

UNIVERSITY OF WALES INSTITUTE CARDIFF

**CENTRE FOR APPLIED EDUCATION
RESEARCH**

**EVALUATION OF THE CHARTERED TEACHER
PILOT IN WALES**

FULL REPORT

Professor David Egan

September, 2009

Acknowledgements

With thanks to Frances Charles, Mike Griffiths, Rhian Morgan and Emmajane Milton for their invaluable professional support and judgement in undertaking this evaluation; to Joan James, Cardiff School of Education, UWIC for her general administrative support and in particular for the work undertaken on the questionnaire survey, Margery McMahon of the University of Glasgow for her assistance with matters relating to Chartered Teacher in Scotland and the providers of the portfolio and programme routes of the Chartered Teacher Pilot for their ready cooperation.

CONTENTS

	Pages
1. Introduction	4-9
2. Details of the Pilot	10-16
3. Evaluation Methodology	17-22
4. Review of Policy and Research Evidence	23-39
5. Findings: the Portfolio Route	40-45
6. Findings: the Programme Route	45-64
7. Summary of Overall Findings	65-71
8. Recommendations	72-78
9. Appendices	79-

1. INTRODUCTION

Background

- 1.1 In 2003, the Welsh Assembly Government invited the General Teaching Council for Wales (GTCW) to take the lead, working with other partners, to develop a Professional Development Framework for teachers in Wales.
- 1.2 In July 2005 in its first piece of advice to the Assembly Government in relation to this work, GTCW noted the absence of any national professional development arrangements for the vast majority of teachers who are neither in their early years of teaching nor aspire to headship or senior leadership posts in their careers.
- 1.3 To address this situation the Council recommended that this should be rectified by introducing a national programme of structured professional development – the Chartered Teacher Programme, which would offer an opportunity for experienced teachers in the middle of their careers to receive structured professional development and study, if they so chose.
- 1.4 The Council further recommended that those teachers who successfully complete the Chartered Teacher Programme should receive professional recognition for their achievements, in order that their standing be recognised both within and outside the teaching profession. This would bring parity with the existing professional milestones of QTS, Induction and Headship, which all offer national programmes of professional development leading to professional recognition. Council advised that the recognition should take the form of the award of “Chartered Teacher Status” which could include the use of post-nominal letters.
- 1.5 The Minister for Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills in Wales accepted the Council’s recommendation subject to the provision of further advice on the detail of such a programme. This further detail was duly provided in July 2006. On that basis the Assembly Government has allowed GTCW to use existing funding it had provided for CPD activity to be used to pilot the Chartered Teacher programme. They have indicated that they will wish to take the evaluation of the pilot into consideration as part of a wider review on professional development across the education sector that is currently being undertaken.

Key Features of the Chartered Teacher Programme in Wales

1.6 The key features of the programme, as established in the advice offered by GTCW and approved by the Assembly Government were:

- **The Standards for Chartered Teacher (CT).** CT status would be underpinned by professional standards. Through undertaking and successfully completing the national programme for CT, a teacher would in effect demonstrate that he / she had met these standards. A working group to develop the CT standards was set up by GTCW. Following a consultation process the final version of the standards was published in May 2007. The standards set out the key elements of what CTs should know, understand and do. They can be found at Appendix 1.
- **Routes to CT Status.** There should be two routes to becoming a Chartered Teacher: a programme route and a portfolio route.
- **The Programme Route.** This was intended to be relevant to classroom teachers, middle leaders and those who perform both roles. It was conceived that it should be based on a common set of core modules, with further modules targeted specifically at classroom practice or middle leadership. This would provide sufficient flexibility for teachers to tailor the programme to their own professional development needs and career aspirations. The number of modules would not be established at the outset, but following the model in operation in Scotland, it was envisioned that a reasonable working model would be twelve modules, made up of 4 core modules, 4 optional modules and a work based project equivalent to 4 further modules. There would be a strong emphasis on analysis, reflection and improving practice. A combination of delivery mechanisms, including taught programmes, self-study, face-to-face training, workshop sessions, classroom observation, residential experience and distance and web based learning would be utilised. Opportunities for teachers to gain credit for prior learning would be allowed. The possibility that some teachers would undertake a small number of modules, as part of their professional development, without completing the entire CT Programme was also envisioned.
- **The Portfolio Route.** There would be an opportunity for very experienced teachers to submit evidence (through a portfolio) which demonstrated that they had already achieved the professional standards for CT. Again the experience of Scotland in offering this route to CT status was pointed to.

The Pilot Of The Programme Modules

1.7. GTCW decided that the most effective way to take forward the programme modules was to conduct a two-year pilot of both the Programme and Portfolio routes.

The initial pilot began in September 2007 and ran until July 2009. An extension of the pilot will be undertaken from September 2009 until July 2010. This evaluation relates to the initial pilot only.

1.8. In respect of the of the **Programme Route** pilot, the following was decided:

- To pilot the core and optional modules, but not the work based project.
- To explore the possibility of HE accreditation for the CT programme. The Council asked pilot providers to clearly set out the credit value a teacher might receive for completing a pilot module or modules, in the context of the Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales.
- Not to specify who the providers of the CT Programme should be, but for providers to design programmes that reflected the Standards for CT.
- To ensure, however, that the content of providers' programmes was applicable to experienced classroom teachers, middle leaders and those with more specific professional development requirements.
- That the programme was available throughout Wales.
- That HEIs, LEAs and others worked in partnership in designing and delivering programmes.
- That there was a wide range of delivery methods.
- That the programme modules were both relevant to a teacher's classroom practice and had a sound underpinning in educational theory. It is felt that one effective way of delivering this was to specify that all programmes be delivered in partnership to ensure a balance of provider expertise in theory and practice.
- Such potential partnerships were not prescribed, but it was indicated that typically these partnerships might involve two or more of HEIs, LEAs, subject associations, private companies, international providers and other bodies.
- In piloting the programme route, the Council wished to ensure a well balanced pilot that would include a range of different delivery methods, a geographical spread of providers, involvement from a range of providers, working in partnership, the piloting of all core modules and a range of optional modules, content relevant to both classroom teachers and middle leaders, coverage of the CT Standards, content relevant to the primary and secondary sector and one or more pilots to be run through the medium of Welsh. This attempt to pilot a broad range of approaches and delivery methods was a key characteristic of the way that GTCW designed the pilot.

1.9 In relation to the **Portfolio Route** the following key characteristics were identified:

- A portfolio of evidence and a reflective report of approximately 10,000 words to be compiled.
- Based on the experience of Scotland the portfolio would:
 - Have an introductory section setting out three key experiences selected by the teacher to demonstrate sustained competence against the standards for CT.
 - Summarise the evidence presented against the standards for CT on a pro-forma provided.
 - Present a wide range of carefully chosen evidence that demonstrated that the sustained professional actions undertaken are relevant and current and are sufficient to meet the CT standards.
- The reflective report should enhance the portfolio. Through the reflective report, a teacher should set out a critical account of his / her learning through professional actions which demonstrate their professional development. The report would be underpinned by reference to relevant literature in appropriate areas. The report would demonstrate that a teacher:
 - Had reflected on and demonstrated learning from the activities outlined in the portfolio.
 - Can identify and critically analyse central principles in relation to professional action.
 - Shows a critical knowledge of relevant literature.
 - Continually sets high standards for his / her professional performance in the classroom and / or at middle leadership level.

1.10 GTCW decided that the **key objectives** of the pilot should be as follows:

- To pilot programme (taught) modules and a portfolio route towards the achievement of CT status.
- To provide a series of positive learning experiences focused on the needs of classroom practitioners and middle leaders who aspire to excellence in their professional learning and practice.
- To manage the pilot in such a way as to test out the perceived benefits of a CT Programme in Wales and highlight the lessons that can be learnt for the future.

- To enable the Council and its partners to address critical issues in the design and development of a CT programme in Wales, and to identify potential solutions.
- To test out the Council's proposals for the programme, as set out in the tender documentation for the Programme and Portfolio Routes.
- To put in place efficient and effective systems for the management of the programme in terms of contractual relationships, provider networks and partnership development.

1.11 In preparation for the pilot, GTCW established a competitive tendering process to identify the providers for the piloting of modules for the proposed Programme and Portfolio routes. Potential pilot providers were invited to submit proposals to pilot one or more modules; these could be a core module, an optional module or a combination of the two. The Council offered funding support of **up to** £20,000 per module per provider. Where a pilot proposal involved more than one module, the Council expected to see some economies of scale.

1.12 For the Portfolio Route, the Council decided to appoint two suitably qualified/experienced individuals to act as advisers/ assessors for the pilot stage. They would each assist four teachers in an advisory capacity in preparing their portfolio of evidence and reflective report. They would then each assess the portfolio and report for the other four teachers involved in the pilot against the draft standards for CT. In terms of the selection of the advisers/assessors, a strong background and experience in both teaching, professional development and the assessment/accreditation of professional staff was deemed essential. It was anticipated that suitable persons would be individuals from HEIs, LEA Advisory staff or former teachers working in a consultancy capacity.

1.13 Those organisations and individuals who were successful in the tendering exercise attended a series of scoping meetings with GTCW to finalise the arrangements and timings of their contribution. Details of the pilot phase, the names of providers and schedule for delivery are provided in section 2 below.

1.14 GTCW provided a number of opportunities for individual teachers to express an interest in participating in the pilots, and in total received over 500 expressions of interest from teachers. An information pack about the pilots due to commence in the 2007-08 academic year was sent to all teachers who had expressed an interest. As well as setting out details about the pilots, teachers were invited to register their interest in particular modules of the taught pilot or in the portfolio route. On receipt of these details, work commenced in selecting those teachers who would participate in each pilot. For the portfolio route, GTCW asked teachers to complete an additional pro-forma setting out their experience against the new CT standards. This

documentation was also used by Council officers and the advisors / assessors to identify participants. The priorities of this selection process were to ensure that all applications were treated equally and fairly through the consistent application of agreed procedures, and to make a final selection of participants that would ensure a balanced pilot. Wherever, possible alternatives opportunities have been found for those teachers who were not able to take up their initial preference.

1.15 As a result of this selection process, 8 participants from across Wales were identified to take part in the pilot of the Portfolio Route, and between 12 and 16 teachers were identified to take part in each of the modules being piloted as part of the Programme Route in the 2007/08 and 2008/09 academic years.

1.16 GTCW established contract management and reporting requirements for the providers of the CT programme. The purposes of these arrangements were to:

- Resolve any contractual issues and clarify GTCW expectations where necessary.
- Monitor progress and respond to the needs of individual providers as they develop, deliver and review their pilots.
- Provide a primary point of contact with each provider and ensure consistency of message about the Chartered Teacher Programme.

1.17 A schedule of reporting requirements and monitoring arrangements was agreed with each provider, based on a series of progress reports, statistical returns and supporting documents.

1.18 GTCW established a Provider Network for the CT Programme, in order to:

- Build upon the professional learning community that already exists across the network of providers involved in the pilot.
- Identify and share good practice in the design and delivery of the elements of the programme that are being piloted.
- Enable providers to contribute to the further development of the CT Programme.
- Enable lessons to be learned as the pilot progresses and manage the dissemination of those lessons across the network of participating organisations.

1.19 GTCW decided to commission an independent evaluation of the CT Pilot. Following a competitive tendering process the contract for the evaluation was

awarded to the Centre for Applied Education Research at the University of Wales Institute Cardiff. Further details on the evaluation are provided in section 3 below.

2. DETAILS OF THE PILOT

Timeline

- 2.1 The initial pilot of the CT Programme in Wales was held between September 2007 and July 2009.
- 2.2 The Portfolio pilot ran across this period with teachers submitting their portfolios for assessment in January, 2009 and being informed of the outcomes in February, 2009.
- 2.3 The Programme pilot took place in two phases, with five modules being offered in the 2007/08 academic year and the other five in 2008/09.

Data

- 2.4 Overall 122 teachers took part in the pilot: 8 through the Portfolio Route and 114 via the Programme Route.
- 2.5 Programme Route participants consisted of 70 from primary, 43 from secondary and 1 from special school sectors. In percentage terms this means that 62% were from primary, 37% from secondary and 1 % from special schools. 22% were male and 78% female.
- 2.6 As was the intention of GTCW, so as to ensure that teachers in all areas of Wales participated in the pilot, teachers from all local authority areas in Wales were involved. The number for each local authority was:

Anglesey 1	Denbighshire 6	Powys 4
Blaenau Gwent 4	Flintshire 2	Rhondda Cynon Taff 10
Bridgend 6	Gwynedd 1	Swansea 5
Cardiff 7	Merthyr Tydfil 4	Torfaen 3
Caerphilly 6	Monmouthshire 4	Vale of Glamorgan 9
Carmarthen 4	Neath Port Talbot 5	Wrexham 10
Ceredigion 4	Newport 4	
Conwy 7	Pembrokeshire 7	

- 2.7 In the majority of cases teachers attended modules in the Programme Route in their own geographical area, with only ten teachers undertaking modules with a provider based some distance from their home.
- 2.8 Twelve teachers were registered for two paired modules with one provider on the Programme Route. This was agreed by GTCW in order to pilot a variety of

academic accreditation models. Four teachers undertook two of the modules and one teacher undertook two other modules.

2.9 The age profile of teachers involved in the pilot was as follows:

Age 25-30: 16
Age 31-35: 26
Age 36-40: 26
Age 41-45: 21
Age 46-50: 13
Age 51-55: 9
Age 56-60: 3

The Portfolio Route

2.10 GTCW decided to recruit eight teachers for the pilot of the Portfolio Route.

2.11 The requirement of participants was that they were 'highly experienced middle leaders/ classroom teachers, who are able to demonstrate that they already meet the standards for CT'. Applicants were required to submit a two page summary of their experience against each of the headings of the standards.

2.12 The teachers recruited represented a reasonable spread of secondary (3), primary (3) and special (1) teachers from different parts of Wales. Six were female and two male. One worked in a welsh-medium setting. The eighth participant was not a serving teacher, but a LA Advisory Teacher.

2.13 Five of the participants held Master's level qualifications, with another completing a Master's during the course of the pilot. Although not presented as a pre-requisite in the information for teachers on the pilot, this was clearly seen as being a strong factor in assessing applications.

2.14 Two advisers/assessors were appointed to assist the teachers in preparing their portfolios and reflective reports. These were experienced higher education professionals (and former teachers) who had a long track record in teacher education and continuous professional development. Both had also been involved in the development of the GTCW Professional Development Framework.

2.15 The following summary sets out the chronology and the process through which the teachers progressed in preparing the portfolios and reflective reports:

- Each teacher was assigned to an adviser to work with them in preparing their portfolio and reflective report.
- Teachers and advisers attended two half-day sessions at the outset of the route where advisers explained the details of the pilot and the materials/support structures available to support them.
- Tutorial arrangements were then provided for each teacher, based on an indicative entitlement to four half day tutorials between March and October 2008. At each tutorial, teachers were required to submit draft documentation to their Adviser for discussion and further guidance.
- In October 2008 teacher and advisers met together for a whole day to review developments relating to the collection of evidence for the portfolio and the production of the reflective reports.
- By a stipulated submission date and when the portfolios and reflective reports were considered to be of an appropriate standard, the documents would then be passed to the Assessor to be considered against the Standards for Chartered Teacher. The Assessors worked closely together to ensure commonality of approaches.

2.16 Each of the advisers/assessors appointed supported 4 teachers in the advisory role and then acted as an assessor for the other four teachers.

2.17 Support materials were developed for the teachers and were available in electronic and hard copy format. These gave guidance on:

- The type of evidence to be presented in the portfolio.
- How the evidence should be linked to the CT Standards.
- The format in which evidence could most effectively be presented.
- Ways in which published sources may be used.
- Strategies available to evaluate the effectiveness of the evidence.
- Approaches to providing a reflective analysis of the learning undertaken.
- Ways in which evidence and learning may be developed to further extend learning and impact on practice.
- Alignment of the work to be undertaken to Master's level.
- Guidance on further reading and academic referencing.

2.18 Of the eight teachers who undertook the Portfolio Route, seven submitted portfolios. Five of the seven submitted were assessed to have met the standard and the other two not to have done so.

The Programme Route

2.19 GTCW piloted 10 modules from the Programme Route: 5 in 2007/08 and the other 5 in 2008/09. Six of the ten were piloted as Core Modules, with two of these being offered at the same time but by different providers and the other 4 were piloted as Optional Modules. It was decided not to pilot the work-based project.

2.20 The grid below provides details of the modules offered in each of the pilot years for the Programme Route. (C) indicates that the module was piloted as a Core Module:

2007-08

Module	Provider	Number of Teachers Who Participated
Talk for Thought	Swansea Metropolitan University(SMU)/Glyndwr University and the Basic Skills Agency	13 at SMU 12 at Glyndwr
Improving Practice Through Action Research	University of Wales Institute Cardiff	9
Education for All (C)	University of Wales Newport, Newport and Torfaen Local Authorities	9
Self Evaluation and Reflection (C)	South West and Mid Wales Local Authority Consortium (swamwac) and Trinity College Carmarthen	11
Self-Evaluation and Reflection (C)	Cardiff University and Blaenau Gwent Local Authority	10

2008-09

Module	Provider	Number of Teachers Who Participated
Language and Methodology: Welsh As a Second Language	Bangor University, Denbighshire and Wrexham Local Authorities	10
Learning, Teaching and Assessment (C)	ESIS and SMU	15
The Pedagogical Application of ICT in Learning and Teaching	University of Glamorgan and ESIS	13
Learning, Teaching and Assessment (C)	Cardiff University and Blaenau Gwent Local Authority	8
Leading the Learning (C)	swamwac and Trinity College Carmarthen	12

2.21 Further indicative details on each of these modules is provided at Appendix 2

2.22 The relationship between these modules and the way in which providers sought to address the CT standards varied greatly. Of the 28 strands within the standards, one module attempted to address 23, while at the other extreme another module attempted to address only 4 of the standards.

2.23 The academic credit offered for each of the modules was as below:

Provider	Module	Credit
Swansea Metropolitan University, Glyndwr University and the Basic Skills Agency	Talk for Thought	20 credits at level 6 (Graduate Diploma) or 15 credits at level 7(Master's).
University of Wales Institute Cardiff	Improving Practice Through Action Research	15 credits at level 7.
University of Wales Newport, Newport and Torfaen Local Authorities	Education for All	15 credits at level 6
South West and Mid Wales Consortium(swamwac) and Trinity College Carmarthen	Self Evaluation and Reflection	30 credits at level 6
Cardiff University and	Self Evaluation and	15 credits at level 7 (

Blaenau Gwent Local Authority	Reflection	with Learning, Teaching and Assessment module below)
Bangor University, Denbighshire and Wrexham Local Authorities	Welsh as a Second Language	30 credits at level 7
SMU and ESIS	Learning, Teaching and Assessment	20 credits at level 6 or 15 credits at level 7
University of Glamorgan and ESIS	The Pedagogical Application of ICT in Learning and Teaching	20 credits at level 7
Cardiff University and Blaenau Gwent Local Authority	Learning, Teaching and Assessment	See above
swamwac and Trinity College Carmarthen	Leading the Learning	20 credits at level 6

2.24 Of the 114 teachers who registered for these modules, approximately 90% completed them. Compared to other forms of teacher professional development this is a high completion rate.

Financial Support

2.25 As providers (for the Programme Route) and advisers/assessors (for the Portfolio Route) were funded directly by GTCW, teachers did not have to meet any course or tuition costs.

2.26 Other costs likely to be incurred by teachers were met by GTCW under the following conditions:

- On the Programme Route, supply cover at £155(2007/08) and £165 (2008/09) per day for up to five days, to cover attendance at sessions and study days and reasonable travel and subsistence expenses.
- For the Portfolio Route supply cover at £155 (2007/08) and £165(2008/09) per day for up to ten days, including time to meet with the adviser/assessor and time to prepare the portfolio and reasonable travel and subsistence expenses.

Achieving Chartered Teacher Status

2.27 GTCW made clear to all participants on both routes that given the nature of the pilot, that successful completion would not at this stage lead to CT Status. Higher Education credits at the levels set out in 2.23 above would, however, be available. It was also made clear that if, following the pilot, the

CT Programme was to be taken forward, that any modules completed and the outcomes of the portfolio accreditation, could be recognised as part of achieving CT status through accreditation of prior learning.

2.28 In this context it is worth noting that the nature of the pilot was such that it was unclear to participants in what format the final CT Programme would be offered, if at all.

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Objectives and Requirements

3.1 GTCW wished the evaluation to have both:

- A **summative element**, to enable the Council to demonstrate accountability and the value for money.
- A **formative element**, to explore what improvements are required in design and delivery, and to identify lessons for the future and good practice which can be disseminated widely.

3.2 The successful tender for the evaluation set out its **objectives** as being to establish the:

- Extent to which the objectives of the pilot programme have been fulfilled.
- Efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness of the design and delivery of the pilot programme.
- Degree to which the pilot programme is relevant to classroom learning and teaching pedagogy.
- Contribution of the programme to the professional development and practice of participants.
- Extent to which an appropriate balance between educational theory and professional practice emerges from the provider partnerships.
- Degree to which the programme can be seen to contribute to school improvement and effectiveness.
- Contribution of the pilot to developing approached to distributed leadership.
- Extent to which the programme has led to the creation of a professional learning community of Chartered Teachers.
- Extent to which, overall, the perceived benefits for participants (experienced classroom teachers and middle leaders) have been met.

3.3 The **requirements** of the evaluation were agreed to be the:

- Collection of evidence about participants' perceptions of their involvement in the programme.
- Identification of participants' views on potential areas for improvement.
- Provision of formative feedback to Council officers to ensure that key lessons are learned from the pilot programme and that best practice is identified and disseminated.
- Provision of a summative evaluation of the conduct of the pilot and recommendations for the further development of the CT Programme.
- Identification of key issues relating to the aims of the planned mainstream CT Programme, and its proposed structure, content, pedagogy and assessment.

3.4 It was agreed that this would require a **focus** upon the:

- Overall design of the pilot programme in terms of its efficiency and effectiveness.
- Ability of the pilot programme to meet the needs of the target audience and the various sub-categories of teachers within this.
- Responsiveness of the pilot programme to the professional learning needs of participants, in terms of coherence, progression, flexibility and choice.
- Overall scope, duration, level of challenge and proposed learning hours.
- Design and delivery of specific modules within the Programme Route.
- Assessment of teachers on the pilot programme against the CT standards.
- The CT standards and their fitness for purpose.
- Accreditation of modules by Higher Education Institutions, the level at which they are assessed, and the credits awarded.
- Existence of, and relationship between, the two routes to achieving CT status.
- Validity and reliability of the preparation and assessment of teachers on the Portfolio Route.
- Impact of the pilot programme on teachers' professional learning, practice and commitment.
- Management of the programme through contractual relationships with a network of providers and partner organisations.
- Proposed design of the mainstream CT Programme.
- Proposals for the delivery of training and assessment, accreditation of providers and quality assurance arrangements as the Council prepares to mainstream the programme for teachers across Wales.

3.5 The evaluation team also recognised the **salience** of the CT Pilot Programme to the Welsh Assembly Government's School Effectiveness Framework and National Pedagogy Strategy. The evaluation would, therefore, reflect possible alignment to these key Assembly Government policy areas.

Methodologies Employed

3.6 The **research methodologies** employed in carrying out the evaluation were:

- A review of relevant policy and research evidence.
- A questionnaire survey of all participants.
- Face-to-face interviews with a sample of all participants and all providers.
- Telephone interviews with a sample of participants.
- Observation of teaching sessions for some modules on the Programme Route.
- Consideration of module/route documentation.
- Consideration of management reports to GTCW from providers.
- Attendance at provider meetings.
- Interview with a group of Directors of Education.

3.7 The **review of relevant policy and research evidence** was undertaken to achieve familiarisation with:

- Documentation relating to the CT Pilot and the wider GTCW Professional Development Framework.
- Associated policy areas being developed by the Welsh Assembly Government, including the School Effectiveness Framework and the Pedagogy Strategy.
- Evidence relating to the CT Programme in Scotland and other attempts to address issues to do with establishing and recognising 'accomplished teaching'.
- The wider context for teacher professional development in the UK and internationally.

3.8 The outcomes of this review have been set out in section 4 of this report below.

The Portfolio Route

3.9 In relation to the **Portfolio Route** the evaluation is based upon:

- **Face-to-face interviews** with six of the eight teachers (75% of participants) involved. The interviews were carried out using semi-structured interview techniques based upon the Standards for CT and the objectives for the route. The six teachers interviewed included one who had been assessed not to have successfully met the standard. The two who were not interviewed included the only teacher who did not submit a portfolio and the other teacher who had been assessed not to have met the standard. Repeated attempts to contact these teachers in order to arrange interviews were not successful.
- **Examination of the portfolios and reflective reports** prepared by the seven teachers who submitted these to GTCW and the reports of their advisers/assessors.
- **Face-to-face interviews** with the two advisers/assessors appointed by GTCW. Again semi-structured interview techniques would be used referenced to the Standards for CT and exploring how these were utilised by the advisers/assessors.
- **Observation** of a meeting between the two advisers/assessors and the eight teachers at a mid-programme point when they were considering the selection of evidence for the portfolio to reflect the CT Standards.
- Consideration of **documentation** made available to participants to guide them on preparing their portfolios and their reflective reports.

The Programme Route

3.10 In the case of the **Programme Route** each module was evaluated using the following methodologies:

- Examination and analysis of programme management data.
- The outcomes of a questionnaire to all participants.
- Semi-structured interviews with a sample of participants.
- Where possible direct observation of programme delivery.
- Examination and analysis of programme documentation produced by providers.
- Semi-structured interviews with programme delivery staff.

3.11 Programme management data, including reports produced for GTCW by module providers, was considered throughout the lifetime of the evaluation and has been used to provide overall data on those undertaking the CT programme.

3.12 Questionnaires were sent to all participants on the pilot of the Programme Route. An overarching template was developed by the Evaluation Team and agreed with GTCW Officers. This template was derived from the Standards for CT. A customised version of the questionnaire was then produced for each of the modules, including both questions that were generic to all modules and those which related specifically to the standards being targeted by the individual modules. The questionnaires were administered once the modules had been completed. They were sent to teachers at their home addresses. When requested the questionnaires were made available for completion on-line. Given that GTCW had made it a requirement for all participants that they complete the questionnaires, the target was to achieve an 80% return. The actual overall return was 66 %. The highest for the ten modules was a 92% return and the lowest a 17% response. In only two modules was there a return of less than 50% of the questionnaires. Therefore, although the target figure was not met, the response overall and for nine of the ten modules was comparatively high and allows robust conclusions to be drawn from this evidence base. A copy of the overarching questionnaire template can be found at Appendix 3.

3.13 Semi-structured interviews with participants were carried out with a sample of the overall population of 122 teachers who registered for the pilot of the Programme Route with providers. This sampling took place within each module. Given that only in the case of two modules was the population the same and in these cases, different teachers were interviewed, approximately 50% of participants were interviewed. The sampling was stratified to represent the different dimensions of the total population:

- Within each module.
- Primary/secondary/special school teachers.

- English/Welsh-medium participants.
- Gender.
- Geographical dispersal.

The semi-structured interview instrument was based upon the Standards for CT. It was drawn up by Evaluation Team and agreed with GTCW officers before use. Approximately one- third of the interviews were completed face-to-face and the other two thirds as telephone interviews.

3.14 Direct observation of programme delivery was undertaken for eight of the ten modules. In one case the contact phase of the module had been completed before the evaluation contract was awarded and in the other finding a mutually convenient time prevented this happening.

3.15 The examination and analysis of **Programme Documentation** held by the providers was undertaken for nine of the ten modules, in the case where this was not completed this was because of the refusal of the provider to share this documentation with the evaluation team.

3.16 Semi-structured interviews with programme delivery staff were carried out for all ten modules. These were generally undertaken as group interviews with available staff who had been involved in delivery. The interviews were based on a pro-forma drawn up by the Evaluation Team and agreed with GTCW Officers. It drew upon the Standards for CT and the objectives of the module in question.

3.17 Based on the methodologies set out in 3.11 to 3.16 above, an evaluation report for each module was drawn up. These were produced to a template established by the Evaluation Team to allow for consistency of reporting. The template reflected the Standards for CT, the objectives of the module and the objectives of the evaluation. The Project Director was not involved in any way with the evaluation of the UWIC provided module.

Other Aspects of the Evaluation

3.18 Regular meetings between the Project Director and GTCW Officers have been held to share emerging findings and to consider other developments.

3.19 Two meetings with providers have been attended. One, organised by GTCW, in the summer of 2008 enabled providers to make presentations on the modules offered in the 2008/09 academic year and to consider issues arising. The other, organised by the Evaluation Team, in June 2009 allowed emerging issues to be presented and discussed.

3.20 At the suggestion of the Project Director, the views of the Association of Directors of Education in Wales on emerging findings was sought at a meeting in June 2009.

The Evaluation Team

3.21 The Evaluation Team was made up of:

- Professor David Egan, University of Wales Institute Cardiff (Project Director).
- Mike Griffiths, Head-teacher, Cardiff High School, Cardiff.
- Frances Charles, Early Years Teacher, Ysgol Evan James, Pontypridd.
- Emmajane Milton, Deputy Head, Duffryn Integrated Children's Centre, Newport.
- Rhian Morgan, Head of Modern Foreign Languages, Ysgol Bro Morgannwg, Barry.

4 REVIEW OF POLICY AND RESEARCH EVIDENCE

Teacher Quality

4.1 Extensive international research in the field of education points to the quality of teaching as being the most critical factor influencing individual student achievement, school and system performance (Greenwald, Hedges and Laine, 1996; Rowe, 2003; Hattie, 2003, 2007; OECD, 1994, 2005; Barber and Mourshed, 2007; Dinham, Ingvarson and Kleinhenz, 2008; Slater, Davies and Burgess, 2009).

4.1 Dinham, Ingvarson and Kleinhenz capture this in their 2008 study when they argue that ‘the quality of what teachers know and can do is fundamental in a way that no other resource is in education’ (Dinham, Ingvarson and Kleinhenz, 2008, 42). They point to evidence that supports the contention that by comparison with other important contributors to educational progress such as developments in the curriculum, new technologies, structural reforms and school re-organisation, reducing class sizes and increases in education spending, teacher quality is predominant and ultimately all these other areas depend upon it being in place.

4.2 The work of Barber and Mourshed in relation to why some countries are able to achieve consistently higher levels of student and system performance from their educational systems compared to other nations, supports this thesis. Their conclusion is that ‘the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers’ (Barber and Mourshed, 2007, 16).

4.3 These and other studies in the field also concur on the critically important role that school leadership has to play in prioritising and developing teacher quality (Leithwood et al, 2006; Hopkins, 2007; Higham, Hopkins and Ahtaridou, 2007; Caldwell and Harris, 2008). Whilst this requires senior leaders, at head and deputy-head level, to focus on the importance of learning and teaching in their schools, the development of distributed forms of leadership provides particular opportunities for leadership of a new kind within the system (Harris, 2008).

4.4 The Barber and Mourshed report for McKinsey and Company in 2007, suggests that successful education systems improve teacher quality through:

- Recruiting high quality candidates into teaching and providing them with excellent initial training.
- High quality professional development that promotes rigorous standards of teacher pedagogy.

- A system of personalised learning where every child is able to benefit from high quality learning and teaching.

Continuous Professional Development of Teachers

4.5 The second of these findings is supported by a growing body of evidence on the importance of continuous professional development (CPD) to improving teacher quality (Harland and Kidner, 1997; Hustler et al, 2003; Cordingley et al, 2003; Goodall et al, 2005; Moor et al, 2005; Estyn, 2005; Bolam and Weindling 2006; Ofsted, 2006; Teacher Development Agency, 2007; Robinson et al, 2008) . Whilst the relative merits of individual-focused and collaborative forms of CPD continue to be debated (Field, 2005), the balance of evidence can be seen to support the contention that collaborative forms of teacher CPD are both more cost-effective and produce stronger outcomes in relation to teacher quality and student performance.

4.6 This perspective is particularly captured in the work of Richard Elmore. He argues as follows:

“Professional development, in the consensus view, should be designed to develop the capacity of teachers to work collectively on problems of practice within their own schools and with practitioners in other settings, as much as to support the knowledge and skill development of individual educators. This view derives from the assumption that learning is essentially a collaborative rather than an individual activity – that educators learn more powerfully in concert with others who are struggling with the same problems - and that the essential purpose of professional development should be the improvement of schools and school systems, not just the improvement of the individuals who work in them.” (Elmore, 2004, 96)

4.7 The location for CPD is also critically important for Elmore:

“Successful professional development is likely to occur in schools and classroom settings rather than off-site and it is likely to involve work with individual teachers or similar groups around the observation of actual teaching. Proximity to practice also requires that the pedagogy of professional developers be as consonant as possible with pedagogy that they expect from educators. It has to involve professional developers who, through expert practice, can model what they expect of the people with whom they are working.” (Elmore, 2004, 97)

4.8 Within the literature on effective collaborative CPD the role of leadership at school level is also strongly articulated. In Scotland for example, the proposed model for teacher CPD being developed by Teaching Scotland on behalf of the

Scottish Executive, sees the highest stage of teacher CPD as being one of 'innovation and creation' where teachers become leaders for learning, coaching and mentoring colleagues and developing and leading teams (Teaching in Scotland, 2007).

4.9 In Australia this has been conceived as being 'leadership at the level of the profession' that recognises that teachers are much more likely to look to expert teachers who teach in the same field... for new ideas and examples of successful practice' (Dinham, Ingvarson and Kleinhenz, 2008, 11). This leads these researchers to propose that a discrete group of what they call 'Leading Teachers' should be established within the Australian teaching profession. These Leading Teachers would 'lead and manage colleagues in successful initiatives to improve student learning and welfare'(Dinham, Ingvarson and Kleinhenz, 2008, 33).

4.10 A similar concept is also being developed in Ontario, where experienced teachers interested in sharing their practice with others are able to access a Teacher Learning and Leadership Programme that provides them with opportunities to carry out such a role as part of their regular teaching activities (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2008).

4.11 Undertaking such a role in leading school-based collaborative CPD is often associated with the concept of developing communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) and, in particular, Professional Learning Communities where effective practice is shared and developed in order to reduce within-school variations in the quality of teaching and student achievement (Hopkins, 2007; Stoll,2003).

4.12 For Elmore, who has more recently developed the idea of 'medical rounds' where groups of expert practitioners work together to observe effective practice in actual school contexts under the leadership and guidance of the lead practitioner in the school (Elmore, 2007) the role of these leaders of CPD at school level is of fundamental importance for system improvement. He argues as follows:

"To improve themselves, systems need to be able to identify people who know what to do, to develop the capacity of those in the organisation to learn what to do and to create settings in which people who know what to do to teach those who don't. Instructional expertise is a key element of organisational capacity in regard to the use of professional development." (Elmore, 2004)

Identifying and Developing Expert Teachers

4.13 A number of educational systems are in different ways attempting to develop the concept of leadership of CPD and teacher pedagogy. Internationally the example of **Australia** has already been pointed to above and is worth elucidating further. Work underway there is based on the belief that the teaching profession can in general define, gather evidence on and validly and reliably assess teacher quality (Ingvarson and Kleinhenz, 2006; Ingvarson and Rowe, 2008). The attributes of quality teaching identified are the following (Dinham, 2002):

1. A high level of knowledge, imagination, passion, and belief in, and for their field.
2. An overriding commitment to, and high aspirations for, moving ahead the learning of their individual students.
3. A rich repertoire of skills, methods and approaches, built up over years of experience, on which they are able to draw to provide the right 'mix' for the specific needs of individual students.
4. A detailed understanding of the context in which they are working; of the specific expectations of the community; and of the needs of the cohort of students for whom they are responsible.
5. A capacity to respond appropriately to students, individually and collectively, and to the context, through their teaching practice.
6. A refusal to let anything get in the way of their own or their students' learning, and what they perceive as needing to be addressed.
7. A high level of respect and even affection from their students and colleagues, a by-product of their hard work and professionalism.
8. A great capacity for engagement in professional learning through self-initiated involvement in various combinations of professional development activities, some provided by the employing authority; others sought out by the individual.
9. A great capacity to contribute to the professional learning of others, and a willingness to do so.
10. Moral leadership and professionalism, in that they exemplify high values and qualities and seek to encourage these in others.

As has been pointed out above, there is a proposal that a new position of Leading Teacher should be developed in Australia to provide leadership at school level focused on developing such attributes among teachers. It is envisaged that in due course Leading Teachers would be about 20% of teachers in a typical school (Dinham, Ingvarson and Kleinhenz, 2008)

4.14 In **England** developments in relation to the proposal for teachers to have a Masters in Learning and Teaching, the work of the General Teaching Council for England in developing a Teacher Learning Academy and the role of Advanced Skills Teachers have salience for this area.

4.15 **Advanced Skills Teachers (ASTs)** are appointed in England. The role also exists potentially within the teaching profession in Wales, but has not been taken up by employers. ASTs can be appointed by individual schools, by local authorities, by federations of schools or other collaborative groups. They have to pass a National Assessment and are then appointed to an AST post which has a separate pay spine and conditions of employment. They normally spend 80% of their time teaching in their own school and the remainder of their time undertaking outreach work with teachers from other schools. It is also possible for them to be deployed in leading or supporting an initiative across a local authority area, working across departments and schools. This has come to be seen as a particularly effective way of them impacting on improved learning and teaching outcomes. If an AST is from a school that is in special measures or facing challenging circumstances, they are able to spend part of the 20% outreach time supporting the local authority plan to remove their home school from these categories.

4.16 Whatever the specific context for their work, the role of ASTs is to support the professional development of other teachers and to contribute to raising standards of learning and teaching. Local Authorities (who usually have an AST Coordinator in place) have found it useful to bring AST s together to work as a team (in essence a community of practice) and this has been seen as a particularly successful way of achieving rapid whole school improvement. They have also been used effectively to contribute to multi-disciplinary teams tackling issues which span a number of schools and/or across a local authority area. Heads of Department in secondary schools can become an AST, but they would then have to release their position in order to concentrate on their new role. There is also in existence in England the position of Excellent Teacher, but such practitioners do not have to take on an additional role such as ASTs, or be given a TLR responsibility. Ultimately it is expected that 3/5% of teachers in England will hold AST posts. A survey carried out in 2003 by Ofsted found that ASTs had 'significantly improved the quality of teaching and learning in over three-quarters of schools inspected' (DCSF, 2003, 2006, 2009; Ofsted, 2003).

4.17 **The Teaching and Learning Academy** has been developed by the General Teaching Council for England. It seeks to provide professional recognition of the learning of teachers, the development of their practice and of their work in school improvement. Drawing on what has been established through research on effective and impactful CPD, the Academy focuses on the following six core dimensions of successful practice:

- Engaging with a knowledge base.
- Coaching and mentoring.

- Planning learning.
- Carrying out the learning plan.
- Sharing learning and influencing the practice of others.
- Evaluating learning and its impact.

Participation in the Teaching and Learning Academy is seen as being a reflective learning journey where teachers prepare, plan, record their progress in a Learning Journal and review their progress with colleagues. The dominant focus is on learning and professional development having an impact at stage one on the classroom of the teacher, at stage two on other colleagues and at stages three and four, on the whole school, on other schools and a wider professional community (General Teaching Council for England, 2008). An evaluation of the Academy published in 2009 points to it having significant impact on the practice of teachers, on policies or strategies in schools and on pupils learning (Lord et al, 2009).

4.18 **The Masters in Learning and Teaching** is being developed by the Teacher Development Agency in England, working with schools and higher education institutions, as a Master's level qualification designed specifically for serving teachers. It is intended to be mainly classroom and school based: study by teachers outside of their working day is meant to be kept to a minimum. In 2009/10 the qualification will be offered to newly qualified teachers in the north-west of England and to teachers in National Challenge or other challenging schools, with the course starting in the summer term of 2010. It is expected to take three years to complete. Recognition will be given for M level study that will have been completed on a PGCE course and for other M level work previously undertaken, against rigorous national criteria. It is intended that the MLT will integrate with and build upon the experience of teacher during their Induction year. It is planned to be personalised and flexible in content, pace and assessment, allowing for the different context in which teachers find themselves and their learning needs. The course will have three phases:

- A diagnostic followed by the development of the teachers skills in enquiry and the use of evidence.
- Four areas of content relating to learning and teaching, subject knowledge, the development of children and young people and working with others.
- A specialist programme.

4.19 Each teacher undertaking the MLT will receive support from a Coach (an experienced teacher from their own or a nearby school) and from a higher education Tutor. It is anticipated that becoming a Coach will be attractive to teachers who are aspiring to Excellent Teacher or AST status. The MLT will be

Government funded with the costs of tuition and the time of the teacher and the Coach, when they are away from the classroom, being covered. Teachers who complete the MLT will not have any guaranteed career or salary progression, but it is anticipated that holding the qualification will be a factor that is utilised in performance management review. Teachers who do not hold the qualification will not be disadvantaged in any way.

4.20 The aim of the Department for Children, Schools and Families is that over time every teacher in England will have a MLT and that, therefore, teaching will become an all Master's profession as in Finland, where the holding of such a qualification is seen as a signal of the high quality teaching which characterises the education system and contributes to its high level educational outcomes. DCSF believe that the MLT will improve the attractiveness of the teaching profession and support teachers in their first 5 years when many currently leave the profession and cite lack of support as a major reason for this. The introduction of MLT is also strongly linked to the drive to improve student attainment, recognising that improving teacher quality is the biggest influence upon these outcomes (Teacher Development Agency, 2009; DCSF, 2008).

4.21 In Scotland as part of a wider policy development to improve teacher quality and the status of the teaching profession, a Chartered Teacher Programme was begun in 2003. Subsequently in London **Chartered Teacher London** status was also introduced. This enables any teacher in London to work towards achieving this status. It is based on the achievement of performance management objectives related to the teacher's day-to-day work and lesson observations undertaken in other schools. A teacher who meets the standard gains the status and a one-off payment of £1,000. In essence this is a performance management driven and teacher retention policy, that does not relate explicitly to the wider role of CPD in developing teacher quality and of the potential for expert teachers taking a leadership role in this area (DCSF, 2009).

4.22 The **Chartered Teacher Scotland** Programme is a much more highly developed approach to providing recognition for expert teachers and as the only example of its kind has inevitably had a considerable influence on the original design of the CT Programme in Wales. CT Scotland has its origins in the Sutherland Report of 1997 on teacher education and training in Scotland and the McCrone Report of 2000 on the remuneration and status of the teaching profession (Sutherland, 1997; McCrone, 2000). The acceptance by the Scottish Executive of most of the McCrone recommendations led to substantial pay increases for Scottish teachers, but also to changes in their contractual obligations and benefits including the introduction of CT status as a means of recognising excellence in classroom teaching.

- 4.23 CT Scotland began in 2003 and by June 2008, 611 Scottish teachers had achieved CT status with approximately 2500 others working towards this status. The majority of teachers (approaching 85%) who have so far achieved CT status have done so through an Accredited Route whereby they submit a portfolio and undertake structured reflection in a way that has generally been followed by the pilot for the Portfolio Route in Wales. Both the Accredited Route and the Programme Route are assessed against the Standards for CT. The Programme Route involves 12 modules at Master's level. Teachers pay the usual tuition fees to those higher education institutions that offer the modules and after having successfully completed two modules, they receive an increment to their salary. Ultimately as well as completing a Master's qualification and simultaneously gaining CT status, teachers will have received an additional £ 6,000 on their salary. Further details on the CT Programme in Scotland can be derived from the Report of the CT Review Group in 2008 (Kirk, Beveridge and Smith, 2003; Scottish Government 2008).
- 4.24 Research and evaluation work on the development of the CT programme in Scotland highlights a number of issues. The majority of CT expressed satisfaction with the scheme and the processes whereby they have achieved CT status. The impact of them becoming CT at school level, however, and the recognition that they receive for their new status from their head-teachers and local authorities seems variable and generally limited.
- 4.25 The extent to which those pursuing CT status are 'expert' or 'excellent' teachers, rather than 'accomplished' practitioners also arises. The McCrone Report actually proposed that there should be two types of CT in Scotland. Firstly, there would be those who would acquire CT status as recognition of their competence and this would be in the reach of a significant number of Scottish teachers. Secondly, there would be Advanced CT, who following four years of further research and advanced learning would take on a significant role within the education system for promoting standards of excellence in teaching. The Scottish Executive, decided, however, not to pursue this proposal, although in the guidance booklet it produced on CT it recognised that CT should 'demonstrate the capacity to contribute to the professional development of colleagues and to make a full contribution to the educational effectiveness of the school and the wider educational community'. (Connelly and McMahan, 2007; McMahan and Reeves, 2008; Scottish Government, 2008, 6).
- 4.26 In 2007 the Scottish Government set up a Review Group on the CT which reported in 2008. Recognising that there was a lack of clarity about the role which CT might play at school level, they noted and implicitly endorsed,

the principles which the Scottish Government National CPD Team had produced in 2005 on the potential contribution of CT. These were:

- CTs will not be asked to undertake management roles.
- The focus of the contribution that CTs make will be on learning and teaching and on strengthening partnerships with other professional groups, parents and other agencies. Such contribution will need to be agreed with the school.
- CTs will continue to maintain a CPD portfolio tracking their professional development against the SCT and their professional review and development will focus on this portfolio.
- Any work-based development or project that CTs undertake will be agreed with their line manager and resourced, including the allocation of time.
- CTs will share their enhanced professionalism with colleagues and will seek opportunities to influence the development of teaching and learning. (Scottish Government, 2008, 7)

4.27 The Review Group whilst continuing to support the principle of the CT, made a number of recommendations for its future, including the following:

- A review of the Standards for CT and of the CT modular route format.
- A strengthening of the eligibility process and in particular a requirement that those applying for the scheme should show evidence of good classroom practice and high professional standards.
- The inclusion of school based evidence as a requirement of the programme and its assessment.
- Agreement between head-teachers and CTs on the role they could perform.
- The impact of CTs should be captured by the Scottish Government.
- Local authorities should ensure that schools monitor that CTs continue to meet the CT Standards.
- Accepting that the Accreditation Route would be coming to an end in 2008, consideration of other flexible routes to achieving the standard for CT to be considered. (Scottish Government, 2008)

4.28 In responding to the report of the Review Group, the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning, whilst strongly reiterating the support of the Scottish Government for CT, pointed to areas where she felt that the Review Group had not been sufficiently strong in its conclusions. This included the potential role of CT as a valuable resource within the Scottish education system. Subsequently she has asked the Inspectorate in Scotland to undertake a review of the impact of CT in schools (Hyslop, 2008).

4.29 As part of its ongoing response to the review and the further development of CT Scotland, the General Teaching Council for Scotland has revised the Standards for CT and revised its application and selection processes in order to ensure that they are as rigorous as possible. The revised Standards for CT in Scotland can be seen at appendix 4

4.30 Whilst the CT Programme, therefore, appears to have successfully established itself in Scotland, there are clearly a number of issues that have presented themselves relating to who exactly should be attracted to become a CT and what role they should be asked to play within the teaching profession. In the view of two academics involved with the CT Programme in Scotland 'while CT formed part of an integrated package of reforms to the teaching profession, it is not yet part of an integrated system of CPD and human resource management' (Connelly and McMahon, 2007, 103). In particular they note that there is limited evidence that the CT scheme has had 'perceived benefits for schools' and that a major weakness of the programme derives from 'a sense in which it is semi-detached from the development of the school as an organisation and organic learning community' (Connelly and McMahon, 2007, 103 and 104).

Developments in Wales

4.31 A number of developments in Wales, other than the Chartered Teacher programme itself, can be seen to be relevant to the policy and research areas reviewed here. These have their origins in the determination of the Welsh Assembly Government since the coming of devolution in 1999, to develop an education system in Wales where teacher professionalism is of a high order and plays a powerful part in educational progress (Welsh Assembly Government 2001 and 2006).

4.32 One significant outcome of this has been the **professional development funding** made available for individual teachers through the General Teaching Council for Wales since 2001. Independent evaluation and Estyn inspection reports have pointed to the benefits generally offered to teachers from this funding stream (Egan and James, 2004; Estyn 2007). The Egan and James study, however, made a number of recommendations designed to improve the overall quality of the work undertaken by teachers, including the promotion of both collaborative as well as individually-focused CPD and for greater emphasis to be placed on the outcomes of this funding for pupils and schools.

4.33 Issues relating to the quality of teaching and the dissemination of effective practice have been at the core of the **Pedagogy Strategy** in Wales (or the 'Focus on Pedagogy' as it has come to be known more recently). This was brought into being by the then Minister for Education, Jane Davidson, in 2005 (Davidson,2007). It was designed to identify outstanding pedagogy across the various education sectors in Wales and to establish mechanisms for the networking of such effective practice. It has led to the development of a model where the process of learning, teaching strategies, and the relationships and environment in which learning and teaching take place, are seen to be in synergy and to produce enhanced student outcomes (Welsh Assembly Government, 2009).

4.34 The Pedagogy Strategy has become a part of a much wider focus in Wales on developing a national system of school effectiveness, which identifies high quality teaching and the development of professional learning communities as being key components. This has emerged out of the broad field of school effectiveness research (Hopkins, 2007; Fullan 2004 and 2006;) and practice and the specific context in which this has been developed in Wales (Welsh Assembly Government 2002 and 2005; ; James, Connolly, Dunning and Elliot 2006; Egan, 2009). It has led to the production of a **School Effectiveness Framework** where the centrality of high quality teaching and teacher professional development are strongly represented (Welsh Assembly Government, 2008; Egan and Marshall, 2007; Egan, 2008). The SEF has been piloted in a number of schools in 2008-09 and following a period of system capacity building in 2009-10 will be introduced incrementally to all schools in Wales from September 2010. It would seem inevitable that the potential development of a CT Programme in Wales should be aligned to this flagship policy for teachers and schools in Wales.

Findings Emerging From This Review

4.35 High quality teaching is the fundamental basis of educational success and progress at individual, institutional and system level.

4.36 CPD has a major role to play in producing and maintaining high quality teaching and for this to be achieved requires a focus on collaborative professional development located within schools.

4.37 School leadership is critically important to supporting high quality teaching and professional development. New forms of leadership are emerging in schools which provide opportunities for the leadership of teacher pedagogy and professional development.

- 4.38 This is leading educational systems across the world towards constructing new roles for expert teachers who can undertake the leadership of teacher pedagogy and professional development at school level. These roles are based upon the identification of a series of attributes that can be seen to exemplify expert teaching.
- 4.39 The role of Advanced Skills Teachers in England offers one model of how such teachers can be made operational within an education system.
- 4.40 The Teacher Learning Academy in England provides a reflective/enquiry based model of CPD that could be deployed by school based leaders of teacher pedagogy and professional development.
- 4.41 The Master of Learning and Teaching in England potentially provides a structured system of system and profession-wide CPD focused on improving teacher quality and pedagogy. It will allow experienced (expert?) teachers a prominent role as coaches for the teachers undertaking the programme.
- 4.42 The introduction of CT status in Scotland whilst generally welcomed as an investment in teacher quality and professional development also raises a number of fundamental questions in relation to the areas covered above, in particular whether it is intended as a route for 'competent' or 'expert' teachers and the role that might be performed by CT within the teaching profession?
- 4.43 Within the wider context of education reform and the development of the teaching profession set out above and the specific context of the School Effectiveness Framework, there would appear to be considerable potential for the role of CT within the education system in Wales.
- 4.44 The critical questions which appear to need addressing in order to achieve this in Wales would, therefore, appear to be:
- How can the concept of CT be aligned to the identification of expert teachers within the profession?
 - How can a role be developed for CT as leaders of teacher pedagogy and professional development at school and system level?

References

Barber, M. and Mourshed, M. (2007) *How the World's Best Performing School Systems Came Out on Top*. New York: McKinsey and Co

Bolam, R. and Weindling, D. (2006) *Synthesis of Research and Evaluation Projects Concerned With Capacity-Building Through Teachers Professional Development*.

Available

http://www.gtce.org.uk/shared/contentlibs/126795/93128/168771/ex_summary.pdf

Caldwell, B. J. and Harris, J. (2008) *Why Not the Best Schools?* Victoria: ACER Press

Connelly, G. and McMahon, M. (2007) 'Chartered Teacher: Accrediting Professionalism for Scotland's Teachers- A View From the Inside' *Journal of In – Service Education*, 33, 1, 91-105.

Cordingley, P., Bell, M., Rundell, B. and Evans, D. (2003) 'How Does Collaborative CPD for Teachers of the 5-16 Age Range Affect Teaching and Learning?' <http://www.eppi.ioe.ac>

Davidson, J. (2007) 'The Importance of Evidence Informed Policy Research in Education: A Perspective From Wales' in OECD. *Evidence in Education*. Paris: OECD

Department of Children, Schools and Families (2003) *Advanced Skills Teachers : Outcomes of Groupworking Pilots*. London: DCSF

Department of Children, Schools and Families (2006) *Advanced Skills Teachers Working in Primary Learning Networks: Summary Evaluation Report*. London: DCSF

Department of Children, Schools and Families (2009) *Advanced Skills Teachers: Frequently Asked Questions*. London: DCSF

Department of Children, Schools and Families (2009) *Chartered London Teacher Status*. London: DCSF

Dinham, S., Ingvarson, L. and Kleinhenz, E. (2008) *Investing in Teacher Quality: Doing What Matters Most*. Business Council for Australia.

Dinham, S. (2002) 'NSW Quality Teaching Awards - Research, Rigour and Transparency, *Unicorn*, 28(1), 5-9

Egan and James (2004) *Evaluation for the General Teaching Council Wales of the Phase 3 Professional Development Pilot Projects*. Cardiff: GTCW

Egan, D. and Marshall, S. (2007) 'Educational Leadership and School Renewal in Wales'. *Australian Journal of Education*, 51(3), 286-297

Egan, D. (2008) 'The School Effectiveness Framework in Wales' in *Agenda: Journal of the Institute for Welsh Affairs*, Summer 2008.

Egan, D. (2009) *Why Not the Best Schools?: The Wales Report*. Victoria: ACER Press

Elmore, R. (2004) *School Reform From Inside Out*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press

Elmore, R. (2007) 'Professional Networks and School Improvement', *The School Administrator*, April 2007

Estyn (2005) *How Linkages Can Be Improved Between CPD, School Development Plans, Performance Management and Raising Standards*. Cardiff: Estyn

Estyn (2007) *The Impact of the Continuing Professional Development Programme on Teachers, Schools and the Raising of Pupils' Achievements*. Cardiff: Estyn

Field, K. (2005) 'Continuing Professional Development for Leaders and Teachers: the English Perspective', in Alexandrou, A., Field, K. and Mitchell, H. *The Continuing Professional Development of Educators* (2005) Didcot: Symposium Books

Fullan, M. (2004) *Leadership and Sustainability: System Leaders in Action*. London: Sage

Fullan, M. (2006) *Beyond Turnaround Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

General Teaching Council for England (2008) *Being a TLA Leader: A Reflective Tool to Support TLA Leaders*. London: General Teaching Council for England

Goodall, J., Day, C., Lindsay, G., Mujis, D. and Harris, A. (2005) *Evaluating the Impact of Continuing Professional Development*. London: DfES

Greenwald, R., Hedges, L.V. and Laine, R.D. (1996) 'The Effect of School Resources on Student Achievement', *Review of Educational Research*, 66(3), 361-396

Harland and Kidner (1997) 'Teachers' Continuing Professional Development: Framing a Model of Outcomes' *British Journal of In-Service Education*, 23, 1, 71-84

Hustler, D., MacNamara, O., Jarvis, J., Londra, M., Campbell, A and Howson, J (2003). *Teachers' Perspectives of Continuing Professional Development*. DfES Research Report 429. London: DfES

Harris, A. (2008) *Distributed Leadership in Schools: Developing the Leaders of Tomorrow*. London: Routledge and Falmer Press

Hattie, J. (2003) 'Teachers Make a Difference: What is the Research Evidence?' <http://www.leadspace.govt.nz/leadersjip/articles/teachers-make-a-difference.php>

Hattie, J. (2007) 'Developing Potentials for Learning Evidence, Assessment and Progress'. http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz/uoa/education/staff/j.hattie/j.hattie_home.cfm,

- Higham, R., Hopkins, D. and Ahtaridou, E. (2007) *Improving School Leadership: Country Background Report*. Paris:OECD
- Hopkins, D. (2007) *Every School A Great School*. Maidenhead: Open University Press
- Hyslop, F. (2008) *Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning's Response to the Report of the Chartered Teacher Review Group*. Edinburgh:Scottish Government
- Ingvarson, L. and Kleinhenz, E. (2006) *A Standards Guided Professional Learning System*. Australian Council for Educational Research
- Ingvarson, L.C. and Rowe, K. (2008) 'Conceptualising and Measuring Teacher Quality: Substantive and Methodological Issues'. *Australian Journal of Education*, 52(1), 5-34
- James, C., Connolly, M., Dunning, G. and Elliot, T. (2006) *How Very Effective Primary Schools Work*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing
- Kirk, G., Beveridge, W. and Smith, I. (2003) *The Chartered Teacher*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press
- Leithwood , K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A. and Hopkins, D (2006) *Seven Strong Claims About Successful School Leadership*. Nottingham: NCSL
- Lord, P., Lamont, E., Harland, J., Mitchell, H. and Straw, S. *Evaluation of the GTC's Teacher Learning Academy. Impacts on Teachers, Pupils and Schools*. National Foundation for Educational Research
- McCrone, (2000) *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century*. Edinburgh: HMSO
- McMahon, M. and Reeves, J. (2008) *Evaluating the Impact of Chartered Teacher in Scotland: the Views of Chartered Teachers*. University of Glasgow and University of Stirling
- Moor, H, Halsey, K., Jones, M., Martin, K., Stott, A., Brown, C., and Harland, J. (2005) *Professional Development for Teachers Early in Their Career: an Evaluation of the Early Professional Development Scheme*. DfESResearchReport 613. London:DfES
- OECD (1994) *Quality in Teaching* Paris: OECD
- OECD (2005) *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers*. Paris: OECD
- Ofsted (2003) *Advanced Skills Teachers: A Survey* London: Ofsted

Ofsted (2006) *The Logical Chain: Continuing Professional Development in Effective Schools*. London: Ofsted

Ontario Ministry of Education (2008). *Teacher Learning and Leadership Program for Experienced Teachers*. Ontario: Ministry of Education

Robinson, M., Walker, M, Kinder, K. and Haines, B. (2008) *Research Into the Role of CPD Leadership in Schools*. Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research

Rowe, K. (2003) 'The Importance of Teacher Quality As a Key Determinant of Student' Experiences and Outcomes of Schooling'. <http://www.nswteachers.nsw.edu.au/library/Rowe/html>

Scottish Government (2008) *Report of the Chartered Teacher Review Group*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Government

Slater, H., Davies, N. and Burgess, S. (2009) *Do Teachers Matter? Measuring the Variation in Teacher Effectiveness in England*. Bristol: Centre for Market and Public Organisation

Stoll, L., Wallace, M., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Thomas, S., Hankey, K., Smith, M. and Greenwood, A. (2003) *Creating and Sustaining Effective Professional Learning Communities*. DfES Research Brief RBX12-03 London: DfES

Sutherland, S. (1997) *Teacher Education and Training : A Study*. Norwich: HMSO

Teacher Development Agency (2007) *Impact Evaluation of CPD*. London: TDA

Teacher Development Agency (2009) *An Introduction to the Masters in Teaching and Learning*. London: TDA

Teaching in Scotland (2007) *Teachers for Excellence: A Model for CPD*. Teaching In Scotland

Welsh Assembly Government (2001) *The Learning Country*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government

Welsh Assembly Government (2002) *Narrowing the Gap in the Performance of Schools*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government

Welsh Assembly Government (2005) *Narrowing the Gap in the Performance of Schools: Phase 2 Primary Schools*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government

Welsh Assembly Government (2006) *The Learning Country: Vision Into Action*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government

Welsh Assembly Government (2008) *School Effectiveness Framework: Building Effective Learning Communities Together*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government

Welsh Assembly Government (2009) *Effective Practice in Learning and Teaching: A Focus on Pedagogy*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.

Wenger, E. (1988) *Communities Of Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press

5 FINDINGS:THE PORTFOLIO PILOT

Introduction

5.1 The findings that follow are based on the evidence set out in 3.9 above. They are presented in relation to evidence emerging from the :

- Views and experiences of the teachers involved.
- Views, experiences and judgements of the Advisers/Assessors.
- Consideration of wider evidence drawn from the evaluation work undertaken, including the review in section 4 above.

5.2 With only eight teachers and two adviser/assessors involved, this was a very small-scale pilot and, therefore, the conclusions that are drawn from it should be considered with this in mind.

The Teachers

5.3 The teachers involved in the pilot (one was a local authority advisory teacher) became aware of the CT pilot in various ways. Similarly they had a variety of reasons in terms of **interest and motivation** for wishing to become involved. Whilst some sought to gain recognition for their classroom excellence, others were motivated to enhance their CPD portfolio in a way that might assist their progression into management/leadership roles: indeed two were moving into senior management/leadership roles and another was simultaneously undertaking two modules on a management/leadership course. Some were motivated by the prospect of broadening their horizons and having an opportunity to reflect on their career development. In the case of the Local Authority Adviser, the motivation was to act as a role model to the teachers she was working with.

5.4 From this analysis it is clear, therefore, that the teachers recruited had a variety of motivations for pursuing the CT Portfolio pilot and in the main they were not driven by the desire to demonstrate and have recognised their classroom excellence and to seek a future leadership role aligned with this.

5.5 All of the teachers had a strong record of **previous involvement in CPD**. For example, five of the eight held Master's degrees (two of these were not in the field of Education) and one other acquired a Master's during the course of undertaking the CT Portfolio pilot. Those who held a Master's regarded this as an essential background for the work that they undertook on the Portfolio pilot, particularly the reflective review: indeed they believe that it should be a pre-requisite.

- 5.6 In general the teachers were satisfied with most aspects of the **support and guidance** they received. A small number felt that they were relatively isolated and unsupported and believed that those on the Programme Route pilot had received more support and attention. Most teachers were, however, particularly positive about the support they received from their Adviser. The majority had not accessed the virtual learning environment and some had faced difficulties in attempting to use this. Other than in the two meetings arranged for them to meet together with their Advisers, they had not kept in touch with each other and in this sense a community of practitioners/professional learning community had not been created. Many regretted this and felt that this had been a missed opportunity in relation to supporting each other, which is known to be the typical view of teachers involved in CPD activity who generally prefer to work collaboratively. They point out that e-mail addresses were not shared. Two teachers who had undertaken previous study with the Open University believed that the support systems in place on the CT Portfolio Route compared unfavourably.
- 5.7 The teachers had found the work involved in **compiling the portfolio** to be demanding and time consuming and they valued, therefore, the flexibility that had been provided for them in meeting deadlines. There was a feeling that considerable duplication was involved in exemplifying the Key Experiences. One of the teachers assessed not to have successfully met the standard through her portfolio, accepted the outcome and recognised that because of the demands of undertaking simultaneously two leadership modules offered by her local authority advisory service and experiencing a school inspection, she had not put sufficient work into preparing the portfolio.
- 5.8 A number of the teachers felt extremely disappointed when they were told at a mid-point of the pilot that it was uncertain as to whether the CT Programme would be adopted in Wales and if, therefore, they would ultimately receive recognition for their work.
- 5.9 In general those teachers who successfully completed the pilot believed that it had been an extremely positive experience that had helped them to reflect upon their career development, broadened their horizons and provided them with a theoretical underpinning to their work that they lacked previously.
- 5.10 In relation to their **future careers** two have already moved into senior management roles and two others are likely to move in this direction through undertaking NPQH. Given that one other is a Local Authority Advisory teacher and that the intentions of one other (who did not submit a portfolio) is unknown, this suggests that only two of the eight are hoping that they will operate in the main as excellent classroom practitioners.

The Advisers/Assessors

5.11 In recruiting the teachers for the pilot, they believed the key consideration was that they had sufficient appropriate experience in order to be able to develop, refine and demonstrate that they could meet the Standard for CT. In general they feel that this process was successful and that particular circumstances applied in the case of the two teachers who subsequently were not able to satisfy the assessors that they had met the standard. They believed that the recruitment of a Local Authority Advisory teacher was supportable in its own right and for reasons of geographical spread.

5.12 They accept, on reflection, that the application process should be refined and believe that this should be done through an initial application sift being followed by a needs analysis process being undertaken with the Adviser. This should then be followed by the teacher undertaking a compulsory Self Evaluation and Reflection module before beginning the actual Portfolio Route, or, if this was deemed not to be suitable for them, to transfer to the Programme Route.

5.13 Their view is that CT should be an entitlement route for teachers and that it should not be aimed at a particular target group in the profession. These teachers should be able to demonstrate in the initial work that they do with the Advisers, that they:

- Are highly competent practitioners.
- Have led initiatives at school level.
- Have reflective qualities.

They recognise that some of the teachers in the pilot cohort did not possess the second of these attributes.

5.14 They believe that the CT Standards have served as a useful reference point for exemplifying the qualities sought in the teachers, but that there have been difficulties faced in teachers being able to demonstrate all of the standards, particularly if they have not had a leadership role. Some of the standards were insufficiently clear for assessment purposes. It is their view that the standards should be seen not as assessment criteria but as prompts for analysis and reflection by the teacher.

5.15 In their view the role of Adviser/Assessor is essential in supporting teachers to achieve the standard. The key skills required by the Adviser are to be able to mentor and challenge teachers. The talent pool for both roles should be common and Advisers/Assessor need to work in teams. The role might be appropriate for experienced head-teachers, appropriate local authority staff, retired HMI, senior academics and, in the future, Chartered Teachers.

5.16 From their perspective the support and guidance system for the Portfolio pilot has, generally, been successful. Their view was that the process of compiling evidence needed to have been a more sustained and iterative one than it has been during the pilot. Teachers needed to access the support that was made available to them: two of the teachers who did not meet the standard had not attended arranged meetings with their Adviser. They agreed that the cohort did not develop as a Professional Learning Community and that opportunities had thereby been lost for group-support and collaborative work.

5.17 They perceive that the process of identifying an exemplifying Key Experiences has worked well and provides the Adviser with the opportunity to challenge and explore the professional experiences and attributes of the teacher. They believe that this should be aligned to domains within the CT Standards associated with leading people, leading change etc

5.18 From the experience of the pilot they believe that teachers undertaking the Portfolio Route need to have/ or be undertaking a Master's qualification because of the training this provides in reflective and critical approaches to evidence.

5.19 In their view there is an important potential role for CT within the profession at individual, school and local authority level. They recognise the synergy that could be gained by linking this to Welsh Assembly Government policies such as the Pedagogy Strategy and the School Effectiveness Framework.

Wider Evidence

5.20 Some of the portfolios were well- presented, appropriately referenced and include critical reflection. Those that did not demonstrate these strengths were the ones that have been assessed not to have met the CT standard. This suggests that generally appropriate and fair assessments have, therefore, been made.

5.21 The identification of what counts as evidence and what it exemplifies is, however, far less clear. It will be suggested in this evaluation, based on the review undertaken in section 4 above, that useful defining characteristics for expert teachers who seek to become Chartered Teachers, might be seen as:

- Excellence in classroom teaching.
- The leadership of colleagues in pedagogy and CPD.

- Work undertaken with agencies external to the school (local authorities, Welsh Assembly Government, Estyn etc)

5.22 Such characteristics might be used to frame and assess the three Key Experiences in the portfolio, rather than the key experiences being drawn from the existing profile of the teacher. It could be argued that what is often presented in the portfolios is information on experiences rather than evidence linked to outcomes. In this respect the standards could usefully be exemplified by quantitative and qualitative evidence linked to improvements at student and school level. In one portfolio of the 31 pieces of evidence presented to exemplify the CT Standard, 9 are drawn from the candidate's M Ed thesis, 7 from power-point presentations given by the person and 7 from evaluations of these presentations. This portfolio was assessed to have met the standard although on this basis the judgement seems questionable. Another issue relates to the multi-usage of the same piece of evidence to exemplify standards. In some cases this seems excessive.

5.23 There are inevitable links here to the wider issue of the selection of teachers for the Portfolio Route. The fact that of the 8 teachers recruited, only 5 have been assessed to have successfully met the standard and one of these outcomes is queried above, might suggest that the process has been rigorous. There is no reason to think, that in the main, this has not been the case. The fact, however, that 3 out of 8 (possibly this should be four) were unsuccessful raises issues about the suitability of some of those recruited. Were these 'excellent' or 'expert' teachers, or were they competent practitioners? What evidence was assembled to support their claim, other than the application forms they submitted? Were they provided with guidance on what was perceived as outstanding performance and how they might seek to exemplify this?

5.24 Six of the eight teacher recruited either held or were working towards a Master's degree. Of the two not in this category, one was successful in meeting the CT standard and the other was not, on account of non-submission of a portfolio. Of the six who held or were studying for a Master's qualification, two were not successful in meeting the standard. The issue of whether teachers should have an M level qualification to successfully undertake the CT Portfolio route thus seems to be an open one. This notwithstanding, the situation whereby some teacher's are able to submit evidence to support their Key Experiences drawn from their Master's work, when others have not been required to have such an experience, seems unfair.

Overall Findings

- 5.25 The pilot of the Portfolio Route suggests that it can be an appropriate means of recruiting potential CT and enabling them to demonstrate that they are able to meet the Standards for CT. Generally the teachers who have undertaken this pilot have found it an enjoyable and rewarding experience.
- 5.26 There appear to remain issues about the criteria and process for recruiting teachers to this route. These include:
- The attributes and experiences they possess.
 - Their motivation for undertaking CT.
 - The appropriateness of those in, or who move to, senior leadership or local authority advisory positions undertaking CT.
 - The need for a formative process of application and preparation for the route including undertaking a core module on Self Evaluation and Reflection.
 - Whether teachers should already possess a Master's level qualification.
 - Whether teachers should be undertaking any other form of professional qualification simultaneously.
- 5.27 The process of organising the portfolio around the exemplification of key experiences is a good basis for demonstrating the standards, but might be strengthened through:
- A framework for the key experiences which reflects the key attributes sought in CT.
 - A stronger emphasis on demonstrating CT standards linked to student achievement and school improvement.
 - A limit on the use of a single piece of evidence to exemplify standards.
- 5.28 The CT standards are a useful framework for referencing the standards, but might usefully be refined to assist the process of evidence collection, exemplification and assessment.
- 5.29 The support and guidance system in place has been successful at the level of Adviser support but more needs to be done to consider the value of a VLE and particularly in relation to developing a professional learning community for those undertaking the Portfolio Route.
- 5.30 The role of Advisers/Assessors as undertaken within the pilot is a sound one that is capable of development.

6 FINDINGS:THE PROGRAMME ROUTE

Introduction

- 6.1 The evidence base for the evaluation of the Programme Route pilot was that set out in 3.10 – 3.17 above.
- 6.2 The use of this mixed evaluation methodology has allowed a rich and rigorous evidence base to be constructed, with 67% of teachers involved responding to questionnaires, approximately half of the cohort and all the providers being interviewed.
- 6.3 In nearly all cases providers cooperated fully and readily with the evaluation. In one case, however, such cooperation was not offered by the provider despite this being a condition of the funding given by the GTCW. This was also the module – coincidentally or not – from which the lowest rate of response (17%) to the teacher questionnaire was received. This has inevitably affected the evaluation of this module, although it is extremely unlikely to have affected the overall evaluation of the Programme Route.

Motivation and Background of Teachers Involved

- 6.4 Responses to the questionnaires and the interviews suggest that, although expressed in a variety of ways, the main motivation for teachers participating in the pilot was their desire to gain further experience, to add to their CPD profile and to further their career development.
- 6.5 The ultimate ambition of the majority (65% of those responding to the questionnaire) of teachers was to take their careers to whole school senior leadership positions, with 23 per cent wishing to become head-teachers. Only about 24 per cent of those replying to the questionnaire wished to remain in the classroom and through gaining recognition for their classroom excellence, find a role in working with other teachers to develop their pedagogy and CPD.
- 6.6 Throughout this evaluation it has been suggested that the CT programme has the potential to be a career route for expert teachers who could lead improvements to teacher pedagogy and CPD. It would appear, however, that the pilot has in the main attracted teachers who saw it as an opportunity to pursue their ambitions to move to whole-school senior leadership, probably as a precursor to undertaking NPQH. Indeed a small number had already begun or applied for NPQH and a larger group were simultaneously undertaking

Middle Leadership modules, which they perceived as being preparation for a senior leadership role.

6.7 This analysis is salient with a wider impression emerging from the views of providers and the judgement of the evaluation team that many of the teachers chosen for the pilot of the Programme Route, whilst clearly being competent teachers, did not appear to have the experience or the standing to be regarded as expert or highly accomplished practitioners. This was borne out in many cases by their performance in module assessments.

6.8 It would appear, therefore, that issues arise in relation to the process for the selection of participants in the CT Programme Route if it is to provide a means for outstanding practitioners to achieve recognition and potentially a role within the profession in leading improvements in teacher quality and CPD.

6.9 Information on the previous formal qualifications acquired by the participating teachers since completing their initial training and prior to their involvement in the pilot, throws further light on the typology suggested above. Thirty-five per cent had undertaken some prior qualification at either Master's or sub-Master's (Post Graduate Certificate/Diploma) level. Although the majority had been involved in a range of school/local authority based initiatives and programmes, 62% had undertaken no further formal qualifications subsequent to their initial training. Given that many of those who had undertaken the Post Graduate Certificate/Diploma courses (about 25% of all respondents to the questionnaire) would have been doing so to pursue their ambitions to enter senior leadership positions, in general this data and the profile of teachers it offers, supports the conclusion set out in 6.8 above.

6.10 Overall, therefore, it would appear that, whilst all of the teachers who participated in the pilot were doing so to develop their professional experience and competence, the majority (c 75%) were doing so in the hope that this would be a stepping stone to whole school senior leadership and only about one –quarter saw it as an opportunity to seek recognition of expert teacher status and future career opportunities associated with such a status.

Organisation of the Modules

6.11 The ten modules offered on the Programme Route pilot involved a variety of methods of provision, including teaching sessions (staged and intensive), tutorials (face- to- face and distant) and directed learning (including virtual learning environments).

- 6.12 Teachers' views on the organisation of modules varied, with most being satisfied with what was offered and others wanting more of something and/ or less of something else. Generally teachers felt that they needed more time to undertake the work required. It should be remembered that only a small number of teachers experienced more than one module and in these cases the organisation of the two modules was broadly similar. They, therefore, were not comparing different modules or making judgements about a fully developed programme.
- 6.13 For those who had to travel some distance to the location where the module was offered, intensive programmes, including one instance where there was two overnight stays, were welcomed, as they caused less disruption to their work and personal lives.
- 6.14 Some teachers felt that more of the allocated time for a module should be given to individual research and enquiry as opposed to taught sessions and tutorials. On the other hand, there were participants who felt that there was too little teaching of the module, with most time being given to facilitation and support. Inevitably this reflects to some extent the learning preferences of the teachers involved. It might also be expected that a fully developed version of the Programme Route would include a variety of learning approaches between modules to meet these varying preferences.
- 6.15 There appear to have been difficulties in some cases with teachers accessing University based virtual learning environments, although in the instance where this was central to the model this was not the case and in fact this was an area of strength in the module organisation. Some students also experienced problems and delays with gaining access to university libraries and given that many were working remotely from university locations, this was a significant difficulty for them.
- 6.16 Nearly all of the modules (there was one that did not) were intended to involve some form of partnership working between higher education institutions and local authorities. The nature of the partnership varied. In the case of two modules, however, whilst the modules were tendered for and the contract let by GTCW on the basis that a partnership between a University and a local authority was in place, this partnership does not appear to have been real or active. The local authority partner was not involved in any way in the presentation or assessment of these modules.
- 6.17 In general, the existence of an active and strong partnership between a HEI and a local authority/local authority consortia or advisory service, was seen to be a major strength for the quality of provision of modules and their successful outcomes. A particular strength of these partnership arrangements

was the way in which research based and theoretical approaches (led by HEI staff) and practice –based approaches (led by local authority staff) could be brought together.

6.18 In general, teachers found the modules to be demanding (extremely demanding in some cases) and had real concerns about this in relation to what would be involved in pursuing the full Programme Route. The fact that funding from GTCW had covered their absence from school including study time had been extremely welcome, but, nevertheless, concerns regarding the potential workload involved in the programme remained.

6.19 Given these concerns and issues tackled above in relation to the strength of partnership working and access to library provision, the issue of whether modules should be provided on a regional basis for teachers undertaking the Programme Route arises.

6.20 In the case of two modules, teachers were required to have a school-based mentor to support them in their work, particularly in relation to maintaining journals recording the practical application of their learning and action research work. Whilst this seems a commendable idea that mirrors the role of school-based coaches in the Masters of Learning and Teaching qualification in England, it faced practical difficulties. These derived from the problems with the quality of support and commitment of those who were asked to take on this role.

6.21 This aligns with a wider point about the awareness and involvement of schools with the pilot of the CT programme. Generally levels of awareness are not high and whilst this might not be surprising at a pilot stage of a programme, given its future potential and the possible, perhaps desirable, need to involve school-based staff in mentoring/coaching roles, this is an area that requires consideration.

6.22 In summary then the evaluation suggests the following in relation to **organisation of the modules** on the Programme Route :

- The desirability for all modules to be based on a real and active regionally-based provider partnership between local authorities and higher education institutions.
- As part of a full iteration of the Programme route, a variety of learning and teaching approaches should be used across modules.
- Consideration should be given to the potential workload of participants.
- Improvements need to be made in access for participants to university library facilities and virtual learning environments.

- A role for school-based mentors/coaches should be considered, in order to provide greater support for participants and to raise the involvement and awareness of schools.

Relevance of the Modules to Learning and Teaching Pedagogy

- 6.23 In general the teachers involved in the pilot feel that the modules have had a positive impact on their own practice and some point to similar, albeit early, outcomes in relation to the achievement of their students.
- 6.24 They instance this in relation to their greater awareness of how learning and teaching take place, the more reflective and evaluative way in which they now operate and an increased respect for the outcomes of educational research.
- 6.25 Particular examples of this which currently have considerable relevance in schools are the skills-based approaches that are central to the curriculum changes introduced since 2008, assessment for learning, oracy and literacy and the use of ICT. Given the importance of these areas, there seems no doubt that in some cases teachers have been exposed to leading-edge pedagogy that will have considerably enhanced their professional practice.
- 6.26 In two modules, however, whilst the theoretical/academic input was highly rated by teachers, the coverage of practical and classroom focused aspects was considered to be at such a low level that it did not either challenge or supplement their existing knowledge. This seemed to be associated with the absence of a strong partnership between the higher education and local authority provider, that utilised the potential input of the latter partner.
- 6.27 Whilst teachers recognised the generally high quality inputs made by those involved in presenting the modules, they particularly valued the learning and the insights they gained from other participants. A particular strength was thought to be the interaction between teachers from different phases (primary/secondary and special) as well as schools. Such findings reflect what is generally known (section 4 above) about teachers preference for collaborative and interactive modes of CPD.
- 6.28 Whilst clearly these outcomes are positive and encouraging, they are largely anecdotal and attitudinal in their nature and are not supported by any

quantitative or robust qualitative data that establishes to what extent gains have been made in teacher expertise and student outcomes.

6.29 In relation to the impact of the Programme Route on the learning and teaching pedagogy of those teachers who participated in the pilot, the following conclusions can, therefore, be drawn:

- In a number of instances teachers have been introduced to areas of leading edge pedagogy which has challenged and informed their practice.
- Participants have particularly valued the opportunity to learn from the varied experience of their colleagues.
- The actual impact of this generally rich experience on their teaching competence and student learning is reported to be a positive one, but such evidence is largely untested and should be explored further in any on-going evaluation of the CT programme.

The Existence of a Professional Learning Community

6.30 Given the known preference of teacher-centred collaborative learning and what is reported in 6.26, there could have been great potential in communities of practice/ professional learning communities being developed among module participants.

6.31 It is apparent that in some cases this was an aspect that was facilitated by providers, but that in others it either was not seen as being part of the organisation of the module or it was left to teachers to act upon.

6.32 In one module the creation of such a community, facilitated by a virtual learning environment, was at the heart of the organisation and purpose of the model. An active discussion forum was created and this became central to what was seen as a highly successful module that modelled the cutting edge pedagogy that was its main focus.

6.33 In another instance a chat room was created where teachers could discuss the standards that they were challenged to address and exemplify in the module, providing both reassurance and collaborative learning drawing upon their own practice.

6.34 The provision of two overnight stops as part of the intensive organisation of another module was also partly justified by the intention to

facilitate a professional learning community and was seen to succeed in this ambition.

- 6.35 Another way in which such collaborative learning was encouraged was through individual presentations of action/classroom research projects to the whole group.
- 6.36 In some cases problems with using university based virtual learning environments prohibited rather than facilitated potential learning communities.
- 6.37 Overall, therefore, the potential for professional learning communities being established as a way of promoting collaborative learning has to some extent been promoted and facilitated in modules on the pilot of the Programme Route. Where this has been the case they have generally been successful and have contributed significantly to the quality of modules.

The Balance Between Theory and Practice

- 6.38 Taking into account a balance between theory and practice in the content of modules was something that GTCW had originally asked providers to do. Whilst this might be an area that itself might lead to professional and academic debate, the evaluation has attempted to establish to what extent this was achieved.
- 6.39 Generally teachers have felt that the balance has been right, with inevitably some thinking there should be more or less of one or the other. In a limited number of cases there was an overall feeling that there was too much theory and too little practice (two modules) or that there was an over concentration on practice and too little theoretical underpinning (one module). These were, however, not areas where in the main teachers had strong views.
- 6.40 Whilst teachers generally enjoyed reading academic works and research reports, they found the integration of this into the work on the module and the time involved challenging.
- 6.41 As has been noted above it was felt that the modules which involved strong partnerships between academic and local authority providers were those which achieved the best balance between theory and practice.
- 6.42 Providers whilst generally believing that the current CT Standards were in need of revision, recognised that having a usable set of standards was a useful way of signalling a balance between theory and practice.

6.43 In summary, therefore, in the majority but not all cases, teachers perceived that modules had the right blend of theory and practice. Those which achieved this balance were also those where the university/local authority partnership was strong. The standards for CT potentially have a useful role to play in signalling how this balance can best be achieved.

Contribution to the Development of Leadership

6.44 As has been argued in section 4 above, the concept of CT can be seen to have considerable potential through the recognition it might afford to expert teachers and the development of a role for them as school-based leaders of pedagogy and teacher CPD.

6.45 Despite the fact, as has been pointed out above, that the majority of teachers who were recruited to the pilot were not seeking to progress their careers in this way and that the majority of schools are not yet familiar with the concept of CT, the potential for it to be developed in this way does emerge from the experience of the pilot.

6.46 Teachers involved in the pilot report that they have become involved in such leadership of pedagogy/CPD through:

- Informal dissemination of learning outcomes from the modules to their colleagues.
- Action/classroom research projects, which are seen as a particularly effective way of developing this role.
- Presentations/reports to senior leadership teams.
- Presentations and membership of school-based learning and teaching working groups.
- Involvement in school-based INSET.
- Contributing to the School Improvement Plan.
- Observation of their lessons by colleagues.
- Involvement with their local authority advisory service in working parties and giving presentations at teacher conferences.

6.47 It is clear that these opportunities have been exploited by some teachers and their schools/local authorities more than others, but it would appear that in the majority of instances there has been some 'feedback' into the system of this kind as a result of participation in the pilot of the CT Programme Route.

6.48 A large number of teachers involved recognise that there exists leadership potential of this kind that could be associated with the CT role, even if this is not the course that they wish their career to follow. Whilst some equate this with the role of being a 'Middle leader', others see it as a completely distinct role.

6.49 In this connection and more broadly the concept of 'Middle Leader' appears to be an amorphous and indistinct one that does not provide clarity for the development of distributed leadership that can impact at whole school level on raising teacher quality and student outcomes.

6.50 It is apparent, therefore, from the pilot of the Programme Route that the role of CT has considerable potential for developing a distinct leadership role related to teacher pedagogy and CPD at school and local authority level. In order for this role to be developed far greater clarity is needed on what is meant by the concept of 'middle leadership' in relation to the development of more distributed forms of leadership.

Contribution To School Effectiveness and Improvement

6.51 The potential for modules on the Programme Route contributing to wider school improvement and effectiveness is considerable. Much of this potential has already been considered above in relation to the impact the modules have had on learning and teaching pedagogy, the development of professional learning communities and leadership development. In only a small number of modules was this potential not considered and developed.

6.52 It is worth noting in synthesis, however, the following instances where the most effective modules appear to have made a significant contribution in this area:

- The sharing of effective practice by teachers across-phase and between secondary subject areas.
- The greater awareness and application of effective pedagogy that teachers have gained from the content of most of the modules.
- Action/classroom research based assignments that have led to discrete interventions designed to achieve school improvement.

Module Assessment

6.53 As has been noted above the most successful assignments have been seen to be those that employed an action/classroom research focus linked to interventions designed to achieve greater school improvement and

effectiveness. Whilst such assignments required appropriate background reading, the balance between this and the practical research element was seen to be critically important. In some cases, where assignments were not thought to have been appropriate, the balance was too much towards background reading and too little on practical implementation.

6.54 A number of modules made use of learning journals where teachers recorded in a reflective and evaluative way their learning and its application. Whilst some students were uneasy and unsure about this approach at the outset of the module, most came to see it as a practical and effective way of undertaking assessment.

6.55 Many teachers felt that they were not given sufficient guidance and support in undertaking assignments and in one case there was considerable confusion regarding the expectations of the assignment which resulted in a number of teachers dropping out of the module.

6.56 Overall then, assignments have been most fit for purpose where they have had the right balance between background reading and an action/classroom research focus. Learning journals proved to be an effective way of teachers undertaking evaluation and reflection associated with such assignments.

The Standards for Chartered Teacher

6.57 Overall, these have proved to be the most problematical aspect in the pilot of the Programme Route.

6.58 The problems encountered have included the following:

- There was not a consistent attempt to diagnostically map where those teachers involved in the pilot are in relation to the Standards at the outset. In general, therefore, there has been no baseline assessment.
- There was no overall mapping of the standards against the modules to ensure that coverage was being achieved in an appropriately dispersed but cohesive way. Thereby some providers have attempted to address all the standards (which itself can be seen as problematic and unachievable) whereas at the other extreme others have confined themselves to 5 or 6 of the standards. GTCW used the experience of the first year of the pilot to encourage providers in the second year to refine practice in this area.

- Providers believe that in some cases the standards are repetitive and thereby not user friendly.
- In three modules there was no discernible attempt by providers to either recognise or address the standards.
- In a larger number of cases (including all involved in the modules referred to in the previous bullet) teachers were unaware or confused about what standards were being focused on in the modules and associated assignments.
- It is clear that not all the standards can be appropriately addressed through written assignments and many teachers and some providers recognise that there should be some practical, classroom based way in which judgements are made against the standards based upon observing teachers at work.
- In many cases providers (most of whom recognised this) addressed additional standards to the ones that they planned to focus upon.
- Few modules actually focused on the standards as part of the learning objectives/pedagogy of the study sessions on the modules and thereby, did not provide teachers with collaborative opportunities to discuss the standards and how they might exemplify them from their own practice.

6.59 In a small number of cases modules avoided these difficulties and chose standards carefully linking them both to the pedagogy of the module and the assignments.

6.60 The essence of the problems that have been encountered appears to be located in the attempt to use a set of standards as a summative way of assessing the competence of teachers in each of the modules, rather than as a diagnostic and formative tool. Thereby they have been used in a summative, tick-box, manner rather than as diagnostic and formative evidence that can prompt evaluation and reflection by the teacher.

6.61 The resolution of this situation is likely, therefore, to be through use diagnostic and formative approaches to assessment for each of the modules leading at the end of the full Programme Route to a summative assessment of teachers against the overall standards in a way similar to the use of the portfolio on the Portfolio Route.

6.62 This would need to be aligned to a revised set of standards which are more concise, less repetitive and thereby more fit for purpose, based on the characteristics of expert teachers set out above in 5.21, viz:

- Excellence in classroom teaching.

- The leadership of colleagues in pedagogy and CPD.
- Work undertaken with agencies external to the school.

6.63 Moving forward in such a direction would probably represent a less bureaucratic and atomised approach to assessing the standards and could be seen to draw upon/model the main features of assessment for learning. It would, however, have implications for the accreditation of the modules against academic frameworks. These are considered further below.

6.64 In summary, therefore, the following can be said in relation to the Standards for CT:

- As they have been used during the pilot, the current standards do not appear to be fit for purpose and should be revised to encompass, in a concise and user-friendly way, the key characteristics of expert teachers.
- The revised standards should be used in a planned and aligned way by each module provider as a means of diagnostically and formatively assessing teachers.
- Teachers should be assessed summatively at the end of the Programme Route through a portfolio bringing together their assessments from the modules.
- The standards should be used as a central feature of the learning objectives and pedagogy of each module and teachers should be involved in collaborative discussion and exemplification of the standards.
- Consideration should be given to practical, classroom and school located, ways in which teachers can demonstrate the standards.

Academic Accreditation

6.65 As with the Standards for CT this area has proved to be a significantly problematical one in relation to the pilot of the Programme route.

6.66 In order to understand why this has been the case it will be useful to set in context both the approach of education systems, including that of Wales, to CPD linked to academic awards and the academic accreditation systems of higher education institutions in Wales.

- 6.67 As has been pointed out above in section 4, Finland is an example of a country where all teachers are required to achieve a Master's qualification. This is seen as being symbolic of the considerable investment it makes in achieving high teacher quality so as to produce outstanding levels of educational performance.
- 6.68 Other countries where teacher quality is known to be high do not have the same requirement for teachers to achieve Master's level, but they do invest significantly in high quality teacher development. Although it is at an early stage the introduction of the Master's in Learning and Teaching in England can be seen as a similar commitment to moving in this direction.
- 6.69 The Welsh Assembly Government does not currently have a policy position in respect of teachers acquiring M level status. In relation to developing teacher quality the importance of CPD is fully recognised and it likely that this emphasis will grow as a result of the introduction of the School Effectiveness Framework. This encouragement for CPD might, as in other professions in Wales such as social work and nursing, include promoting the achievement of Master's level qualifications.
- 6.70 If this were to be the case, it would be clearly useful if an all-Wales framework for accrediting CPD was to be in place that would include recognition of the CT Programme. Such a framework does not exist and in fact there is no consistency in the system of accreditation awarded by HEIs in Wales to teacher CPD. In respect of what follows it is important to note that a full Master's degree requires 180 academic credits at level 7
- 6.71 M level credits are now awarded to those who pursue the PGCE route into teaching. PGCE providers in Wales offer between 30 and 60 credits.
- 6.72 In relation to the Chartered Teacher Programme modules the situation regarding academic accreditation is that set out in 2.23 above. What this indicates is that HEIs, as was intended by GTCW as part of the pilot, have both:
- Aligned the modules at different levels in their academic frameworks: either level 6 (Post Graduate Diploma) or level 7 (Master's).
 - Allocated different credit scores at each of these levels.
- 6.73 Universities as autonomous institutions are of course fully entitled to make their own decisions, through their academic quality assurance systems, about the amount of academic credit they will award to a module.

- 6.74 The evidence collected through this evaluation, however, suggests that there has been significant inconsistency in the expectations of individual institutions in their assessment of the modules. In some cases teachers appear to have been required to do the same amount and quality of work for 15 credits at level 7 where in other modules they have been receiving 30 credits at the same level. The same also appears to be true of work at level 6. It also appeared to be the case that expectations between institutions for work at the same level and for the same number of credits was significantly different.
- 6.75 There were, therefore, significant inconsistencies and apparent inequities in the awarding of academic credit to the modules on the pilot programme.
- 6.76 The views of the teachers involved in the pilot are interesting in this respect. A significant number of teachers seemed at least uninterested in the prospect of gaining academic accreditation for their work, with some of these being opposed to the notion that this should be an element within the programme, as it over-emphasised the academic as opposed to the practical aspect of the modules. It is likely that there would be a strong correspondence between the teacher holding such views and the 62% of participants who had not pursued any formal qualifications related to CPD since their initial teacher training.
- 6.77 There were, however, a large number of teachers (probably corresponding with the 35% who had undertaken M level related study since initial training, plus some who had not) who did believe very strongly that work on the CT modules should be linked to academic accreditation. Many of these teacher felt that only receiving 15 or 20 credits for their work was very unfair and that by comparison they had received far more credit for equally or even less demanding work in other modules that they had studied on M or M level programmes.
- 6.78 These teachers also tended to have strong opinions about the work undertaken being accredited at level 7 (Master's) rather than level 6 (PG Diploma). Those teachers who were not interested in academic accreditation, or who felt it should not be a dominant feature of the modules, were more content that it be at level 6, if indeed it was to attract academic accreditation.
- 6.79 It is also important to consider these issues in the round. If a developed CT Programme Route in Wales is to be 12 modules and if those modules are to be linked to a Master's qualification that requires 180 academic credits, then the implication is that each module would be 15 credits in value at level 7 and presumably a different value at level 6. This might imply, that although some

teachers would receive accreditation for prior learning (for example the 35% on the pilot who already had undertaken some form of study) this could still mean that if 2 modules were studied per year that it would take six years for some teachers to achieve Chartered Teacher status and a Master's qualification. This seems inequitable when teacher currently can undertake Master's modules at 30 credits value and complete a Master's degree in three years. This will also be the case with the Master's in Learning and Teaching in England.

6.80 This appears to be both a confused and confusing situation. What might be the way forward? There could be fewer modules in any finalised Programme Route, with each attracting 30 credits and with the programme completed in 3 and not 6 years. Alternatively, perhaps only some modules could be aligned with academic accreditation. These might be the core modules, taken by all teachers and including those who had credit awarded for prior learning.

6.81 Another alternative could be linked to the suggestion in 6.61-6.63 above that the Programme Route be assessed at the end of the programme and not through each of the modules. This would enable academic credit to then be awarded at an appropriate level to the whole programme and its outcomes.

6.82 This would, in turn, require a national framework to be in place to align various forms of CPD including the CT Programme to credit ratings agreed between the Welsh Assembly Government and higher education institutions. Thereby rather than decreeing that teachers in Wales would in future need to be qualified to Master's level, strong encouragement and facilitation would be provided for teachers undertaking CPD to seek academic accreditation through these nationally agreed standards. The CT Programme Route would be one, important, means whereby teachers, if they chose to do so, could achieve this.

6.83 In summary, therefore:

- Many teachers on the pilot programme did not appear to be interested in academic accreditation of the programme, but a significant number did believe that it should be capable of accreditation.
- Those who were interested in academic accreditation believed that it should be at level 7 with 30 credits available.
- Whilst it was the intention of GTCW to pilot various approaches to HE accreditation, there have been considerable inconsistencies and

apparent inequities in the way that higher education institutions have awarded credit to modules on the programme route.

- The way forward in this situation could be for a national framework for the accreditation by higher education institutions of teacher CPD to be developed, as part of a commitment by the Welsh Assembly Government for teachers to link CPD to academic accreditation.
- This could enable those teachers who wish to gain academic accreditation to be assessed at the end of the CT Programme route, as part of the process whereby they are judged against the Standards for CT.

Other Issues

6.84 Generally teachers who undertook designated core modules felt they should have that status within the programme route. Similarly strong views were held by teachers and providers in relation to both the Pedagogy of ICT module and the Action Research module.

6.85 It is interesting in this respect that the Masters for Learning and Teaching has research and enquiry as a core module and this is generally the case with Master's degrees in education. Given, as pointed out above, the strong support given by teachers to using action/classroom research approaches in their assignments and the potential these have for both the leadership role of CT and their participation in school improvement, the case for a research and enquiry type module becoming a core component of a developed CT programme seems a strong one.

6.86 The case for ICT seems similarly strong. If CT are to be expert teachers and are to provide leadership for others, it seems inconceivable that they would not be highly competent users of ICT pedagogy. If this were to become a core module, however, there would clearly be a need to make an existing fairly high level of competency in the use of ICT a requirement of recruitment on to the CTeacher.

6.87 A further issue in relation to core modules has been identified by the evaluation team. In relation to two of the core modules (Self-Evaluation and Reflection/Learning, Teaching and Assessment) GTCW decided to involve two providers in each case in different parts of Wales. In each case there were considerable differences in the way that these providers approached the presentation of the modules and based on teacher perceptions and this evaluation, of the quality of outcomes achieved. Given that it is likely that in a possible finalised version of the Programme Route that the delivery of modules would be undertaken by a number of providers, it would be important that the

pedagogy and quality of experience was broadly similar and that quality assurance procedures were in place to achieve this.

6.88 Some teachers put forward the idea that the CT programme should be more personalised in the sense that it should build upon both the existing strengths of teachers and areas where they needed to further develop their expertise. This aligns with the points made above in relation to the Standards for CT of the lack of a diagnostic assessment of teacher at the beginning of the programme: something that is a feature of the Masters in Learning and Teaching in England. Whilst this might have been part of the planned intention in the Self Evaluation and Reflection pilot modules, it does not appear to have been successful in that respect. There is also the related issue of whether the programme is intended primarily to assess the teachers against the standards, or to develop their competence in relation to them or a mixture of both. These are significant issues in relation to the underpinning philosophy of the CT Programme.

6.89 As has been pointed out above, a large number of the teachers who have undertaken the pilot feel that given the time commitment and work involved that there would have to be considerable career and financial incentives involved in order to attract and motivate teachers to complete the programme.

6.90 In relation to the issue of career incentive, it has been suggested throughout this evaluation that this might be provided by a discrete leadership role for the expert classroom practitioners who could be provided with recognition through the programme.

6.91 With respect to financial incentives, teachers participating in the pilot were or became aware of the situation in Scotland and are strongly of the view that such incentives, related to career progression, would need to be in place in Wales.

6.92 As part of the evaluation, the above issues were among those discussed with representatives of the Association of Directors in Wales. They supported the view that in order for CT to be an attractive and effective position within the profession in Wales at both school and local authority level, that terms and conditions of employment and career structure would need to be considered.

6.93 In summary, therefore, other significant issues which have arisen through the evaluation are:

- There is a strong case to be made for core modules in research and enquiry and ICT pedagogy.
- Greater consistency needs to be achieved in the provision of core modules by different providers.
- A personalised approach to the Programme Route should be considered, building upon a diagnostic assessment of the strengths and areas for development of teachers recruited.
- Consideration will need to be given to the career and financial incentives that would need to be in place to make CT an attractive position within the teaching profession.

Overall Strengths of the Programme Pilot

6.94 Generally the modules have provided good quality experiences for the teachers involved and in a number of cases they have been of outstanding quality.

6.95 The highest quality modules were characterised by:

- Coverage of innovative pedagogy.
- Accomplished teaching.
- Strong partnership working between higher education and local authorities.
- An appropriate balance between theoretical and practical approaches.
- Organisation that fitted well with teachers working lives and allowed quality time for reflection and research.
- A strong element of action/classroom research that provided opportunities for leadership of other colleagues and contributions to school improvement.

A number of teachers who had previously undertaken 'middle leadership' courses compared the module/s they had studied on the Programme Pilot very favourably.

6.96 Teachers particularly welcomed the opportunity to work collaboratively with colleagues from other phases and schools.

6.97 Some of the work undertaken by teachers has been outstanding, indicating that expert teachers have been recruited to the Programme Pilot.

6.98 The involvement of higher education institutions allowed teachers access to academic resources that they would otherwise been unable to use.

Overall Shortcomings of the Programme Route

- 6.99 One module was unsuited to the CT Programme pilot. This and two other modules did not display most of the qualities set out in 6/96 above. In particular two of the modules did not involve the active partnership of a local authority provider in the way that had been contracted for with GTCW.
- 6.100 In the way in which they have been used by providers during the pilot of the programme route the Standards for CT have not proved to be fit for purpose.
- 6.101 A significant number of the teachers recruited to the programme do not appear to have been 'expert practitioners'. This resulted from the recruitment/selection processes in place and the lack of diagnostic assessment.
- 6.102 There has been inconsistency and apparent inequity between providers in relation to academic accreditation.

7 SUMMARY OF OVERALL FINDINGS

7.1 GTCW has undertaken the pilot in an efficient and inclusive way. The outcomes should prove to be extremely useful in any future development of the CT programme in Wales.

Outcomes of the Review of Policy and Research Evidence

7.2 High quality **teaching** is the fundamental basis of educational success and progress at individual, institutional and system level.

7.3 CPD has a major role to play in producing and maintaining high quality teaching and for this to be achieved requires a focus on **collaborative professional development**, particularly that located within schools.

7.4 School **leadership** is critically important to supporting high quality teaching and professional development. New forms of leadership are emerging in schools which provide opportunities for the leadership of teacher pedagogy and professional development.

7.5 Educational systems across the world are, therefore, constructing new roles for **expert teachers** who can undertake the leadership of teacher pedagogy and professional development at school level. These roles are based upon the identification of a series of attributes that can be seen to exemplify expert teaching.

7.6 The role of **Advanced Skills Teachers** in England offers one model of how such teachers can be made operational within an education system.

7.7 The General Teaching Council for England's **Teacher Learning Academy** provides a reflective/enquiry based model of CPD that could be deployed by school based leaders of teacher pedagogy and professional development.

7.8 The **Masters in Learning and Teaching** in England potentially provides a structured system of system and profession-wide CPD focused on improving teacher quality and pedagogy. It will allow experienced teachers a prominent role as coaches for the teachers undertaking the programme.

7.9 The introduction of CT status in **Scotland** whilst generally welcomed as an investment in teacher quality and professional development also raises a number of fundamental questions in relation to the areas covered above. These include the issue of whether CT is a route for 'competent' or 'expert'

teachers and the potential role that CT might have within the teaching profession.

7.10 Within the wider context of education reform and the development of the teaching profession set out above and the specific context of the **School Effectiveness Framework**, there would appear to be considerable potential for the role of CT within the education system in Wales.

7.11 The **critical questions** which appear to need addressing for this to be achieved, and which therefore should be considered in this evaluation are:

- How can the concept of CT be aligned to the identification of expert teachers within the profession?
- How can a role be developed for CT as leaders of teacher pedagogy and professional development at school and system level?

The Portfolio Pilot

7.12 The pilot of the Portfolio Route suggests that it can be an **appropriate means** of recruiting potential CT and enabling them to demonstrate that they meet the Standards for CT. Generally the teachers who have undertaken the pilot have found it an enjoyable and rewarding experience.

7.13 There appear to remain issues about the criteria and process for **recruiting** teachers to this route. These include:

- The attributes and experiences they possess.
- Their motivation for undertaking CT.
- The appropriateness of those in, or who move to, senior leadership or local authority advisory positions undertaking CT.
- The need for a formative process of application and preparation for the route including undertaking a core module on Self Evaluation and Reflection.
- Whether teachers should already possess a Master's level qualification.
- Whether teachers should be undertaking any other form of professional qualification simultaneously.

7.14 The process of organising **the portfolio** around the exemplification of key experiences is a good basis for demonstrating the standards, but might be strengthened through:

- A framework for the key experiences which reflects the key attributes sought in CT.
- A stronger emphasis on demonstrating outcomes linked to student achievement and school improvement.
- A limit on the use of a single piece of evidence to exemplify standards.

7.15 The **Standards for CT** are a useful framework, but in the way they have been used by providers during the pilot they are not currently fit for purpose as a means of guiding the collection, exemplification and assessment of evidence.

7.16 The **support and guidance** system in place has been successful at the level of adviser /assessor support, but the potential value of the VLE and a professional learning community has been less well developed.

7.17 The role of **Advisers/Assessors** as undertaken within the pilot is an appropriate one and is capable of further development.

The Programme Pilot

7.18 The general **motivation** of all the teachers who participated in the pilot was a desire to develop their professional experience and competence. A majority (c 75%) believed participation would assist their desired progression to whole- school senior leadership. Only a quarter of teachers saw participation in the pilot as an opportunity to seek recognition of expert teacher status and to develop future career opportunities associated with this.

7.19 The following issues arise in relation to the **organisation** of the modules :

- The existence of a strong regionally-based provider partnership between local authorities and higher education institutions.
- Their utilisation of a variety of learning and teaching approaches.
- The potential workload of participants.
- Access for participants to university library facilities and virtual learning environments.
- The role of school-based mentors/coaches.

7.20 The following conclusions can be drawn about the impact of the route on the **learning and teaching pedagogy** of those teachers involved:

- In a number of instances teachers were introduced to areas of leading edge pedagogy which have challenged and informed their practice.
- Participants particularly valued the opportunity to learn from the varied experience of their colleagues.
- The actual impact of this generally rich experience on their teaching competence and student learning is reported to be a positive one, but such evidence is largely untested and should be explored further in any future research and evaluation on the impact of the CT programme.

7.21 The potential for **professional learning communities** being established as a way of promoting collaborative learning has to some extent been promoted and facilitated in modules on the pilot of the Programme Route. Where this has been the case they have generally been successful and have contributed significantly to the quality of modules.

7.22 In the majority of cases modules appear to have had the right blend of **theory and practice**. Those which achieved this balance were also those where the university/local authority partnership was strong. The standards for CT potentially have a useful role to play in signalling how this balance can best be achieved.

7.23 CT offers considerable potential for developing a distinct **leadership role** related to teacher pedagogy and CPD at school and local authority level. In order for this to be developed, far greater clarity is needed on the designation/nomenclature 'middle leadership' in relation to establishing more distributed forms of leadership.

7.24 The following were significant examples of where modules contributed to **school improvement and effectiveness**:

- The sharing of effective practice by teachers across-phase and between secondary subject areas.
- The greater awareness and application of effective pedagogy that teachers have gained from the content of most of the modules.
- Action/classroom research based assignments that have led to discrete interventions designed to achieve school improvement.

7.25 Module **assignments** were found to be most fit for purpose where they achieved the right balance between background reading and an action/classroom research focus. Learning journals proved to be an effective way of teachers undertaking evaluation and reflection associated with such assignments.

7.26 The following can be said in relation to the **Standards for CT** as they have been used by providers on the pilot of the route:

- The current standards do not appear to be fit for purpose.
- The most effective usage of the standards by providers was as a:
 - ✓ Means of diagnostically and formatively assessing teachers.
 - ✓ Central feature of the learning objectives and pedagogy of each module.
 - ✓ Basis for collaborative discussion and exemplification with teachers.

7.27 On the basis of the pilot, the following can be said In relation to **academic accreditation** of modules:

- Many teachers on the pilot programme did not appear to be interested in academic accreditation of the programme, but a significant number did believe that it should be accredited.
- Those who were interested in academic accreditation believed that each module should be at level 7 with 30 credits available.
- There are considerable inconsistencies and apparent inequities in the way that higher education institutions have awarded credit.

7.28 **Other significant issues** which have arisen are:

- A strong case can be made for core modules to include those on research and enquiry and ICT pedagogy.
- There appears to have been inconsistency in the provision of core modules by different providers, although some of this variety was an intended part of the pilot.

- The need for a more personalised route building upon a diagnostic assessment of the strengths and areas for development of the teachers recruited.
- The need for career and financial incentives to be provided in order to make CT status attractive.

7.29 The overall **strengths** of the pilot of the route have been:

- Generally the modules have provided good quality experiences for the teachers involved and in a number of cases they have been of outstanding quality.
- The highest quality modules were characterised by:
 - ✓ Coverage of innovative pedagogy.
 - ✓ Accomplished teaching.
 - ✓ Strong partnership working between higher education and local authorities.
 - ✓ An appropriate balance between theoretical and practical approaches.
 - ✓ Organisation that fitted well with teachers working lives and allowed quality time for reflection and research.
 - ✓ A strong element of action/classroom research that provided opportunities for leadership of other colleagues and contributions to school improvement.

A number of teachers who had previously undertaken 'middle leadership' courses compared the module/s they had studied on the Programme pilot very favourably.

- Teachers particularly welcomed the opportunity to work collaboratively with colleagues from other phases and schools.
- Some of the work undertaken by teachers has been outstanding, indicating that some expert teachers have been recruited to the programme.
- The involvement of higher education institutions allowed teachers access to academic resources that they would otherwise been unable to use.

7.30 The overall **shortcomings** of the pilot of the modules were:

- One module was unsuited to the CT programme. This and two other modules did not display most of the qualities set out in 7.29 above. In particular two of the modules did not involve the active partnership of a local authority provider in the way that had been contracted for with GTCW.
- In the way they have been used by providers on the pilot the Standards for CT have not proved to be fit for purpose.
- A significant number of the teachers recruited to the pilot do not appear to have been 'expert practitioners'.
- There has been inconsistency and apparent inequity between HE providers in relation to academic accreditation.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 In order to take forward the development of the CT programme in Wales, building upon the impetus that has been achieved during the pilot, it is the view of this independent evaluation that the GTCW should consider and promote the recommendations that follow.

Implementation and Delivery

8.2 The **Welsh Assembly Government** should, as part of its current review of CPD and leadership programmes, consider a full implementation of the CT Programme in Wales on the basis that it has considerable potential for:

- Further developing the quality of teaching in schools.
- Providing a leadership role for expert teachers at school and local authority level.
- Supporting the School Effectiveness Framework and the Pedagogy Strategy.

Given the current uncertainty about the future of the CT programme in Wales, this recommendation should be considered with some urgency.

8.3 The **Welsh Assembly Government** should remit:

- The General Teaching Council for Wales to undertake the overall management of the programme, including its promotion with teachers, schools and local authorities, the Standards for CT and the award of CT status.
- The four local authority consortia in Wales, working in partnership with designated higher education institutions in their region, to undertake the delivery of the programme, including recruitment, the provision of modules and of support to teachers.

8.4 The **Welsh Assembly Government** should, working with the GTCW, local authority consortia and higher education institutions, take the lead in drawing up the agreed attributes of expert teachers that would form the essential criteria for the selection of teachers for the CT programme. These attributes should be founded upon the following characteristics of expert teachers:

- Excellence in classroom teaching.
- Leadership of colleagues in pedagogy and CPD.

- Work undertaken with agencies external to the school.

The Standards for Chartered Teacher

8.5 The General Teaching Council for Wales, working with the local authority consortia and higher education institutions, should undertake a revision of the existing Standards for CT in order to strengthen their fitness for purpose. This should be to provide both a diagnostic and formative tool for use in selecting teachers for the programme and the work they undertake as part of it and as a summative basis for the award of CT status.

8.6 The General Teaching Council for Wales, working with local authority consortia, will need to consider how teachers who achieved Chartered Teacher status should maintain that status over time through demonstrating their ongoing experience and achievement in relation to the characteristics set out in 8.4 above.

Academic Accreditation

8.7 The Welsh Assembly Government, as part of its current review of CPD and leadership programmes, in alignment with the School Effectiveness Framework and in order to encourage teachers in Wales to seek academic accreditation for their CPD activities, should consider establishing a National Framework for the academic accreditation of CPD in Wales. This framework should be developed through joint work with local authority consortia and higher education institutions. Thereafter all funding allocated to higher education institutions for CPD courses for teachers, through the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales, should be aligned to this framework. It is within such a context that the CT Programme in Wales could best be taken forward.

8.8 Local authority consortia and higher education institutions involved in the delivery of the CT programme should actively facilitate the achievement of academic accreditation by teacher participants. This should be achieved as a summative exercise at the end of the programme, simultaneous to the assessment of teachers against the standards for CT, aligned to the National Framework for CPD Accreditation proposed in 8.7 above. Thereby, the CT programme would simultaneously:

- Be for teachers who already have a Master's qualification (particularly on the Portfolio Route).
- Be for teachers who are already attempting to achieve Master's status.
- Assist teachers who were trying to gain Master's status, through allowing their work to gain accreditation.
- Not, however, lead automatically to a Master's degree and would not require teachers on the Programme Route, if they did not wish, to pursue such an option.

Thereby, the principle would be clear that the CT programme was based on professional standards that could be articulated and accredited against academic standards and not vice versa.

The Routes to Chartered Teacher

8.9 **The General Teaching Council for Wales** should continue to offer two routes to the achievement of CT status: a Portfolio Route and a Programme Route. Whilst, as in Scotland the availability of the portfolio route might be time-limited (to perhaps 2015), an opportunity should continue to exist thereafter for teachers to achieve CT status through a more flexible mechanism than the programme route.

8.10 **Local authority consortia**, working with the GTCW, should establish criteria that supported by a diagnostic assessment based upon the revised standards, determine the recruitment and allocation of teachers to the Portfolio or Programme Route. In essence these criteria should define:

- *The Portfolio Route* as being appropriate for those teachers who are able to demonstrate robust evidence of their expert teacher status, aligned with the characteristics set out in 8.4 above and who, thereby, should be able to assemble the evidence to be successfully assessed against the Standards for CT.
- *The Programme Route* as being appropriate for those teachers who, whilst they are able to demonstrate sufficient evidence of their aspiration to be regarded as of expert teacher status (for which they should be able to gain accreditation of prior learning for up to one-third of the route) are judged to be in need of the reinforcement and further development that the route would offer to enable them to be successfully assessed against the standards for CT status.

8.11 **The General Teaching Council for Wales** should, as part of the work it is currently undertaking on the re-design of the CT Programme, consider the possibility that the overall structure of the CT programme should be one of six modules. The different categories of core/optional/work-based modules should be dispensed with. The six modules should be:

- Self Evaluation and Reflection
- Research and Enquiry.
- Learning, Teaching and Assessment
- Education for All
- ICT Pedagogy
- Leading Pedagogy and CPD

This would allow on the Programme Route, two modules to be taken each year and CT status to be achieved in a maximum of 3 years through this route. This would meet the concerns of teachers on the pilot regarding the excessive workload involved if CT status took up to six years to achieve and the likelihood that this would deter appropriate teachers from applying. The modules should be conceived as being able to attract 30 academic credits through the proposed National CPD Framework. Those seeking APL (via the proposed National Framework for CPD accreditation) through the Programme Route would be able to do so by substituting up to two modules, not to include those on Self Evaluation and Reflection and Research and Enquiry, which should be regarded as compulsory. Teachers on the Portfolio Route should be required to pursue the module on Self Evaluation and Reflection prior to compiling their portfolio.

8.12 **Local authority consortia** in selecting teachers for the Portfolio Route should also take into account:

- The desirability of teachers already holding a Master's qualification as an indication of their high level CPD activity or having undertaken some other experience with a commensurate level of challenge.
- The undesirability of teachers taking any other form of professional qualification/ training simultaneously with following the route.

8.13 **Local authority consortia** should in relation to the use of the portfolio on the Portfolio Route:

- Use the characteristics of expert teachers, as set out in 8.4 above, as a framework for the three key experiences to be exemplified.

- Ensure that teachers place a strong emphasis on demonstrating outcomes linked to student achievement and school improvement.
- Limit the number of times that a single piece of evidence can be used to exemplify standards.

8.14 **Local authority consortia and their higher education partners** should provide advice to those undertaking the Portfolio Route in relation to the development of their portfolio and their reflective review.

8.15 **The General Teaching Council for Wales** should appoint Assessors for both the Portfolio and Programme routes to make summative judgements on whether teachers have met the Standards for CT. These assessors should be drawn from those who have been involved in delivering both routes and who should work together collaboratively to ensure consistency in the application of the standards. In order for the professional credibility and currency of the CT award to be demonstrated, a significant proportion of the Assessors should be outstanding practitioners themselves, including in due course, Chartered Teachers. A Chief Assessor should be appointed to monitor and calibrate standards overall. That person should be independent of the delivery of the CT programme in Wales.

8.16 **Local authority consortia and their higher education partners** should in relation to the organisation of the modules on the Programme Route should:

- Ensure that each module is available locally to avoid difficulties in access for teachers.
- That a variety of learning and teaching approaches are available across the modules.
- That the learning and teaching pedagogy deployed itself models the expert practice that teachers are being asked to exemplify and the examples of high quality that have been identified on the pilot programme.
- That the quality assurance of the delivery of modules is monitored across the consortia providers.
- That a strong and active partnership exists with the regional higher education institutions that they work with.
- That full ease of access is provided to HE library and other learning facilities.
- That within and across modules teachers are encouraged to collaborate and to form professional learning communities.

- 8.17 **Local authority consortia** should develop the role of school-based mentors/coaches so that all those teachers undertaking the CT programme, through either route, can be supported by an existing expert practitioner (in time a Chartered Teacher) from their own or a nearby school.

The Role and Status of Chartered Teachers

- 8.18 **The Welsh Assembly Government and its local authority partners** will need to give consideration as to the career and financial incentives that should be put in place if the role of CT is to develop in the way that has been proposed above and particularly in relation to improving teacher quality and student outcomes in schools. In this respect, the role of Advanced Skills Teachers appears to be a model worthy of consideration and adaptation. In Wales CT might be released from their teaching commitments for up to one-third of their time to work with colleagues in their own schools, through their local authorities with teachers and schools elsewhere in their area and via their local authority consortia with schools across their region. The potential for CT across Wales forming a discrete Professional Learning Community on which the Welsh Assembly Government could draw in taking forward education policies such as the School Effectiveness Framework also appears to have considerable potential. The emergence of such a system-wide role for CT can be seen to be salient with the findings of the policy and research review and the discussions with providers and Directors of Education undertaken as part of this evaluation.

- 8.19 **The Welsh Assembly Government** and its local authority partners, prior to remitting GTCW and the local authority consortia to take forward the CT Programme in Wales, should give consideration to the operational and funding issues associated with the training and deployment of CT in the way that has been proposed above. This consideration should include:

- The approximate number of CT who would be within the education system in Wales at any one time.
- Would it be expected that every secondary school would have at least one CT?
- Would it be expected that groups of primary schools would have access to a CT?
- What proportion of CT would be produced by the portfolio routes and the programme routes?
- If the Portfolio Route was time- limited to 2015, would the Programme Route, thereafter, be a way of topping up the number of CT within the system? As such the logistics of offering the modules,

given the likely numbers involved, would suggest that the local authority consortia would need to collaborate in providing regional/national delivery.

- How the CT programme was to be funded?

8.20 **The Welsh Assembly Government** should in due course commission evaluative research on the impact of CT on raising quality and standards in schools.

9. APPENDICES

9.1 The Standards for Chartered Teacher in Wales.

9.2 Details of Modules on the pilot of the Programme Route.

9.3 Template for the participant questionnaire used in the evaluation of the pilot of the Programme Route.

9.4 Revised Standards for Chartered Teacher in Scotland.

9.1 The Standards for Chartered Teacher in Wales

To be included

9.2 Details of modules on the pilot of the Programme Route.

Module title:	Talk for Thought
Provider	North East Wales Institute of Higher Education(NEWI) and Swansea Institute of Higher Education (SIHE) Two cohorts of 10 teacher participants will follow this pilot module, one based in the North and one in the South.
Duration	Start: Early October 2007 Finish: Late January 2008 Comprising a total of 150 learning hours
Target Teacher Participants	Relevant for: Middle leaders and / or Classroom teachers Primary, secondary, special, PRU
Delivery	Blended learning Delivered through medium of English. Option of mentor support, resources and assessment available through medium of Welsh if requested
HE credit on completion	20 credits at Level 6 (Graduate Diploma)
Summary	<p>This module has been developed in partnership by NEWI, SIHE and the Basic Skills Agency.</p> <p>The module will explore issues relating to speaking and listening in primary and secondary schools and will focus on the link between the development of oracy skills and pupil understanding. It will identify the difficulties pupils face in this area, and review the range of strategies available for increasing the status and impact of oracy through subject teaching and in whole school approaches.</p> <p>The aim is for those teachers who follow this module to support under attaining pupils in their own classrooms, and contribute to ways of refining / improving the strategies used by the school for promoting thinking and understanding through oracy.</p> <p>The module will be delivered over the equivalent of one term. It will require attendance at three full day sessions, a half day tutorial and completion of a module assignment. The teacher experience will comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent and directed study, including lectures, practical workshops and tutorial support; • Peer discussion, reflection and problem solving; • Trust groups; • Classroom observation, investigation, evaluation and research; • evaluation of impact on learners; • Critical reflection with group support; • Research report writing; • Enquiry based action carried out by teachers in two periods between sessions; • Applying ideas and theory in the day to day context of the classroom; • Modeling a variety of effective teaching strategies.

Module title:	Education for All
Provider	University of Wales Newport and collaborating LEA partners (Newport LEA and Torfaen LEA) One cohort of 10 teacher participants will follow this pilot module.
Duration	Start: Late January 2008 Finish: Late June 2008 Comprising a total of 150 learning hours
Target Teacher Participants	Relevant for: Middle leaders and / or Classroom teachers Primary, secondary, special, PRU
Delivery	Blended learning Delivered through medium of English. Option of mentor support and assessment available through medium of Welsh if requested
HE credit on completion	15 credits at Level 7 (Masters)
Summary	<p>This module will explore issues of equality, discrimination, social justice and inclusion. It will also consider positive responses to diversity within education, teaching and learning and look at the political, social and cultural contexts within which the education system operates in Wales and the UK.</p> <p>Throughout the module, the over-arching concept of inclusive education will be explored and developed.</p> <p>The module will be delivered over the equivalent of one semester. It will require attendance at an initial one day workshop, followed by a small number of further full day or half day taught sessions, negotiated with the teacher cohort and spread over the term, with sufficient time for reflection and planning of improvement. The module will be supplemented by three individual one hour tutorials or the equivalent by telephone or email. Assessment will involve the submission of a 4000 word assignment.</p> <p>The teacher experience will comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • directed and independent learning; • desk top and wider research approaches; • didactic approaches; • collaborative approaches; • use of MLE (My Learning Environment) and Welsh Assembly Government SEN e-learning resources; • working in partnership with schools, LEAs and others.

Module title:	Improving Practice through Action Research
Provider	University of Wales Institute Cardiff (UWIC) One cohort of 10 teacher participants will follow this pilot module.
Duration	Start: Mid January 2008 Finish: Late June 2008 Comprising a total of 150 learning hours
Target Teacher Participants	Relevant for: Middle leaders and / or Classroom teachers Primary, secondary, special, PRU
Delivery	Blended learning Delivered through medium of English. Option of assessment available through medium of Welsh if required
HE credit on completion	15 credits at Level 7 (Masters)
Summary	<p>The module will give teachers the knowledge and skills to engage in classroom / school based research in order to critically evaluate the impact of interventions in learning, so developing their critical and analytical abilities as reflective practitioners.</p> <p>By the end of the module, teacher participants will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have an understanding of a range of principles, methodologies and techniques in relation to action research; • be able to apply such principles, methodologies and techniques to a chosen aspect of their own pedagogy / leadership; • be able to analyse evidence gathered and to critically evaluate the impact or effectiveness of interventions on pupil learning and / or behaviours; • be able to critically reflect and make recommendations for future practice; • have an understanding of how to disseminate aspects of their research to colleagues. <p>The module will be delivered over the equivalent of one term. It will require attendance at three full day sessions. The module will be supplemented by two forty five minutes personal tutorials and supported by a virtual learning environment, using Blackboard. Assessment will involve the submission of a 3000 word report, together with an appendix of evidence (equivalent to 4500 words).</p> <p>The teacher experience will comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent and directed study, including lectures, practical workshops and tutorial support; • Peer seminars, poster presentations, discussions and critique; • On-line study, using Blackboard; • Classroom / school based investigations, evaluations and research; • Research report writing; • Tutorial support.

Module titles:	Self Evaluation and Reflection Learning, Teaching and Assessment
Provider	The School of Social Sciences, Cardiff University working in partnership with Blaenau Gwent LEA School Services. One cohort of a minimum of 10 teacher participants will follow the two pilot modules.
Duration	'Self Evaluation and Reflection' module, April 2008 - July 2008. 'Learning, Teaching and Assessment' module, October 2008 - December 2008. Comprising a total of 150 learning hours per module, including an intensive 3 day face-to-face programme for each module.
Target Teacher Participants	Relevant for: Middle leaders and / or Classroom teachers. Primary, secondary and special education settings.
Delivery	Delivery methods will include face-to-face sessions, workshop activities, experiential learning, individual coaching and guided research. The modules are to be delivered through the medium of English.
HE credit on completion	The modules will be accredited at level 7 (Master's level) and, taken together, will have a total combined value of 30 credits in the context of the Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales.
Summary	<p>'Self-Evaluation and Reflection'</p> <p>The purpose of this module is to encourage highly skilled practitioners to examine aspects of their own already developed practice and to identify areas of strength and areas for development. It will serve as a foundation for other core and optional modules. Indicatively, the areas to be addressed in the module will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exploring modules of self-evaluation in the context of the teachers' own professional values and practice; • Exploring mechanisms of critical reflection to aid the personal reflective process; • Promoting reflection on professional practice including inter-agency work to improve the experience of self and learners; • Demonstrating self evaluation and critical reflection as key components of personal and professional development. <p>'Learning, Teaching and Assessment'</p> <p>This module will enable highly skilled practitioners to examine their own pedagogy, and to further develop their expertise in learning, teaching and assessment. Indicatively, the areas to be addressed in the module will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exploring key ideas in learning, teaching and assessment; • Promoting and improving student learning: theory and research; • Promoting and improving student learning: critical reflection on classroom practice; • The purposes and principles of assessment; • Assessment for learning; • 'Listening' to and giving feedback to learners. <p>Module assessment</p> <p>Assessment of each module will comprise: literature review, data review and preparation of report. This assessment strategy will enable teachers on completion of the module to demonstrate that they meet the relevant Chartered Teacher standards.</p>

Module title:	Teaching, Learning and Assessment
Provider	ESIS & Swansea Metropolitan University
Duration	Start: September 2008. Finish: January 2009.
Target Participants	Relevant for: classroom teachers. Primary, secondary, special, PRU.
Delivery	Blended learning. It will require attendance at three full day sessions, one half day group seminar and one individual tutorial.
HE accreditation	20 credits at Level 6 (Graduate Diploma)
Summary	This module will explore the relationship between learning theories and current learning and teaching initiatives within the context of the participant's own professional practice and experience in primary and secondary schools. It will also consider the issues of assessment, particularly the philosophy, theory and practice of Assessment for Learning. The module will facilitate the identification of areas of the participant's practice suitable for development, identify, review and explore a range of strategies / interventions and relate them to practitioner's needs, and support the evaluation of the effect of the interventions implemented. This practitioner research will be underpinned by taught sessions focused on research methods.
Assessment	The module is assessed through two intersessional tasks: a. the investigation of a focus for practitioner research, and b. the subsequent data collection, these will inform the 4,000 word research report.

Module title:	The pedagogical application of ICT in learning and teaching
Provider	CELT at the University of Glamorgan & ESIS
Duration	Start: September 2008. Finish: January 2009.
Target Participants	Relevant for: classroom practitioners and middle leaders. Primary, secondary, special, PRU. Teachers must already possess some IT skills: use of internet; e-mail; MSOffice applications (at least Word and PowerPoint)
Delivery	Blended learning It will require two full days face-to-face, two half days group seminar, plus personal tutorials for each teacher. Teachers will also take part in online discussion forums with peers and e-moderators.
HE accreditation	20 credits at Level 7 (Master level)
Summary	The module aims to enable teachers to create and critically evaluate an effective online learning environment appropriate to the needs of their learners. Teachers will identify and reflect on a range of pedagogical approaches to online and blended learning. Teachers will develop knowledge of the latest research in online learning, understand the learner's needs and evaluate online resources.
Assessment	Assessment of the module will comprise; a portfolio of evidence and critical reflection.

Module title:	Leading the Learning
Provider	South West and Mid Wales Consortium (swamwac)
Duration	Start: January 2009. Finish: May 2009.
Target Participants	Relevant for: classroom practitioners and middle leaders. Primary, secondary, special, PRU.
Delivery	Blended learning. Delivered bilingually through the medium of English and Welsh It will require two/three days face-to-face delivery, plus a half day with school-based mentor.
HE accreditation	20 credits at Level 6 (Graduate Diploma)
Summary	<p>The purpose of this module is to provide participants for Chartered Teacher status with the opportunity to act as leaders of learning and improve an aspect of learning and teaching in their own school or setting.</p> <p>Initial sessions will use a range of learning approaches to enable candidates to consider theories of learning and leadership, and their impact on current approaches to the organisation and management of learning; and to consider action planning, practitioner research and change leadership in order to critically reflect on how these are used to enhance a school's vision for learning. This is linked to the key concepts of personalised learning and learning-centred leadership.</p> <p>Candidates will be supported in the development of a model of leading, mentoring or coaching applicable in their own school setting. Teachers are then supported in school as they plan and implement a small-scale 'Leading the Learning' project to develop an aspect of personalised learning within their own teaching or more widely across the school. Collaborative review workshops are designed to sustain the teachers through their projects and provide peer support and challenge.</p>
Assessment	The module is assessed through the submission of an evidence based leadership and learning file and a structured presentation with an element of peer assessment.

Module title:	Self Evaluation and Reflection & Professional Development Planning
Provider	South West and Mid Wales Consortium (swamwac) A partnership of the Local Authorities of Carmarthenshire, Ceredigion, Neath Port Talbot, Pembrokeshire, Powys and Swansea and Swansea Metropolitan University, Trinity College, Carmarthen. One cohort of 10 teachers.
Duration	Start: Mid February 2008. Finish: Mid June 2008.
Target Participants	Relevant for: classroom practitioners and middle leaders. Primary, secondary, special, PRU.
Delivery	Blended learning. Delivered bilingually through the medium of English and Welsh The module will be delivered over the equivalent of one term. It will require attendance at an evening followed by a full day session and two twilight sessions (4.30 – 7.30).
HE accreditation	20 credits at Level 6 (Graduate Diploma)
Summary	<p>The purpose of this module is to enable candidates to assess their current capabilities accurately against the National Chartered Teacher Standards and plan for further professional learning.</p> <p>The module will draw on a range of diagnostic tools and self-assessment processes to enable teacher participants to analyse their learning needs. This includes use of an on-line diagnostic instrument, a 360 degree process and self managed peer classroom observation and feedback.</p> <p>On completion of this module, teachers will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • apply the professional standards for Chartered Teacher to their own professional practice; • manage processes to collect feedback about their own teaching; • analyse their own teaching skills, capabilities and learning styles; • understand the key concepts of effective teaching, school leadership, personal effectiveness, emotional intelligence and self-directed adult learning; • engage in professional dialogue with others about their professional capabilities and contribution to school improvement; • collect, analyse and present evidence about their professional practice; • accurately assess their own professional capabilities and the development needs; • engage in critical reflection on their own professional values and the way in which these inform their daily practice and contribution to the life and work of the school; • initiate their own professional learning and development <p>The teacher experience will comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent and directed study, including lectures and tutor / mentor support; • Self managed peer classroom observation and feedback; • The design and conduct of a 360 degree feedback process; • Personal effectiveness profile and online learning styles analysis; • Self reflection on a critical incident related to professional values; • The collection and presentation of supporting evidence about professional practice; • Professional development planning
Assessment	Assessment will involve the completion of a leadership and learning profile (3000 words plus additional evidence) and a structured interview of 30 minutes.

9.3 Template for the Participant Questionnaire Used in the Evaluation of the Pilot of the Programme Route

1. Candidate Details

- 1.1 Name:
- 1.2 School:
- 1.3 English/Welsh medium school:
- 1.4 LEA:
- 1.5 Position held/responsibilities (including TLR allowance):
- 1.6 Module completed:

2. General

- 2.1 How did you first find out about the Chartered Teacher Programme?
- 2.2 Why did you decide to participate in the Chartered Teacher pilot?
- 2.3 If you were to complete the Chartered Teacher Programme what would be your ultimate career ambition in teaching?
- 2.4 What other significant qualifications/experience have you gained since you first qualified as a teacher?

3. Professional Knowledge and Understanding

- 3.1 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your professional knowledge and expertise?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.2 If your answer to 3.1 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 3.3 Did the module enable you to **develop** your professional knowledge and expertise?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.4 If your answer to 3.3 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge and expertise you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 3.5 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your knowledge and understanding of the learning needs and developmental attributes of the learners in your care?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.6 If your answer to 3.5 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.

- 3.7 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge and understanding of the learning needs and developmental attributes of learners in your care?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.8 If your answer to 3.7 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge and understanding you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 3.9 Did the module enable you to **exhibit and promote** your knowledge of effective learning and teaching strategies?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.10 If your answer to 3.9 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 3.11 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge of effective learning and teaching strategies?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.12 If your answer to 3.11 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 3.13 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your knowledge and understanding of effective leadership?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.14 If your answer to 3.13 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 3.15 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge and understanding of effective leadership?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.16 If your answer to 3.15 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge and understanding you gained and **how** that was achieved.
- 3.17 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your curriculum knowledge and promote its relevance to wider learning?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.18 If your answer to 3.17 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 3.19 Did the module enable you to **develop** your curriculum knowledge and its relevance to wider learning?
Yes No Don't Know

- 3.20 If your answer to 3.19 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 3.21 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your understanding of current developments in policy, research and practice and how they impact on learning and teaching?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.22 If your answer to 3.21 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 3.23 Did the module enable you to **develop** your understanding of current developments in policy, research and practice and how they impact on learning and teaching?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.24 If your answer to 3.28 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional understanding you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 3.25 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your knowledge and understanding of the principles and practices of equality, inclusion and anti-discrimination strategies?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.26 If your answer to 3.25 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 3.27 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge and understanding of the principles and practices of equality, inclusion and anti-discrimination strategies?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.28 If your answer to 3.27 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge and understanding you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 3.29 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your knowledge of effective assessment practices?
Yes No Don't Know
- 3.30 If your answer to 3.29 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 3.31 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge of effective assessment practices?
Yes No Don't Know

3.32 If your answer to 3.31 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.

3.33 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** a knowledge and understanding of professional responsibilities?
Yes No Don't Know

3.34 If your answer to 3.33 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.

3.35 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge and understanding of professional responsibilities?
Yes No Don't Know

3.36 If your answer to 3.35 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge and understanding you gained and **how** this was achieved.

4. Professional Skills in Practice

4.1 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** how you advise and assist colleagues in planning for effective teaching?
Yes No Don't Know

4.2 If your answer to 4.1 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.

4.3 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge of how best to advice and assist colleagues in planning for effective teaching?
Yes No Don't Know

4.4 If your answer to 4.3 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** that was achieved.

4.5 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** how you advise and assist colleagues in planning to use effective assessment strategies?
Yes No Don't Know

4.6 If your answer to 4.5 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.

4.7 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge of how to advise and assist colleagues in planning to use effective assessment strategies?
Yes No Don't Know

4.8 If your answer to 4.7 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.

- 4.9 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** how you advise and assist colleagues in planning to use effective reporting techniques?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.10 If your answer to 4.9 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 4.11 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge of how to advise and assist colleagues in planning to use effective reporting techniques?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.12 If your answer to 4.11 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 4.13 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** how you advise and assist colleagues in effectively using the outcomes of assessment?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.14 If your answer to 4.13 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 4.15 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge on how to advise and assist colleagues in effectively using the outcomes of assessment?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.16 If your answer to 4.15 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 4.17 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** how you communicate effectively with learners?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.18 If your answer to 4.17 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 4.19 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge on how to communicate effectively with learners?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.20 If your answer to 4.19 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 4.21 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** how you communicate effectively with parents/carers?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.22 If your answer to 4.21 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.

- 4.23 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge on how to communicate effectively with parents/carers?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.24 If your answer to 4.23 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 4.25 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your ability to participate in effective collaboration and team work with a range of colleagues?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.26 If your answer to 4.25 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 4.27 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge of effective collaboration and team work with a range of colleagues?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.28 If your answer to 4.27 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 4.29 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** how you assist colleagues in developing and using teaching strategies?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.30 If your answer to 4.29 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 4.31 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge of how to assist your colleagues in developing and using teaching strategies?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.32 If your answer to 4.31 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 4.33 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your use of a range of strategies to maximise student learning?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.34 If your answer to 4.33 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 4.35 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge of learning strategies?
Yes No Don't Know

- 4.36 If your answer to 4.35 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 4.37 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your ability to establish a positive classroom environment?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.38 If your answer to 4.37 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 4.39 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge on how to establish positive classroom environments?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.40 If your answer to 4.39 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge was gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 4.41 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** that you have a proactive approach to CPD?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.42 If your answer to 4.41 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 4.43 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge of the importance of CPD?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.44 If your answer to 4.43 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 4.45 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your ability to lead whole school initiatives?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.46 If your answer to 4.45 is yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 4.47 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge on how to lead whole school initiatives?
Yes No Don't Know
- 4.48 If your answer to 4.47 is yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 4.49 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your work with outside agencies and colleagues?

Yes No Don't Know

4.50 If your answer to 4.49 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.

4.51 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge of effective working with outside agencies and colleagues?

Yes No Don't Know

4.52 If your answer to 4.51 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge was gained and **how** this was achieved.

5. Professional Commitment

5.1 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your commitment to improving your own practice?

Yes No Don't Know

5.2 If your answer to 5.1 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.

5.3 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge on how to improve your own practice?

Yes No Don't Know

5.4 If your answer to 5.3 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.

5.5 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your commitment to improving the practice of your colleagues?

Yes No Don't Know

5.6 If your answer to 5.5 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.

5.7 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge on how best to improve the practice of your colleagues?

Yes No Don't Know

5.8 If your answer to 5.7 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.

5.9 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** how you develop and implement your school's vision?

Yes No Don't Know

5.10 If your answer to 5.9 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.

- 5.11 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge on how a school can successfully develop and implement its vision?
Yes No Don't Know
- 5.12 If your answer to 5.11 is yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 5.13 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your open attitude to change?
Yes No Don't Know
- 5.14 If your answer to 5.13 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 5.15 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge on change management?
Yes No Don't Know
- 5.16 If your answer to 5.15 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 5.17 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** your professional approach to learners, parents and the wider community to foster positive relationships?
Yes No Don't Know
- 5.18 If your answer to 5.17 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 5.19 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge of this area of professional practice?
Yes No Don't Know
- 5.20 If your answer to 5.19 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.
- 5.21 Did the module enable you to **demonstrate** professional core values as outlined in the standards for Chartered Teacher?
Yes No Don't Know
- 5.22 If your answer to 5.21 was yes, briefly describe **how** this was achieved.
- 5.23 Did the module enable you to **develop** your knowledge of these core values?
Yes No Don't Know
- 5.24 If your answer to 5.23 was yes, briefly describe **what** additional knowledge you gained and **how** this was achieved.

6. Overall

6.1 How would you rate the overall quality of the module:

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

6.2 List what you consider to have been the strengths of the module:

6.3 List what you consider to be areas where the module needs to be improved:

6.4 What did you feel about the method of delivery adopted for the module (i.e. in relation to it being an intensive 3 day experience/over a longer period etc)?

6.5 Do you think the module should be either a Core or an Option module within the Chartered Teacher Programme?

6.6 Do you feel that the module had the right blend of theory and practice?

6.7 Based on your experience do you think that the current model for Chartered Teacher in Wales is one that can be successfully implemented?
Yes No Don't Know

6.8 If your answer to 6.4 was yes, what improvements/changes do you think should be considered before the current model is implemented.

6.9 If your answer to 6.4 was no, what action do you think is needed.

9.4 Revised Standards for Chartered Teacher in Scotland

To be included

