 1, includes a focus on coverage of specific discipline-based knowledge. However, this Dimension 1, defined as 'Discipline Knowledge' with the Goal 'to develop knowledge *for* teaching and learning', also includes more widely a focus on knowledge of relationships and the ability to lead and work in teams; problem solving capacity; knowledge of structure and function of organisations; knowledge of current issues in society and issues and policies related to education and social well-being. Beyond this, there are four more dimensions. Dimension 2 is defined as 'Academic Study', with the Goal 'to develop knowledge *about* teaching and learning', and with the focus on knowledge about such aspects as student development and factors influencing student motivation to learn. Dimension 3 is defined as 'Practical Study', with the Goal 'to develop knowledge *of* (doing) teaching and learning', and with the focus on experiences designed to build competence and confidence in the action of teaching. Dimension 4 is defined as 'Research Study', with the Goal 'to develop knowledge of *use of evidence* in teaching and learning'. Dimension 5 is defined as 'Professional Study', with the Goal 'to develop knowledge of the *professional guidelines* in teaching and learning'. (see p.468, Table 1.) This type of sophisticated model of teacher development suggests that ITE programmes should certainly include coverage of specific discipline-based knowledge, but within a broader approach to 'Discipline Knowledge' and within an overall programme which combines several other dimensions of teacher development in a coherent way. I would argue that this is more likely to be achieved fully within a form of B.Ed. programme than a concurrent degree (which carries the greater risk of a lack of connection between subject discipline studies and the other dimensions of teacher development).

Another example of an emphasis on ITE programme coherence, in this case achieved by integrating knowledge beyond specific subject content, can be seen in Gal (2011). Gal considers the implementation of an interdisciplinary liberal studies curriculum in Hong Kong school education, but argues that very important lessons can be learned from this for US initial teacher education (which can certainly be generalised for elsewhere). Although Hong Kong is seen as 'a stellar performer on international achievement tests' (p.243), current emphasis is on the introduction of liberal studies as a new interdisciplinary core subject in Hong Kong high schools (p. 242). In contrast, Gal argues that

American teacher education policy, and some of teacher education literature remain focused on specific content knowledge coupled with pedagogical skill development. There has been less discourse on how teachers will integrate their knowledge either for themselves or the students they eventually teach (p.245).

Gal urges that 'liberal studies should undergird the education of all future teachers, and the ability to integrate knowledge across disciplines should be nurtured' (p.241). This is because 'the purpose of teachers' continuing education and professionalism is to engage themselves in learning opportunities so that they can effectively model the enquiry process for students rather than deliver specified content' (p.247). Interestingly, Gal links this position specifically to Cochran-Smith's and Lytle's 'inquiry as stance' (p.253). In my earlier paper, I emphasised the significance of 'inquiry as stance' (Cochrane-Smith and Lytle 1999) as an integrating conceptualisation of teacher knowledge within ITE (Smith 2010: 38). Once more, I would suggest that Gal's emphasis on moving beyond specific content knowledge to integration of knowledge across disciplines may well sit better with a B.Ed model than a concurrent degree model.

One of the fullest exponents of an integrated model of ITE is Korthagen (2010), who has developed his approach of 'realistic teacher education'. Korthagen's aim is to address the gap between theory and practice. He draws upon his three-level model of teacher learning: the gestalt level ('unconscious behaviour'); the schema level of reflection (de-situating knowledge); and the theory level (more theoretical understanding) (pp.410-414). Taking this three-level model into account, realistic teacher education 'starts from concrete practical problems and the concerns experienced by student teachers in real contexts' ('first guiding principle', p.414). Realistic ITE programmes draw upon his ALACT approach (Action; Looking back on the action; Awareness of essential aspects; Creating alternative methods of action; Trial) (p.415). This is because 'guiding principle two' 'aims at the promotion of systematic reflection by student teachers' (p.414). Crucially, in identifying five guiding principles for realistic teacher education, Korthagen states the fifth principle as 'A realistic programme has a strongly integrated character. Two types of integration are involved: integration of theory and practice and integration of several disciplines.' (p.414). In discussing the 'organisational consequences' of such approaches, Korthagen emphasises

the approach advocated here implies that it is impossible to make a clear distinction between different subjects in the teacher education programme. The realistic

approach is not compatible with a programme structure showing separate modules such as 'subject matter methods', 'general education', 'psychology of learning', and so forth (ibid, p.419).

It seems reasonable to suggest that it will be easier to achieve this type of integrated ITE programme within a form of B.Ed. model, and more difficult for a concurrent degree model.

As a final example of the importance of underlying coherence in ITE programmes, the internationally praised Finnish provision can be considered. Krokfors *et al.* (2011) provide interesting insights into approaches to relevant issues within Finnish ITE. They emphasise that the Finnish 'class teacher students' (i.e. elementary teacher students) complete a Masters degree (300 ECTS<sup>8</sup>) in teacher education. Within this, the students study education as their main subject (140 ECTS), multidisciplinary studies in subjects taught in school (also referred to as pedagogy of school subjects) (60 ECTS) as their minor subject, and one or two other subjects (60-75 ECTS) as their complementary minor subject studies 'to profile their expertise as a future teacher'. They also study communication and 'orienting' studies (25 ECTS). (pp.3-4). Of particular interest, Krokfors *et al.* comment that 'the research orientation was not perceived as very obvious in the pedagogical content knowledge courses', which contrasted with the research-based approach in the main subject education courses (p.10). Of course, the whole philosophy of Finnish teacher education is that it should be 'research-based', and Krokfors *et al.* imply that the Finnish system recognises this as an area for further development within pedagogical content knowledge courses. This analysis of the Finnish system supports an undergraduate primary ITE which bases its strengths on placing pedagogical content knowledge courses firmly in the context of underlying coherence around the 'research-based' principle of teacher education, and a greater emphasis on education studies over pedagogical content knowledge courses. Again, this seems to sit more closely with a form of B.Ed. model, rather than the concurrent degree model.

#### *Conclusion on Future Development of Primary ITE*

It will be vital to avoid narrowness of approach in the future development of primary ITE. There should be no prescription of a single model of undergraduate primary ITE. Diversity and flexibility of approach should be based on avoiding an unrealistic attempt to overload programmes with excessive specific subject content, and on judging courses by their capacity to deliver coherent overall programmes which include full engagement with broad and deep academic issues through education studies. There should certainly still be a place for an appropriately developed, continually innovating B.Ed. within such future provision.

---

8 ECTS refers to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation Scheme, which assigns credits to course components across Europe.

## **MISSED OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE CONTINUUM BEYOND ITE**

In my previous paper, I suggested some provocative possibilities for the continuum beyond ITE, if a genuinely collaborative partnership between the universities and the teaching profession were to develop from ITE through Induction and CPD. I proposed the possibility of a Masters level teaching profession, with all teachers expected to reach the career benchmark of a new Chartered Teacher<sup>9</sup> status through achieving a Masters degree provided by one of the Scottish teacher education universities, working in partnership with other stakeholders. I suggested a profession structured upon this universal enhanced Chartered Teacher status could provide the basis for a truly activist teaching profession. I recognised the potential for this approach to achieve meaningful collegiality and distributed/distributive leadership (see Smith 2010: 51-52).

However, from such perspectives, the Donaldson Report demonstrates a number of missed opportunities.

### *A Missed Opportunity on a Masters Level Profession*

I appreciate there are research perspectives which emphasise the importance of informal, collaborative CPD, in contrast to more formal, course-based provision leading to individual certification. Kennedy (2011: 25,30) argues that informal collaborative CPD can be more effective than individual CPD linked to individualised standards, especially if genuinely transformative CPD is sought. On the basis of research on CPD for early-career teachers, Kennedy and McKay (2011: 565) recommend 'informal learning...should be recognised and be made more explicit, acknowledging that CPD ....should involve engagement with colleagues, not just courses; for example, mentoring, observing, peer coaching and networking'. Such perspectives would suggest formal Masters-level recognition is not a key element of future CPD provision.

On the other hand, in such research on Scottish schoolteachers and CPD, Kennedy (2011: 33,35) also refers to research interviewees who 'suggested that collaborative learning was currently ad-hoc but expressed hope that it would be a much more systematic and integral aspect of professional learning in the future', and to other respondents who focus on the individual when discussing 'effective' CPD. The basis for formal recognition of individual Masters level work within CPD has already been set by the emergence of m-level ITE within Scotland, as exemplified for one university's PGDE provision by Dickson (2011). A move to more structured CPD, including Masters recognition, is consistent with wider European developments. For example, in a comparable system such as Ireland's, Harford (2010) argues that there are significant gaps in Irish teacher education policy on CPD if the wider European agenda is to be met, and 'a more structured approach is urgently required' ( p. 356).

---

9 The existing Chartered Teacher Scheme was introduced in 2003 as an opportunity for classroom teachers to achieve enhanced status and salary without assuming a formal leadership and management post. These teachers have to meet The Standard for Chartered Teacher (GTCS & The Scottish Government 2009), which now requires the successful completion of a Masters degree.

The Report gives some encouragement to increasing the number of Scottish teachers who achieve Masters qualifications. The Report calls for Masters level credits to be built into ITE, Induction and CPD, with teachers having 'Masters accounts' and a greater range of CPD being formally accredited (Scottish Government 2011a, pp.10, 75-76 and Recommendation 44). However, the Report does not specifically argue that the benchmark for Scottish schoolteachers should be an all-Masters profession. The Report makes clear that it is 'not advocating a "Masters profession" as a key policy driver' (p.10). The international move towards teaching becoming a 'Masters-level profession' is recognised, and specific research evidence is quoted linking the level of teachers' qualifications and 'academic calibre' with high performing systems and pupil achievement. However, such evidence is rejected as 'not sufficiently conclusive to suggest an immediate policy of requiring all teachers to be educated to Masters level' (p.75). Interestingly, no specific research evidence for this more negative conclusion is quoted to counter the positive research evidence specifically referenced in the Report. This failure to insist upon an all-Masters profession leaves the future of Scotland's teaching profession adrift of what can increasingly be seen as the European benchmark.

#### *A Missed Opportunity on the Chartered Teacher Programme*

More specifically, the Report misses the opportunity to base an argument for a Masters-level Scottish teaching profession upon the maximum use of the existing strengths of the Chartered Teacher Scheme<sup>10</sup>. Instead, the Report is generally negative about the Chartered Teacher Scheme. It appears to present criticism which some may describe as impressionistic and anecdotal, and not based upon systematic evidence (pp.62-63, 76-78 and Recommendation 45). While the narrower criticisms of the Chartered Teacher Scheme produced by HMIE in 2007 are highlighted, no mention is made of the broader endorsement of the Scheme the following year by the National Chartered Teacher Review Group (see HMIE 2007 and Scottish Government 2008). The connection between the 2009 revised Standard for Chartered Teacher (GTCS and Scottish Government 2009) and that national Review is not made clear (Scottish Government 2011a, p.63). Further emphasis on the negative can be seen in the suggestion that 'the uptake of the chartered teacher role is unlikely to increase significantly in the next five years', although it is conceded that the evidence for this is 'not representative' (p.77). Without any evidence being directly provided, the Report states that 'The programme does not always attract and reward our highest-performing class teachers and the

---

<sup>10</sup> At the time of writing, the future of the Chartered Teacher Scheme is now in serious doubt. Advancing Professionalism in Teaching, the Report of the McCormac Review of Teacher Employment in Scotland, has just been published (see Scottish Government 2011d). A seven-person group, chaired by Professor Gerry McCormac, the Principal of Stirling University, was appointed in January 2011 to review the current arrangements for teacher employment. Among a range of recommendations, the Report calls for the Chartered Teacher Scheme to be discontinued, mirroring much of the Donaldson Report's negativity about the current Scheme. A detailed Scottish Government response to the McCormac Report has not yet been made, but the Government has initially given a broad welcome to the Report. This new threat appears to re-emphasise the importance of the Scheme's supporters making their case to retain the Scheme.

nature of the programme does not ensure that participants are better teachers as a result of gaining the reward' (ibid). However, rather surprisingly, the Report does not then call for the removal of the Chartered Teacher Scheme. Rather, the Report recommends that 'local authorities should have greater control over the number of teachers who apply for the award', and, in recommending 'The award of Chartered Teacher status should be based on a range of evidence, including improved teaching skills and significant impact on improving the learning of young people and colleagues with whom they work', there is presumably an implication that existing university partnership programmes do not achieve this (see p.100, and Recommendation 45). Yet, the Report states 'Ultimately, our aspiration should be for all teachers to reach the highest possible professional standards', and, even if this is linked to the new 'Standard for Active Registration'<sup>11</sup>, this in itself would involve 'learning from the chartered teacher programme' (p.78).

An alternative approach to the Report's emphasis on the negative around the existing Chartered Teacher Scheme would have been to argue as positively as possible for developing the Chartered Teacher pathway as an immediately available basis for moving towards an all-Masters profession.

#### *A Missed Opportunity on Distributed Leadership*

Again, the Report could push much harder for moves to genuine distributed leadership in Scottish schools. Initially, there is an emphasis on the 'greater focus on leadership for learning and distributive forms of leadership' and the 'culture of initiative and collegiality' which is the 'hallmark of our most dynamic and effective schools' (p.16). However, the specific section on Leadership then very much focuses on headship and headteachers, or at its widest only those in formal leadership positions (pp.79-81). This is reflected in Recommendations 46 -50. There is no equivalent emphasis on the notion that 'all teachers are leaders' beyond those in formal leadership roles, certainly not in the 'radical' sense discussed in my previous paper (see Smith 2010: 51-52).

Yet, powerful academic arguments continue for distributed leadership approaches. As Townshend (2011) suggests, in the context of moving 'individual teachers past competence and into a position of capability' (p.128) there is 'the need to share leadership within the school' (p.131), whether the terminology used refers to distributed leadership, shared leadership, democratic leadership, or team/teacher leadership. This can be linked to developing forward-thinking approaches such as deep leadership, sustainable leadership and regenerative leadership. (pp.132-133). The Report does not engage thoroughly with such fuller definitions of leadership, all of which include an emphasis on the shared involvement of the broad range of staff in leadership.

In summary, the Report could have given more consideration to the potential to achieve genuine collegiality and distributed/distributive leadership within Scottish schools, using further development of the Chartered Teacher Programme as a basis for moving towards a Masters-level teaching profession.

---

<sup>11</sup> The Donaldson Report recommends a new Standard for Active Registration as a mechanism for fully registered teachers continuing to develop their skills and competences - Recommendation 36 in the Report.

## **THE GOVERNANCE OF TEACHER EDUCATION**

In my previous paper, I speculated on whether or not a formal national body should be established to drive through change in Scottish teacher education (see Smith 2010: 49-50). My intention in that discussion was to debate the framework for the longer-term governance of Scottish teacher education, not simply to suggest a shorter-term 'implementation group' to be established following the publication of the Donaldson Report. Such a short-term group, with associated sub-groups, has certainly been established by the Scottish Government (Scottish Government 2011b,c and see Footnote 1). However, longer-term issues on the governance of Scottish teacher education remain unresolved, and the Donaldson Report failed to make any definitive recommendations on these issues (see Scottish Government 2011a, Chapter 7). Chapter 7 in the Report (Implications and next steps) does not attempt any long-term recommendations on how an overall governance structure for Scottish teacher education may be brought together. Rather, the Chapter simply identifies 'high level messages' separately for different groups of stakeholders: teachers; school leaders; local authorities; universities, including the Scottish Funding Council<sup>12</sup>; the GTCS; the new national body Education Scotland (which brings together the work of HM Inspectorate of Education and Learning and Teaching Scotland)<sup>13</sup>; and Scottish Government itself. Even the 'messages' to Scottish Government do not include any specific suggestions on how precisely the other different stakeholders should be brought together in the long-term to ensure future developments. The Chapter also pulls back from specific recommendations on the deeper detail of some of its 'messages' to particular stakeholders, e.g. the 'rationalisation of provision' question (i.e. the possible reduction in the number of Scottish universities involved in teacher education)<sup>14</sup> is simply posed to the university sector and the Scottish Funding Council, but no judgement is delivered on the issue.

## **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

In general terms, the Donaldson Report has taken a broader and deeper approach to teacher education than recent national reviews of ITE in Scotland. In particular, the Report clearly supports some key principles of genuinely collaborative partnership on ITE. On the other hand, the Report falls short of providing the strongest possible base for the fullest reform and on-going creative innovation in Scottish teacher education. The Report could have addressed more explicitly and robustly the attitudinal and resource challenges in fully implementing collaborative partnership, rather than leaving too much of this simply to be attempted by the various groups involved in the implementation phase. The Report has narrowed long-term possibilities for on-going innovation based on breadth and flexibility in ITE qualifications by very prescriptively advocating a single model of undergraduate

---

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

13 This new body was set up with effect from July 2011.

14 See Smith (2010: 40) for some further discussion of the 'rationalisation of provision' question.

primary provision. On this issue, the Report's approaches need to be more fully informed by research and theoretical perspectives on the nature of coherent ITE, and the place of genuinely demanding education studies, and appropriate subject studies, within this. Moving into the continuum beyond ITE, the Report has missed opportunities to push for a fully Masters-level teaching profession, which could have been based on the Chartered Teacher Scheme, and achieve much more genuinely distributed leadership in Scottish schools. While including much that is positive, the Report has also left much for those involved in the implementation phase to grapple with. I would urge those involved in implementation to ask the hard questions, and push for the difficult outcomes, necessary if genuinely collaborative partnership on teacher education is actually to be achieved. I would call upon them to resist narrowing any aspect of ITE provision exclusively to a single model. Specifically, the programme structures available for undergraduate primary ITE should include a range of options, judged by whether or not they deliver genuinely coherent ITE, appropriate approaches to subject studies, and fully demanding education studies. Such options should certainly include the possibility of further innovation within some kind of B.Ed. degree. I would ask them to sustain the drive for innovation by pushing for a Masters-level teaching profession, ideally retaining a key role for a Chartered Teacher Programme, and embracing genuine distributed leadership. If it proves difficult to achieve such outcomes during the shorter-term implementation phase, this will re-inforce the need to establish an appropriate long-term system of governance for Scottish teacher education, capable of addressing and overcoming the most difficult challenges.

## 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), 138-152.
- Andreotti, V. & Major, J. (2010) Shifting conceptualisations of knowledge and learning in initial teacher education in Aotearoa/New Zealand, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(4), 441-459.
- Biesta, G. (2011) Disciplines and theory in the academic study of education: a comparative analysis of the Anglo-American and Continental construction of the field, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 19(2), 175-192.
- 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.
- Carson, T., Chapman, O., Chinnery, A., Kanu, Y. et al. (2008) Working group report for Theme 3: Understanding of practices in teacher education related to diversity, identity and inclusion, and demographic change. In *Mapping research in teacher education in Canada*, ed. T. Falkenberg and H. Smits Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Faculty of Education. Online at [www.umanitoba.ca/education/TEResearch](http://www.umanitoba.ca/education/TEResearch) (accessed 2/9/11).
- Christie, D. (2008) 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.
- Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (1999) Relationships of Knowledge and Practice: Teacher Learning in Communities, *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249-305.
- Dickson, B. (2011) Beginning teachers as enquirers: m-level work in initial teacher education, *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(3), 259-276.
- 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.
- Ellis, V. (2010) Impoverishing experience: the problem of teacher education in England, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(1), 105-120.
- Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C., et al. (2000) *Teacher education in transition – reforming professionalism?* Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Furlong, J. & Lawn, M. (eds.) (2011) *Disciplines of Education: Their Role in the Future of Educational Research* Abingdon: Routledge
- Gal, D. (2011) New Opportunities for Change in American Teacher Education: Insights from Hong Kong, *Educational Studies*, 47(3), 240-259.
- 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.
- Harford, J. (2010) Teacher education policy in Ireland and the challenges of the twenty-first century, *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(4), 349-360.
- Harris, R. & Burn, K. (2011) Curriculum theory, curriculum policy and the problem of ill-disciplined thinking, *Journal of Education Policy*, 26(2), 245-261.
- 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.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (HMIE) (2007) *Teaching Scotland's Children*, Livingston: HMIE.
- Hillis, V. (1999) *The lure of the transcendent: Collected essays by Dwayne E. Huebner* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Kennedy, A. (2011) Collaborative continuing professional development (CPD) for teachers in Scotland: aspirations, opportunities and barriers, *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(1), 25-41.
- Kennedy, A. & McKay, J. (2011) Beyond induction: the continuing professional development needs of early-career teachers in Scotland, *Professional Development in Education*, 37(4), 551-569.
- Korthagen, F. (2010) How teacher education can make a difference, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(4), 407-423.
- Krokfors, L., Kynaslahti, H., Stenberg, K., Toom, A. et al. (2011) Investigating Finnish teacher educators' views on research-based teacher education, *Teaching Education*, 22(1), 1-13.
- Lawn, M. & Furlong, J. (2009) The disciplines of education in the UK: between the ghost and the shadow, *Oxford Review of Education*, 35(5), 541-552.
- Livingston, K. (2008) New Directions in Teacher Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M.Humes (eds.) *Scottish Education (Third Edition): Beyond Devolution* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- 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.
- 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., Hulme, M., Elliot, D., Lewin, J. et al. (2010) *Literature Review on Teacher Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Online at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/325663/0105011.pdf>. (accessed 26/1/11).
- 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.
- Phelan, A. (2011) Towards a complicated conversation: teacher education and the curriculum turn, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 19(2), 207-220.
- Priestley, M. (2011) Whatever happened to curriculum theory? Critical realism and curriculum change, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 19(2), 221-237.
- Rogers, G. (2011) Learning-to-learn and learning-to-teach: the impact of disciplinary subject study on student-teachers' professional identity, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43(2), 249-268.
- Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (2011) *The Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework*, Glasgow: The Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework. Online at <http://www.scqf.org.uk> (accessed 8/9/11).
- Scottish Government (2008) *Report of the Chartered Teacher Review Group*, Edinburgh: The Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2011a) *Teaching Scotland's Future: Report of a review of teacher education in Scotland*, Edinburgh: The Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2011b) *Continuing To Build Excellence In Teaching: The Scottish Government's Response To Teaching Scotland's Future*, Edinburgh: The Scottish Government. Online at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/920/0114570.pdf> (accessed 7/10/11).
- Scottish Government (2011c) *Teaching Scotland's Future National Partnership Group*. Online at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/About/NationalPartnershipGroup/> (accessed 13/9/11).
- Scottish Government (2011d) *Advancing Professionalism in Teaching: The Report of the Review of Teacher Employment in Scotland*. Online at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/920/0120902.pdf> (accessed 16/9/11).

- 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.
- Smith, I. (2010) Reviewing Scottish Teacher Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Let Collaborative Partnership Flourish, *Scottish Educational Review*, 42(2), 33-56.
- Sosu, E., Mtika, P. & Colucci-Gray, L. (2010), Does initial teacher education make a difference? The impact of teacher preparation and student teachers' attitudes towards educational inclusion, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(4), 389-405.
- Tan, S., Wong, I., Fang, Y., Devi, L., et al. (2010) Educational collaboration across borders: the preparation of the *Transforming teacher education: Redefined professionals for 21<sup>st</sup> century schools* report, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(4), 477-493.
- 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-Conway/Murphy/RathHall-2009\\_10344263.pdf](http://www.teachingcouncil.ie/fileupload/Publications/LearningToTeach-Conway/Murphy/RathHall-2009_10344263.pdf) (accessed 27/8/10).
- The Teacher Educator (2011) Voices in Education: Traditional or Alternative Teacher Education (Featured Article), *The Teacher Educator*, 46(3), 177-181. Online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2011.583191> (accessed 30/8/11)
- Tibble, J.W. (1966) *The Study of Education* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Townsend, T. (2011) Thinking and acting both locally and globally: new issues for teacher education, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 37(2), 121-137.
- Ure, C. L. (2010) Reforming teacher education through a professionally applied study of teaching, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36(4), 461-475.
- Young, M. (2008) *Bringing knowledge back in: From social constructivism to social realism in the sociology of education* Abingdon: Routledge.
- Zeichner, K.M. & Conklin, H.G. (2005) Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith & K.M. Zeichner (eds.) *Studying teacher education* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.