

University of Leicester School of Education

An examination of the language and
interpretations of Standard One for Initial
Teacher Training in England - *Professional
Values and Practice*

Jenny Harrison

November 2005

University of Leicester
School of Education
21 University Road
Leicester LE1 7RF

Email: jkh4@le.ac.uk
Tel: (UK) 0116 252 3673

Abstract

This report focuses on data collated in one UK Higher Education Institute from all the end-of-year assessments of post-graduate student teachers over a three-year period (2002-5), together with interview data from a sample of student teachers and their school tutors /assessors. It provides an analysis of the school tutors' assessments of *Standard One, Professional Values and Practice* (DfES/TTA 2002), for whole cohorts of secondary student teachers across nine curriculum areas in each year, together with a scrutiny of the associated reporting commentary in cross-subject samples.

The analyses attempt to tease out trends in these teachers' interpretations of the set of sub-categories within this Standard area and to consider these in terms of three key questions:

- § How is the terminology of the Standard being defined and described?
- § How is the evidence for assessment selected and evaluated?
- § What are the interpretative frameworks?

Many of the tensions, clearly embedded in the wording of the Standard itself, are highlighted by differences in the way it is being assessed by teachers, and to some extent these tensions reveal themselves differently in different curriculum areas and in different schools.

While this Standard is almost universally welcomed as an important component of teacher education, its assessment remains elusive for many teachers, and the choice of criteria that might reflect different levels of teacher development remains challenging to both teachers and trainees alike. As a result the Standard is highly subject to personal interpretations of 'professionalism' and what this means in terms of schools' provision for teacher development in this area.

The report presents an emerging framework of teachers' virtues and personal attributes, professional skills and learning, and a set of professional behaviours, which might allow for institutional assessment procedures to take better account of both personal and professional development as well as professional competence. The place of critical reflection on practice is considered as a way of clarifying values and a further important recommendation is that it should become a central component of this Standard.

Contents

	Pages
I Background and Introduction	1 - 4
II Small-scale project - Method	5 - 7
III Data analyses and Discussion	8 - 28
1. Assessment Data	8 - 14
2. School tutors' and trainees' interpretations	14 - 28
IV Key Conclusions and Recommendations	29 - 33
V References	34 - 35

I Background and Introduction

There has been state control of entry into teaching in England and Wales since 1992 with the introduction of *Circular 9/92* (DES 1992) which formulated, regulated and licensed the mechanisms for those gaining qualified teacher status (QTS). In addition the professional preparation of new teachers has been increasingly devolved to schools so that trainees for secondary postgraduate initial training (regardless of the route) were required to spend two-thirds of the 36 week training year in school-based training. The list of competences associated with the *Circular* provided a framework for assessment of suitability for entry to teaching.

A central question for teacher educators remained: how to measure and demonstrate outcomes in teacher education. To demonstrate that teacher education is effective and adds value, such lists of competence assume that we have the answer to what the trainees need to know and what teacher learning should look like. Much has been written about the impact of the competence movement and how the foci on instrumental practices and knowledge may be masking the subtleties and complexities of personal challenges of school and classroom life for beginning teachers (see Darling-Hammond 1994; Wright and Bottery 1997; Cochran-Smith 2000, 2001).

By 1998 the competences of *Circular 9/92* were replaced by Standards for Qualified Teacher Status and a somewhat unwieldy National Curriculum for Initial Teacher Training was put in place (DfEE/TTA 1998). By 2002 with the presence of a new General Teaching Council in England (GTCE), a more streamlined set of Standards was introduced (DfES/TTA 2002) in which the first of the three, Standard One, Professional Values and Practice, made explicit reference to the new national Code of Professional Values and Practices (as agreed in 2002 by the GTCE). This move to embrace professional competence was widely welcomed since it began to acknowledge the complexities of teacher development and the Code of Practice provides a vehicle for future discussion and reflection on what professional competence might actually mean. Nevertheless all three Standards¹ remain the 'outcomes' expected of teacher education and the related training programme. Thus, inevitably, there is reductionism in terms of the evidence bases that can be drawn upon, and how any of the Standards might be assessed.

¹ From September 2002 the following Standards for initial teacher education were put in place for both primary and secondary teacher training courses in England:

SA1 Professional Values and Practice;
SA2 Knowledge and Understanding;
SA3 (1) Teaching - Planning, expectations and target setting; (2) Teaching - Monitoring and assessment; (3) Teaching and class management.

The accompanying *Handbook of Guidance 'Qualifying to Teach'* (TTA 2003) focuses particularly on assessment, in that

'Standards are outcome statements that indicate what trainee teachers need to know, understand and be able to do in order to achieve Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). The many different people involved in assessment - school-based tutors, class teachers, higher education tutors and the trainees themselves - need to develop a common understanding of what is involved in meeting the Standards. Assessment against the Standards is a matter of skilled professional judgement made a different times in contexts, and often draws on evidence from a range of sources collected over time' (ibid, p.5).

This focus on what beginning teachers can do, rather than what the new teacher *is* and can *become*, means the training focusses on methods and techniques, and assessment focusses on skills. Standard One *Professional Values and Practice* immediately raises important questions for trainers about:

What is a profession?

What are professional values?

How does a teacher become professional?

Professions generally recognise the social and moral contexts of their work. As the GTCE (2002) Code of Practice indicates, there has to be an awareness amongst teachers of the values dimension and the responsibilities of teaching. Thus new teachers need an awareness of the social setting of the school in which they teach, to have the flexibility to adapt to change, to be able to adapt teaching methods to new situations and, importantly, develop a capacity to challenge, where necessary, any new commitments given to them. Therefore one's personal values and qualities appropriate to the teaching profession (personal attributes) not only provide starting points in the training process but also need developing alongside increasing commitment to a range of professional values (and, in turn, professional practices). I refer to these as professional skills and attributes.

Halstead and Taylor (2000a) note two key assumptions that lie behind standards in professional values. One is that teachers see their role as one in which they influence the development of pupils' lives. The second is that pupils' values are 'influenced, consciously or otherwise, by the example set by teachers in their relationships, attitudes and teaching styles' (p.177). Bonnett (1996) notes that the teacher-pupil relationship lies at the heart of educational practice and that a strong sense of personal identity infuses the work of a good teacher (p.35). Professional values are therefore a complex set of beliefs considered positive and appropriate to hold, and include the actions by which those beliefs may be communicated to pupils.

The list of eight parts to Standard One has statutory force in England and, as expected, highlight many important personal and professional attributes, professional skills and professional behaviours (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Standard One. Professional Values and Practice
Those awarded Qualified Teacher Status must understand and uphold the professional code of the General Teaching Council for England by demonstrating all of the following:
1.1 They have high expectations of all pupils; respect their social, cultural, linguistic, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and are committed to raising their educational achievement.
1.2 They treat pupils consistently, with respect and consideration, and are concerned for their development as learners.
1.3 They demonstrate and promote the positive values, attitudes and behaviour that they expect from their pupils.
1.4 They can communicate sensitively and effectively with parents and carers, recognising their roles in pupils' learning, and their rights, responsibilities and interests in this.
1.5 They can contribute to, and share responsibly in, the corporate life of schools.
1.6 They understand the contribution that support staff and other professionals make to teaching and learning.
1.7 They are able to improve their own teaching, by evaluating it, learning from the effective practice of others and from evidence. They are motivated and able to take increasing responsibility for their own professional development.
1.8 They are aware of, and work within, the statutory frameworks relating to teachers' responsibilities.

However these statements are not explicit about teaching practices and they are not framed in terms of ethical values. The *Handbook of Guidance* (TTA 2003) does attempt to provide some further support for assessors and trainees in terms of the scope, suggestions and kinds of evidence that might be drawn on for each of the eight sub-sections of Standard One. Technically it might be possible, systematically, to assess competent professional practice in teaching within a values context, but the current Standards model does not provide for pre-determined goals including any expected attitudes and values and so the criteria for the achievement of Standard one are not easily identified.

There appear, at the time of writing, to be few or no published evaluations or other studies of how teachers and trainees are responding to the assessment of Standard One in England, or to the formative and summative assessment of professional values and practices more widely. The external consultant for the HEI under study had already conducted, as part of earlier course evaluation, an initial study (March 2003, unpublished) of the emerging grades in the first half of the first year of its introduction and raised some important questions for the Partnership Steering Committee to consider about teachers' interpretations in their first written reports.

The research that is described in this paper began with the posing of some broad strategic questions:

- § How is the terminology of the Standard being defined and described?
- § What are the interpretative frameworks?

The reporting and interview data were examined in order to answer three initial research questions:

- 1 What is evidence for assessment is selected and how is it evaluated by school tutors charged with the responsibility of assessing the trainees in their care?
- 2 What are the various interpretations of the sub-sections of Standard One made by the school tutors?
- 3 What are the interpretations and experiences of the trainees in the assessment of Standard One?

There follows a description of the small-scale project conducted in one HEI in England with departmental research funding between May and August 2005.

II Small scale project - method

Three research strategies used to collect the data for this exploratory, pilot study.

(1) Data sets from one HEI were assembled from the mid-year and end-of-year grades for Standard One, which are kept on record for all trainees, from three consecutive cohorts of trainees between 2002 and 2005. This allowed for some analysis of emerging patterns of gradings from the time of introduction of the new Standard One, *Professional Values and Practice*, and for exploration of similarities and differences in grading patterns within and across the nine subject groupings.

Trainees are placed in two partner schools in the training year, and receive a school report and grading for Standard One at the end of the first placement (Phase A) and a final report and grading at the end of the year (Phase B). At each school there are two school tutors with particular roles and responsibilities in relation to the trainee. The school subject tutor who has day-to-day contact with the trainee within the specialist subject area takes charge of the assembly of the assessment evidence for all three Standards and usually drafts out the report and assigns a provisional grade (on a five-point scale) for each Standard. A second co-ordinating school tutor who also has moderating role in the school for the assessment grades for all the trainees from that HEI, can contribute additional evidence of a trainee's work and progress in the school.

The five-point grading system and the grade descriptors for Standard One are described further in Figure 2. The allocation of grades Q, H and E represent equivalence to qualified teacher status (QTS) level for a trainee in that school context and for that particular stage of the training year. Teachers in the partner schools report that this requirement for mid- and end-of-year grading is not required by the other HEIs in the region with whom these schools work. These other institutions appear to give simply a Pass/Fail report at the end of the year. The reporting system at the target HEI has its rationale in providing developmental feedback, through the grades and commentaries at the mid and final stages of the year, allowing the trainee and school tutors to engage in individual action planning in order assist the trainee to progress to higher levels of achievement in each Standard.

Figure 2: The five-point grading system and the grade descriptors for Standard One

Grade	Level description
E (Exceptional)	Trainee has reached a good level of performance in all aspects of the sub-sections in the Standard, and an outstanding level in at least two sections.
H (High)	Trainee has reached the standard in all subsections expected of a beginning teacher, and in addition has shown a good level of performance in at least half the sub-sections of the Standard.
Q (QTS)	Trainee has reached all the sub-sections in the Standard to the level expected of a beginning teacher.
P (Potential QTS)	Trainee has reached most of the sub-sections in the Standard to at least QTS level but requires improvement in one or two sub-sections in order to reach the level of a beginning teacher.
L (Low)	Trainee has not reached the level of a beginning teacher in at least three of the sub-sections in the Standard and requires significant improvement in order to attain QTS level.

(2) A substantial sample of the written reporting documents for Standard One from each year (representing on average 19% of the cohorts in each of the years under study) were scrutinised in detail to examine the evidence base used for and judgements made under each of the sub-sections of the Standard (Figure 1). The reporting school tutors complete an electronic proforma and make comments in relation to each of the sub-sections. The resulting copies are easily accessed for analysis since they are lodged permanently in office files as part of general course procedures. The chosen sample of reports includes the Phase A and B reports for all trainees receiving the bottom two grades (L and P) in Phase A, and further samples of the higher Q/H/E grades for Phase B in each subject area where these were needed to complete the coverage of grades across all subject areas.

(3) One-to-one interviews were conducted in June 2005 with 13 school tutors and 6 trainees located in six partner schools. The schedule of open-ended interview questions that was put separately to school subject tutor, school co-ordinating tutor and one of the school's trainees, is given in Figure 3. Teachers in 30 of the Partner schools had received a letter inviting them to participate in these interviews. Selections were made from the offers to ensure there was representation by subject tutor and trainee across as many subject areas as possible and ensure that the school co-ordinating tutor was also involved. Matched trainees in these schools were then invited to participate in the interviews. Positive responses rates were high, indicating significant levels of interest by these teachers in Standard One and an ongoing commitment to participate in course

improvements. Seven of the nine subject areas (Maths, Science, English, English/Media, Citizenship, History and Geography) were represented by selected trainees and their subject tutors - there were however no responses from teachers in Social Sciences or Modern Foreign Languages.

The interview sample of teachers represented an approximate 10% sample of school tutors and covered different subject areas and different types and age-phase of partner schools, thus permitting some triangulation of the interview data within these schools.

Figure 3: Schedule of interview questions

1. How have you (as subject tutor / co-ordinating tutor / trainee) regarded Standard One?
2. What specific help have the trainees been given /received with Standard One
 - a) overall?
 - b) with regard to its component parts?and who provided this help?
3. How was Standard One assessed and graded?
4. (for trainees only)
 - What specific help did you receive with Standard One?
 - How were developmental targets identified and supported for Standard One?

III Data analyses and discussion

The data is discussed under the two main sections:

1. Assessment data

The proportions and patterns of trainees gaining particular grades in each of the three years remained remarkably similar year on year. Tables 1, 2 and 3 show the spread of grades L to E for each subject area and in each Phase for each of the three years under study.

Generally the proportion of trainees in Citizenship, Geography and Social Sciences gaining the higher grades in Phase A and B appears consistently higher year on year than in Science, Maths and Modern Languages. This first group of three subject areas represent, on average, 26% of the whole cohort for the three years under study. Table 4 presents the proportion of students gaining the top two grades at the end-of-course to illustrate the subject differences and the overall consistency of the emerging subject pattern over the three years.

Some of the larger variations to the emerging pattern for the Year 1 data (Maths, Social Sciences, Geography, English and English/Media) and for Year 2 data (History), might be accounted for by the newness of the Standard and the developing acquaintance by these teachers with its interpretation and assessment.

Table 1: Summary of evidence from 2002-03 Reports
Spread of grades L-E for each subject area and in each Phase of the course (N = 196)

Subject	L (%)	P (%)	Q (%)	H (%)	E (%)
Citizenship					
Phase A (n=14)	0	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	7 (50%)	3 (21%)
Phase B (n=14)	0	0	1 (7%)	11 (79%)	2 (14%)
English					
Phase A (n=31)	0	2 (6%)	15 (48%)	14 (45%)	0
Phase B (n=30)	0	0	7 (23%)	22 (71%)	1 (3%)
English /Media					
Phase A (n=16)	0	0	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	0
Phase B (n=16)	0	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	11 (69%)	3 (19%)
Maths					
Phase A (n=21)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	9 (43%)	9 (43%)	0
Phase B (n=21)	0	0	4 (19%)	13 (62%)	4 (19%)
Social Sciences					
Phase A (n=15)	0	0	9 (60%)	6 (40%)	0
Phase B (n=15)	0	0	9 (60%)	2 (13%)	4 (27%)
Geography					
Phase A (n=21)	0	1 (5%)	11 (52%)	7 (33%)	2 (10%)
Phase B (n=21)	0	0	10 (48%)	9 (43%)	2 (10%)
History					
Phase A (n=19)	0	2 (11%)	6 (32%)	11 (58%)	0
Phase B (n=19)	0	0	5 (26%)	11 (58%)	3 (5%)
Modern Languages					
Phase A (n=24)	0	3 (13%)	13 (54%)	7 (29%)	1 (4%)
Phase B (n=24)	0	0	12 (50%)	10 (48%)	2 (8%)
Sciences					
Phase A (n=35)	0	5 (14%)	18 (51%)	10 (29%)	2 (6%)
Phase B (n=35)	0	1 (3%)	12 (34%)	18 (51%)	4 (11%)

Table 2: Summary of evidence from 2003-04 Reports

Spread of grades L-E for each subject area and in each Phase of the course (N = 187)

Subject	L (%)	P (%)	Q (%)	H (%)	E (%)
Citizenship					
Phase A (n=16)	0	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	11 (69%)	3 (19%)
Phase B (n=16)	0	0	4 (25%)	10 (63%)	2 (13%)
English					
Phase A (n=30)	0	3 (10%)	13 (43%)	12 (40%)	2 (7%)
Phase B (n=30)	0	0	9 (30%)	15 (50%)	6 (20%)
English /Media					
Phase A (n=14)	0	0	7 (50%)	5 (36%)	2 (14%)
Phase B (n=14)	0	0	5 (36%)	7 (50%)	2 (14%)
Maths					
Phase A (n=19)	1 (5%)	4 (21%)	8 (42%)	6 (32%)	0
Phase B (n=19)	0	0	6 (32%)	12 (63%)	1 (5%)
Social Sciences					
Phase A (n=14)	0	0	5 (36%)	9 (64%)	0
Phase B (n=14)	0	0	1 (7%)	9 (64%)	4 (29%)
Geography					
Phase A (n=19)	0	0	6 (32%)	10 (53%)	3 (16%)
Phase B (n=19)	0	0	3 (16%)	12 (63%)	4 (21%)
History					
Phase A (n=20)	0	1 (5%)	9 (45%)	9 (45%)	1 (5%)
Phase B (n=20)	0	0	3 (15%)	14 (70%)	3 (15%)
Modern Languages					
Phase A (n=20)	0	6 (30%)	10 (50%)	4 (20%)	0
Phase B (n=20)	0	0	8 (40%)	10 (50%)	2 (10%)
Sciences					
Phase A (n=35)	1 (3%)	4(12%)	17 (50%)	11 (32%)	1 (3%)
Phase B (n=35)	0	0	13 (38%)	17 (50%)	4 (12%)

Table 3: Summary of evidence from 2004-05 Reports
Spread of grades L-E for each subject area and in each Phase of the course (N =183)

Subject	L (%)	P (%)	Q (%)	H (%)	E (%)
Citizenship					
Phase A (n=16)	0	0	4 (25%)	12 (70%)	0
Phase B (n=16)	0	0	2 (13%)	11 (69%)	3 (19%)
English					
Phase A (n=26)	0	4 (15%)	14 (54%)	7 (27%)	1 (4%)
Phase B (n=26)	0	0	6 (23%)	13 (50%)	7 (27%)
English /Media					
Phase A (n=18)	0	2 (11%)	8 (44%)	8 (44%)	0
Phase B (n=18)	0	1 (6%)	7 (39%)	8 (44%)	2 (11%)
Maths					
Phase A (n=20)	0	2 (10%)	8 (40%)	9 (45%)	1 (5%)
Phase B (n=20)	0	0	6 (30%)	12 (60%)	2 (10%)
Social Sciences					
Phase A (n=15)	0	2 (13%)	5 (33%)	6 (30%)	2 (13%)
Phase B (n=15)	0	0	3 (20%)	7 (47%)	5 (33%)
Geography					
Phase A (n=18)	0	1 (6%)	5 (33%)	9 (50%)	3 (20%)
Phase B (n=18)	0	0	3 (17%)	12 (67%)	3 (20%)
History					
Phase A (n=21)	0	1 (5%)	9 (43%)	6 (29%)	5 (24%)
Phase B (n=21)	0	0	8 (38%)	9 (43%)	4 (19%)
Modern Languages					
Phase A (n=18)	0	3 (17%)	10 (56%)	5 (28%)	0
Phase B (n=18)	0	1 (6%)	7 (39%)	8 (44%)	2 (11%)
Sciences					
Phase A (n=30)	0	9 (28%)	15 (47%)	5 (16%)	2 (6%)
Phase B (n=31)	0	0	10 (31%)	18 (56%)	2 (6%)

Table 4: Combining % trainees attaining grades H+E in the Phase B reports
 - to identify subject differences, and emerging patterns over 3 years

Subject area	% students gaining H/E grades 02-03	% students gaining H/E grades 03-04	% students gaining H/E grades 04-05
Citizenship	93 (1 st)	76 (4 th)	88 (1 st)
English/Media	88 (2 nd)	64 (7 th)	56 (8 th)
Maths	81 (3 rd)	68 (6 th)	70 (5 th)
English	74 (4 th)	70 (5 th)	77 (4 th)
History	63 (5 th)	85 (2 nd)	62 (6 th =)
Sciences	62 (6 th)	62 (8 th)	62 (6 th =)
Modern Languages	56 (7 th)	60 (9 th)	55 (9 th)
Geography	53 (8 th)	84 (3 rd)	87 (2 nd)
Social Sciences	40 (9 th)	93 (1 st)	80 (3 rd)

Interesting also is an examination of the percentage increases/decreases from Phase A to Phase B of trainees in different subject areas gaining the top two grades. Table 5 presents this analysis for further scrutiny. With just three exceptions in Year 3 (Maths, English and Social Sciences cohorts) and History (Year 2), Sciences, Maths and Modern Languages trainees show the largest increases in the percentage of trainees gaining the two highest grades; in other words the rate of development towards these highest grades in these particular cohorts was greatest. In all subjects areas with the exception of just two cohorts (Social Sciences Year 1; Citizenship Year 2) there was an increase in the proportion receiving the top two grades, indicating progression during the year in Standard One.

There may be a several explanations for the particular, and apparently lower, starting points for these Science, Maths and Modern Language trainees. A number of subject areas have been, and continue to be, designated 'shortage subjects' in terms of recruitment and retention to training and during the first five years of teaching. These areas are Science, Maths and Modern Languages. The high proportion of shortage subject trainees at this HEI (they represent 40% of the intake for these three years) means this is an important area for consideration of any underlying factors. The degree backgrounds of these shortage subject recruits tend to be more variable in terms of components of the degree subjects and lower overall in their degree classifications. In other words it might be argued that these trainees' starting points for Standard One might be lower in terms of professional subject knowledge and related attributes at the start of the year; that their time in school might

be more focussed on developing subject expertise and dealing with subject concerns in their teaching rather than on the wider professional issues in relation to the whole school.

Table 5: An examination of the increase /decrease from Phase A to B in proportions of trainees with H+E grades by subject, and trends over 3 years

Subject	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Citizenship	+28	-13	+17
English	+64	+ 48	+148
English /Media	+57	+28	+25
Geography	+23	+21	+24
History	+9	+70	+17
Maths	+88	+113	+43
Modern Languages	+94	+200	+96
Social Sciences	0	+45	+86
Sciences	+77	+77	+182

Age, maturity and other work experiences amongst recruits vary from year to year in any of the subject cohorts and so these factors alone cannot account for the consistency of the trends across the shortage subject areas in the three years. Year on year Science recruits a somewhat higher proportion of minority ethnic trainees and this factor might raise particular issues early in the year as these students settle into what might be unfamiliar school contexts. Similarly Modern Languages recruit a proportion of foreign European nationals year on year and again this factor might explain a 'settling in ' to an unfamiliar school context early in the year. Finally there might be particular training needs for the school tutors in these three subject areas in relation to the evidence that is being drawn upon, or where there might be a particularly high turnover of new teachers taking on the role of assessor. The interview data described in section 2 below attempts to shed more light on such predictions.

This particular training course has some very recent feedback from a first OFSTED inspection report on the new subject area of Citizenship (draft report, unpublished, August 2005). The report comments positively on 'the wide range of degree backgrounds for this group, which included graduates in International Relations, Geography, Politics, American Studies, Media and Film Studies, Public Policy and Management, Social Work, Social Ethics, Youth Studies, Psychology and Philosophy', and noted the high proportion of first class degrees. The report also notes that the many work and life experiences of these trainees applied to the teaching of Citizenship. Crucially too, the report confirms:

'In Partner schools trainees benefit from their involvement in a range of citizen-related activities such as collapsed days, field trips, mock elections, debating clubs, fund-raising activities and school council work. These activities contribute significantly to the trainees' professional development and the wider life of school.'

Thus the Citizenship curriculum area and the particular opportunities that its wider dimensions offer to trainees for engagement in whole school activities from the start indicate that the evidence base for their assessment in standard one is similar to that being drawn on for the other two standards. This is probably also the case for Social Sciences and some of the Humanities subject areas. It is less likely to be so in the shortage subjects for example. We can speculate that Citizenship trainees have increased access from the start of the year to provide the sort of evidence that might be considered worthy of the higher grades. Scrutiny of the details of the reporting documents will be considered in the next section to determine what is reported on in the subsections and to ascertain curriculum similarities and differences.

2. School tutors' and trainees' interpretations of the sections of the Standard

In this section analyses of reporting documents and interview data are discussed with reference to each sub-section of Standard One.

1.1 High expectations, respect and commitment

This standard area covers a singularly daunting list of items for trainees to meet. School tutors need to identify evidence of 'professional commitment to raising the educational achievement of all their pupils whatever their background or educational achievement' (TTA 2003, *Handbook of Guidance*, p. 7). Trainees need to 'know how to draw on their awareness and understanding of pupils' social, cultural, linguistic, religious and ethnic backgrounds to support learning and to teach in ways that engage and challenge pupils' (ibid, p. 7). The standard area actually identifies the very heart of educational practice and focusses particularly on trainees' personal and professional attitudes and professional relationships with pupils. The following extract from a report illustrates the school tutor's judgements and the range of evidence used:

Carol, English/Media, P grade for Standard One, (Phase A)

‘Carol has struggled to engage pupils and establish rapport with them (in order) to establish positive relationships in the classroom. As she has found difficulty in feeling confident in the learning environment (of the classroom), she has not been able to plan and deliver lessons in response to their abilities, personalities and backgrounds. She has attempted to treat pupils fairly and equally, and has a genuine commitment to raising educational achievement; unfortunately she has not yet developed enough sensitivity to social backgrounds and educational needs.’

This extract illustrates the difficulty for the assessor when definitions of competence go beyond skills to include knowledge, values and attitudes. Personal attributes clearly require considerable sensitivity in assessment - hence the ambiguity that emerges in part of this assessment. Also, the less that criteria are spelled out, the greater is the level of inference that is expected. Judgements need to be well informed and a range of indicators here might be called for. In relation to the needs of this particular trainee, Carol, some further targets need to be put in place. For example, in order to progress, she needs to demonstrate that she can find out about pupils’ backgrounds and use that knowledge positively (as the *Guidance* document suggests, p. 8). It is clearly difficult for the assessor to disentangle evidence that might show the trainee showing some ‘understanding (of social backgrounds) and a commitment to enabling pupils from all backgrounds to progress in learning’ (ibid, p.8). The standard area becomes less a specific achievement and more a dimension of performance in terms of which the trainee can perform at different levels. This raises important issues about reliability and validity in the assessment process as the next extract with its limited focus and descriptive commentary reflects:

Chris, Social Sciences, H grade

‘(Name of school) is a multi-cultural institution with policies and practices that promote diversity. Chris had throughout the placement shown respect for all the pupils.’

The commentary for another trainee, David, Science, also with an H grade, begins to get to the heart of some of the characteristics of a good teacher:

‘David constantly evaluated his work and methods of teaching. He also examined his own assumptions on ability and cognitive development (when) teaching mixed ability (classes) including very able pupils. He was very aware of the religious backgrounds of the pupils.’

One of the following two trainees was awarded a E grade overall, the other received a Q grade. There are many similarities in these two commentaries and it is difficult to appreciate which of the two trainees received the substantially higher grade overall, and why.

John, History

‘John has high expectations of all his pupils irrespective of their social, cultural, linguistic, religious and ethnic backgrounds. This has been demonstrated by John when acting as a (form /pastoral) tutor and subject specialist and he has shown sustained commitment to raising educational achievement.’

Simon, Science

‘Simon has high expectations of all pupils in all areas, regardless of their ability. He uses prior data to set challenging targets for each of his groups. He respects the views of his pupils and listens carefully to their opinions. He punishes those pupils who do not behave in an appropriate way. He is committed to his teaching role and this is evident in all he does. His written evaluations of issues are detailed and thorough.’

The particular meanings associated with the term ‘commitment’ mean it is a complex one to assess. The set of beliefs, values and traditions expected of a successful, or effective, or good professional are rarely articulated by those already in the profession. As one school tutor (History) said, in interview:

‘I’ve never really had any situation that I can remember where I’ve had to discuss professional values and practice with a trainee. I think you would only have that conversation if there was an issue (problem).’

It appears from all the data that it is generally assumed that caring for pupils is an activity for which no special skill is required; that there is no developmental sequence which takes account of the knowledge needed, of the amount and type of care and respect, or of the extent to which a new teacher takes his or her pupils seriously. Successful or effective teachers might be more easily recognised in terms of their delivery of the desired learning, or their knowledge of the nature of the subject and how they go about teaching it. The nature of the evidence base for identifying good teachers who are expected to have ‘a professional commitment to raising the educational achievement of all their pupils ...’ (*Guidance* p.7), clearly leaves the way wide open to a variety of interpretations as the reporting and interview data clearly show.

1.2 Consideration for pupils

To some extent the evidence base that is drawn upon is implicit in the reporting commentary as the following extract illustrates:

Andrew (Geography, E grade) 'has demonstrated a very high professional standard in dress, speech and conduct and this has earned him the respect of his classes. Colleagues are impressed by his standard of planning, preparation and teaching. A. has insisted on high standards of behaviour and respect (by pupils) for each other. He has shown a care and concern for all pupils' well-being.'

Since there is much overlap in the personality characteristics for standards areas 1.2 and 1.3, the HEI under study has, from the start, asked school tutors to assess and report on standard areas 1.2 and 1.3 together. It is probable that teachers' assessment of this standard area will draw on non-verbal aspects such as teachers' facial expressions and gestures, the confidence and trust they may inspire, the aura of friendliness and personal integrity that surrounds them, as well as the messages they convey through personal routines and other aspects of teaching styles they adopt. It appears as combination of professional behaviours as well as professional service through relationships (Downie 1990). The evidence base takes account of the impact the trainee has on the pupils since young people are likely to be most influenced by teachers whose qualities they admire: tolerance, fairness, acting in a reasonable manner, and a willingness to explain things (Hayes, 1993; Taylor 1996). A science school tutor articulated this clearly indicating her source of evidence (lesson observation), her feedback and her advice:

'Sometimes trainees don't get on very well with some pupils and they can be quite dismissive of those pupils, resulting in a quite a lot of antagonism between trainee and pupils. I try to watch out for that from the start; I monitor it when I do a lesson observation (of the trainee) ... I come up with alternative strategies for (the trainee) to deal with the situation and say, "You've got to be fair and consistent" '

1.3 Promoting positive values

Since the term 'values' can refer to 'the principles and fundamental convictions which act as general guides to behaviour, the standards by which particular actions are judged to be good or desirable' (Halstead and Taylor, 2000a, p.169), examples might include love, equality, justice and truth. It is closely aligned to character development and the development of attitudes and personal qualities (Halstead and Taylor 2000b)

It has been usefully suggested (Arthur, Davison and Lewis, 2005) that assessment of this standard area involves both evidence of (i) demonstration in oneself and, importantly, (ii) the explicit promotion (of positive values) in one's pupils.

The following extracts from the *Handbook of Guidance* (TTA 2003, p.10) can be placed under the headings for sources of evidence to highlight both aspects more clearly:

(i) demonstration in oneself (includes both personal attributes, and professional attributes and skills

'Can the trainee establish positive relationships with their pupils, particularly through positive communication?'

'Does their teaching communicate positive attitudes, values and behaviour, both explicitly and by example?'

Draw on, ' ... teachers' time in school when not teaching for evidence of their engagement with a school's values and respect for its ethos'

' ... value diversity'

(ii) explicit promotion in pupils (includes professional attributes and skills)

'Does their teaching ...promote positive attitudes,?'

'Do their lessons motivate pupils and encourage them to engage in learning?'

'Teachers' planning will be a source of evidence of how they aim to develop specific values, attitudes and behaviour ... '

'...build successful relationships with pupils'

'...interest, motivate pupils ... manage behaviour constructively... deal with bullying and harassment'.

Thus, there is indication in the *Guidance* of opportunities to assess personal attributes (coded 'a', in the examples below) as well as professional skills and attributes (coded 'b').

The *Guidance* also refers to using evidence such as 'time management and reliability' (p.11), both examples of professional behaviours (coded 'c' below). It is therefore a somewhat sticky mixture of what qualities a teacher brings to the job plus the sort of classroom climate that the teacher is able to create.

School tutors drew on a wide variety of evidence for their reporting documents. The following trainee (Tom, Geography) was graded Q for the whole Standard (he was probably a borderline P/Q based on the commentary for this sub-section alone); the insertions of a/b/c are those of the author to highlight the framework under discussion:

'Within departmental guidelines Tom has taken steps to treat pupils in a positive way (a/b). He has handled most individual cases with a low-key style that is often calm and encouraging (a/b). His relationships with pupils is usually positive (a/b). He has presented himself well (c). He has struggled to meet deadlines (c).'

The next trainee (Angie, English/Media) gained an E grade:

'Angie made a concerted effort to follow the school behaviour management system (b/c)... praised pupils wherever possible (a/b)... (gave) positive feedback in oral work and in writing when marking (work) (a/b)... encouraged positive behaviour through credit system displayed on the wall (b)... has made good use of classroom and corridors for display work to acknowledge good work (b)... took time (a) to generate a display following a museum visit for the school hall (b).'

In contrast James (Science, grade P for Phase A) the evidence base that is utilised is more limited:

'James has used the school behaviour management system (b/c) and is beginning to feel comfortable using sanctions with the support of other members of staff (b).'

With the help of a clearer framework for the different types of evidence based on the categories for development (a/b/c) the commentary with judgements made might have been made more detailed, broader and therefore more developmentally useful to the trainee.

1.4 Communication with parents and carers

This area is about the trainees' professional relations with parent; it has a knowledge component to do with knowing about the statutory educational rights of parents, for example, to information on their child's progress. It also seeks to assess trainee's level of understanding about the role of parents or other carers in children's development. The guidance makes it clear that meeting the standard does not require the trainee to take full part or have sole responsibility for a school's communication in this area; merely 'to explore the trainee's potential to communicate sensitively and effectively with parents ...' (p. 12). Evidence for this might be drawn from a variety of settings with other adults in order to gauge it.

Overall the reporting commentary was descriptive, indicating the trainee 'has sat in on a parents' evening', 'acted on letters received from parents', but without much clue as to

how successful or effective this involvement was. Where links were made to a wider pastoral role with both pupil and family, perhaps by taking on the role of a form tutor, the commentary became clearer in what was being achieved: e.g. 'played an important pastoral role, working alongside a tutor to build up the team spirit of the tutor group ... accompanied a field visit' (i.e. off site, *in loco parentis*); 'demonstrated a supportive and collaborative attitude to other people involved in the learning and support of pupils'. There was often much overlap in the type of evidence that could also be located under the standard areas 1.5 and 1.6 (see below).

1.5 Contributing to the school

This area is about the wider community and the school. It asks for involvement in the corporate life of the school and this begs an important question for assessment, 'What is the corporate life?' It could be something to do with the ethos, management, leadership, non-curricular parts of the school and its running, together with its extra-curricular activities. There are important links with standard area 1.3 and it raises crucial assessment issues in connection with the particular context of the school and, in turn, department in which the trainee is placed. It relies often on judgements based on what is seen and what is felt, and on what this school tutor might expect the trainee to be doing in the school or department. Trainees at this HEI are expected to be attached to a form or tutor group for experience of pastoral work. Not all assessors seem to refer to this involvement however.

Kevin (English, P/Q grades):

Phase A report: 'K has attended and been involved in Faculty, Year Group and full Staff meetings. In Phase B, K. will need to examine (consider?) contributions to extra-curricular activities and explore how they benefit the students and the life of the school.'

The implication here is the Kevin has not yet contributed to and hence participated in any extra-curricular activities, and that the attendance and involvement in the various meetings thus far is not enough for gaining a pass grade.

Phase B report: 'K. has made no attempt to contribute to the corporate life of the school, although he acknowledges its importance to the achievement of pupils.'

A final comment on his second report (Q/Q/Q grades gained for all three standards) says,

'K. has not found this placement at all easy, but he has shown determination and guts to keep going when others might have capitulated. He has earned my respect for this.'

In contrast, Alan (Maths, H grade) receives a list of bullet points of what he has done with some commentary about his successes:

- A. has worked effectively with the faculty and has attended some Maths meetings
- A. has regularly attended whole school briefings
- He has supported a Year 8 tutor group
- A. has taken opportunity to become a full member of the faculty and attended some meetings (some repetition here of the first bullet point)
- He has attended a Special Needs course within the school.

And Florence (Modern Languages, H grade):

'In addition to attendance at (all?) parents' evenings, F. has participated in school beyond the Languages classrooms. She has attended all relevant meetings and training sessions ... contributing to activities and discussions. She has even helped to train us in the use of the interactive whiteboard!'

The interview data from the sample trainees' interviews revealed that for them this particular area was fraught with dilemmas for their assessment: how to get involved, how much to get involved, how inclusive the department or school was, and how the trainees thought the Cotutors formed their judgements:

Iris (English, grades Q/H for Phases A/B), recognised that 'joining in' is an important part of this standard area but often trainees are left to interpret what this means in practice.

'It may be so embedded in what people talk to you about (it) anyway ... lots of what your school tutors talk to you about encompasses this section. I mean, I was certainly told, "We'd really welcome your input to evening meetings," ... Some people (trainees) saw that as a bit of a bind, really, having to do that. I saw it as an opportunity to pitch in, to show that I was interested and willing, but, you know, everyone has different priorities and there was no explicit advice about, well, "we'd like to see you come to every other meeting or ...". '

Tessa, (English, grades H/Q) reinforces these personal difficulties,

' I always find standard 1.5 extremely vague ... (does it refer to) just departmental meetings, because (if so) some schools seem to have more going on than others? ... I feel it (involvement) depends on all sorts of factors, but mostly, the levels of interest (shown by the trainee). I went to as many (meetings) as I could and found that was expected of me ... but then, in the Phase B school, I'd find there had been a meeting yesterday and nobody had actually told me! They'd (announce a meeting and) say, "Um, anyone can come along, even PGCE students (trainees). You know, it was just that 'even', just that little undertone, ...that perhaps we weren't as welcome as they tried to make out. It was very odd.'

Maggie (History, grades E/E) clarifies further the recognition by trainees of the importance of being pro-active and driving the agendas here. Standard 1.5 seems to have provided her with the appropriate stimulus:

'Sharing in the corporate life of the school, that's been something very much at the forefront of my mind on my placements ... you want to hit that standard several times through what you've got to offer the school. With that in mind, I initiated and ran my own art classes at lunchtime, exploring humanities through art ... it got so successful that it moved to (taking place) two or three times a week. I have taken part in Duke of Edinburgh Award schemes in my second placement - that made me much more willing to contribute to life in school. I was interviewed for my first job and they homed in on that, too. That was an important standard to them.'

Bea (Maths, grades Q/H) recognised that 'the types of things you did in school' contributed to the evidence on which judgements were made. Fortunately she received more specific guidance:

'There was trampolining on Monday lunchtimes so I'd help with that And there was a Careers' evening for Year 11, so I went along, though we didn't have to, specifically.... At the very start my school tutor said to me, "I won't nag you, but if I am going to write ... (something very positive) ... just turning up for, say, an after-school revision class with pupils, won't be enough (to meet this standard area) ... if you just turn up just twice and help, that's not enough ..."

The tension in knowing how to address this standard area for trainees from different curriculum areas was particularly noticeable for those trying to integrate in, for example, larger Science departments compared with much smaller Citizenship departments:

Dana (Science, grades Q/H)

'I found this one quite difficult to do. I think the evidence (for its assessment) came from my school file, from what my tutors observed of my attitude to the school .. yes, meetings and things like that ... The fact is you don't know all the details about what is going on in their department (but) you need to look as though you try and like you are paying attention. ... Also there was no coaching for this one, no model to follow there.'

Ivy (Citizenship, grades H/H)

'In my first school I set up a debating club, was part of the student council ...'

She also put great store on her professional presentation to the pupils and was confident to be able to articulate how she wishes to interpret this in her dress code:

'At the second school I wasn't sure it was a good idea that the teacher was able to wear jeans. To me that just didn't seem professional ... maybe that is coming from a law background, as well. I always wore a suit and vowed to maintain that (dress code) because I think it is important.'

From my experiences, there's not much guidance (with the Standard overall) ... you are just viewed in your dealings with others, and then a judgement is made of you; you are not given any guidance.'

Several of the interviewees reflected on the demands of their personal lives in preventing them from a fuller commitment to extracurricular activities and meetings.

Susan (Geography, grades E/E):

'There were a couple of meetings after school a week ... a couple of times I couldn't attend ... "3.30 pm, sorry I have got to go ...". I was submitting my thesis for my PhD that week. I didn't contribute any extra-curricular things for pupil groups and I think my school placed a great deal of emphasis on that. But I did other things, for example, within a couple of days (in the second school) I took over the form assembly .. I was giving up my lunchtimes for that, organising sports things and banners, nothing formal but, you know ... '

1.6 Working with others

This standard area covers many aspects of collaboration with others and teamwork. School tutors report extensively on the trainees' involvements at various levels with teaching assistants and support staff in the classroom, with departmental teaching colleagues, pastoral staff, and science technicians where applicable, but rarely, if ever, with staff in other working groups or administrative staff, including technical and library staff. It is possible to compile a very long list of other professionals with whom teachers and in turn trainees might work. Arthur et al (2005) suggest identifying four categories of personnel:

- School staff with whom the trainee has regular contact
- School staff with whom the trainee has occasional contact
- Visitors to the school
- Related personnel who work off-site.

Assessment of this standard area seemed generally to be in terms of a factual account of what has been done. Occasionally it created an opportunity to address a wider set of concerns:

Rachel (Science, P grade, Phase A)

'R. still needs to improve her liaison with support staff. I would suggest that more mutual planning is required... In order to do this R. needs to improve her organisation. Lesson plans were rarely planned far enough ahead for my liking. I have made certain allowances for R. due to extenuating circumstances in her personal life which have impinged on her time ...'

Rather than focussing on the professional skills for improvements in planning specifically when working with others, this school tutor chose to emphasize personal details here. A broader framework for assessment (see Figure 4) might have helped to widen both the outcomes that could be assessed and the opportunities for further professional development. We might expect this standard area to embrace the forming of professional relations with colleagues and cover, at the very minimum, the skills of collaboration and team work. The standard area also embraces the aptitudes, capabilities and dispositions necessary for collaborative working. There is to some extent a socialization process at work, but it also seems that these attributes are generally assumed in the reporting to be there intuitively. Trainees are provided with little or no developmental training as evidenced in the reporting documents.

Figure 4: Framework for assessment of each sub-section of Standard One

Category of evidence	Nature of evidence
a	Personal attributes (virtues) e.g. conscientious; truthful; calm; fair; thoughtful; listens actively; gives own time willingly
b	Professional skills and attributes e.g. forms positive relationships with pupils; encouraging of others; values diversity; team-player; able to collaborate; communicates with a range of audiences
c	Professional behaviours e.g. self-presentation (dress, manner, language); punctual, reliable; good time-keeping; marks pupils' work; keeps records (of pupils' absences); invigilates examinations; attends meetings

Using a structured list of personnel with whom the trainee might be working in that school context, might provide for the exploration of the purpose and function of each relationship, for questions asked of the status and position of the teacher in these relationships, and for discussion about the requisite range of skills and knowledge in particular relationships could then form a training agenda. Trainees need time to practise associated skills, e.g. active listening skills, self-presentation, and communicating with a range of audiences. This generic list of skills permeates standard areas 1.4 and 1.5 as well. Thus a focus on skills and scenarios for reporting on all three standard areas could prevent the assessment from merely cataloguing a range of incidental situations.

1.7 Commitment to professional development

Of all 13 school tutors interviewed, only one stressed the importance of reflective practice as part of the whole Standard:

'... (Standard One) is the most important standard simply because it underpins everything a teacher does ...it looks at the relationships the trainees make with both pupils and other members of the teaching team; it looks at the way they work; the way they consider what they are doing; the way they reflect on what they are doing and self-evaluation is the key to being a professional. I think that if the trainee reaches a good level in this standard, they are likely to be a model professional. ... I give it very high importance.'

This co-ordinating school tutor who runs a series of seminar sessions for the trainees in her school, assesses her trainees as follows:

'I base a lot of my judgement on what they do with me, but I can't separate that from how they are doing with their pupils in the classroom. ... you can't help making professional judgements when they are working here (in the seminars). ... I can see which ones have questions prepared, which ones take the lead; which ones are trying to take a lead with tasks and organising others. You get a sense of team work, co-operation, willingness to have a go, leadership qualities... you know, the lot.'

In trying to distinguish the sort of evidence she would seek for an overall H grade, she focuses a range of professional qualities which clearly encompass this area, 1.7:

'... (the trainee) has to show me that he or she really wants to learn how to do this job well; that he is using everything available to develop the skills of a teacher; listening to other teachers; observing others; making an analysis of what might have gone wrong; having an effect on others; helping other trainees. It's the ability to learn from what we are offering them ... it is the person who can go on a course and not forget about it three days later.'

Interestingly she herself illustrates this on-going capacity for critical reflection and ongoing self evaluation:

'... some of the articles and materials you (the HEI) use with the trainees - I get the trainees to copy them for me and I keep them for my own use ... I find (my) assessment tracking document quite helpful - I made my own - I would like to know how other school tutors tackle assessmentif it is very different elsewhere I would like to know because all you try to do is make it work in the context of your own school. There isn't much opportunity to find out what is happening elsewhere, which is why, I guess, you are doing this (survey).'

Other co-ordinating tutors stressed the importance of the whole standard in terms of its acknowledgement of the importance of team work and of communication with others. Only one felt it was 'a bit artificial' and thought it a 'bit too woolly to be very meaningful'. He felt very unclear about how to assess area 1.7.

The wide and international use of the term 'reflective practice' means it is in danger of becoming an overused and meaningless phrase (refs ...). Often it becomes simply part of the language of the training institution. Importantly however it is a concept which is rooted in the educative processes rather than the training processes of new teachers (Bhatia 1995, p.4) as the extract above has illustrated. We should be acknowledging fully in Standard One

that new teacher development is individual, non-linear and complex. Reflective practice involves problem setting and problem solving, and involves a set of analytical skills and attitudes towards reflective practice that might be evidenced in increased self awareness and self determination. Cite authors ...

There is a strong link between 1.7 and Standard 3 in which planning and evaluation of lessons plays a part. Since critical reflective practice generally requires other people to bring about accurate self-appraisal by the trainee together with realistic target setting, the reporting school tutors might draw more substantially from the trainees' responses to any structured feedback (verbal or written) from expert teachers based on observations or other tasks.

1.8 Working within the law

As with 1.4 the reporting evidence was almost entirely descriptive, with comments such as:

' ... has attended staff meetings where elements of the statutory framework have been discussed'

' ... has accompanied two off-site visits and is aware that risk assessments are required'

' ... is aware of the statutory frameworks .. has collated information on ... while carrying out the role of form tutor, she now has knowledge of the form tutor role within the statutory framework.'

'has studied all the pertinent documentation; ...understands the general principles of ..'

On occasions this section was left blank by the reporting tutor. Tutors seem to be grappling with what might be required here. Very few reported on the trainee's overall level of attendance, punctuality and reliability in relation to a teacher's roles and responsibilities, or to the teacher's role *in loco parentis*,

The proposed framework in Figure 4 might help tutors here in differentiating the range and types of evidence that might be drawn on - particularly for component c of the framework. There are both statutory and non-statutory requirements on a teacher. Most reporting statements referred indirectly to Acts of Parliament and Statutory Orders from the Secretary of State for Education, such as trainees' compliance with the national curriculum, or the GTCE Code of Practice (which is backed by legislation). Rather fewer report on aspects such as how much trainees showing an awareness of the contracts of

employment or how they demonstrate behaviours in relation to these. There is a great deal of non-statutory obligation that the trainee might be able to demonstrate knowledge and awareness of too: for example, the requirements on schools and teachers for recording pupils absences, invigilating examinations and minuting meetings; the circumstances in which Head teacher have discretionary authority in school life, or the work of the school's Governing Body to put in place school policies; Government recommendations to be followed in the daily life of the teacher in a department, e.g. for marking pupils work, and how this is reflected in departmental policy and protocols. Such professional behaviours are often learnt by a process of osmosis. They also require a critical eye and more developmental reporting could assist with this.

One of the trainees noted in her interview:

'I think that (1.8) needs to be expanded a bit ... I've had conversations with other peers on 1.8 ... one male student was in a position of giving a group teaching session after school .. it ended up as an all-girl group and he felt kind of uncomfortable with that. I can appreciate how he felt. .. he was very committed to doing the teaching and these pupils were very appreciative too ... but for male teachers, it is a bit of minefield out there ...'

'Some teachers I know would never touch a pupil, ever, under any circumstances. Well, I am quite a tactile sort of person and I found that I was patting pupils on the shoulder, you know ... I was more more aware of this in my (multi-cultural) school - a pupil reacted quite strongly when I tapped him on the shoulder. You know, I had invaded his personal space. That would have been very helpful to know (think) about (beforehand).'

IV Key Conclusions and Recommendations

(1) Standard One presents multiple challenges for its assessment by school tutors.

The relative subjectivity of the present assessment process for Standard One is widely acknowledged by the majority of teachers and trainees in this survey. Most teachers indicated that they relied on their professional expertise to make the overall grade. Little moderation of allocation of grades took place within the six schools in this survey - only one had a clear system in place.

This survey has highlighted difficulties that appear to centre largely on the choice and range of evidence. The content of the assessment commentary is mostly on a description of the trainee's achievement with a consequent lack of judgement by the reporting teachers on how much or how well the expected outcomes have been met.

All the trainees were very unclear how their assessments for Standard One had been conducted, and about the evidence base used. Several voiced their concerns about and perceptions of inequities in, and between, departments in the same school, and across schools. They also acknowledged the challenges that the assessment of this area presented to their school tutors.

All teachers interviewed indicated that they had not attempted to apply a grade system to individual areas within the standard, which might have allowed them to assemble a particular overall grade based on the majority grades given to the sub-sections. There is skewed grading towards the top end of the grading scale across the training year in all subject areas, and this appears most marked in some of the non-shortage subjects. There is some evidence in this survey to suggest that the allocations of grades are most unreliable for the two highest grades. Particular school contexts also seem play a part in the final allocation of grades indicating the the variations placed on different aspects of professional competence in different settings.

It would appear that an exposure to a 'values-led' curriculum (both in schools and in the training) in some subject areas enhances the opportunities for these trainees to engage with the sort of evidence bases that are required for assessment of Standard One. Darling-Hammond et al (1999) poses a series of questions for addressing how outcomes for teaching and teacher education are constructed, and the grounds upon which they are decided which would be helpful here for Standard One. What counts as evidence? What are the criteria? Who decides?

More research is now needed to consider in depth what school tutors in different subject areas and in different types of school might expect of a 'not yet proficient', 'just proficient', 'very proficient' or 'expert' beginning teacher in relation to Standard One, and its sub-sections. As well as ability-based performance assessment, some assessment of performance understanding is also needed. This would allow the tutor's assessment to reflect how well a trainee knows or uses reasoning or problem-solving or carries out communication. Schallock and Imig (2000) ask us to consider an important distinction: whether we are looking for accomplished teachers or teachers who can accomplish some (particular) thing? As the survey in this paper shows, narrow views of teaching concerned only with measuring outputs do not assist with the overall assessment of Standard One, only with a few of its constituent parts.

A framework that could begin to dissociate the types of evidence that might illustrate person-related performance and task-related performance could provide a useful starting point for assessors. In Figure 5, the statements within Standard One have been, in part, dissociated, in order to draw attention to the mixture of task-related and person-related items. Thus trainees might thus be judged in relation to a broader range of evidence for different areas in relation to both columns. Hoyle and John (1995) identify the qualities of a teacher as someone who is tolerant, patient, gentle, sympathetic, socially conscious and responsible. How are professional judgements made on these qualities and how consistent are teachers in their assessment of performance in relation to each of these? These particular personal attributes are 'virtues' rather than skills. How are they judged in relation to each school?

Perhaps a trainee might need to demonstrate a selection of professional values which are rooted in good interpersonal relationships and can be shown in different types of actions. This would provide a way of cutting across some of the commonalities, I noted earlier, are embedded in standard areas 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6. Some curriculum areas have more direct bearing on values than others; some trainees are more emotionally mature than others, and so subject tutors will need to point the way to others more clearly by posing questions for discussion. For example, these and similar questions might be put to individuals in discussion, or addressed indirectly through scenario-based learning:

- Are you an adequate role model?
- Are you patient with pupils?
- Are you selfish or generous with your time?
- How do you behave with other teachers?

To put in place more reliable forms of assessment, HEIs might need to distinguish better between competence as a specific achievement (that may imply the minimum or threshold level necessary to perform the particular activity) and competence as a dimension of performance in terms of which one can perform at different levels. Standard One would benefit from being rewritten to distinguish more clearly between these two dimensions, and to introduce the notion of levelness for the second dimension to assist a developmental grading process. A range of indicators that help describe the context for a particular performance would be helpful for this.

Figure 5: A dissociation of the task-related and person-related items within Standard One)

Person-related; to what extent can the trainee demonstrate that they ...	Task(i.e. <u>outcome</u>)-related; to what extent can the trainee demonstrate that they ...
1.1 ... respect their (pupils') social, cultural, linguistic, religious and ethnic backgrounds ...are committed to raising educational achievement.	1.1 ... have high expectations of all pupils; ..
1.2 ... are concerned for their (pupils') development as learners.	1.2 ... treat pupils consistently, with respect and consideration, ...
1.3 ...	1.3 ...demonstrate and promote positive values, attitudes and behaviour that they expect from their pupils.
1.4 ... recognise their roles in pupils' learning, and their rights, responsibilities and interests in this	1.4 ... can communicate sensitively and effectively with parents and carers
1.5 ...	1.5 ... can contribute to, and share responsibility in, the corporate life of the school
1.6 ...	1.6 ... understand the contribution that support staff and other professionals make to teaching and learning
1.7 ... are motivated ...	1.7 ... are able to improve their own teaching, by evaluating it, learning from the practice of others and from evidence. ... are able to take increasing responsibility for their own professional development
1.8	1.8 ... are aware of, and work within, the statutory frameworks relating to teachers' responsibilities.

A more sophisticated three-way assessment framework might be built up along the lines of the one used in some of the analyses of the reporting documents (Figure 4). To summarise, for the sub-sections of Standard One, one domain might incorporate assessment evidence in relation to (a) personal attributes (virtues); a second domain would incorporate evidence in relation to professional skills and attributes (b). Helsby (1996) distinguished between 'being a professional' and 'behaving professionally'. The latter involves a range of personal virtues (a) such as, having patience, having trust, being inspiring, as well as, what I would refer to, a raft of 'professional behaviours' (c) (i.e. being a clear role model, being punctual, having high standards of personal conduct).

(2) Issues of formative assessment

This survey has identified a wide lack of developmental targets in relation to Standard One. When asked what they now needed to do to perform at the next level up in Standard One, none of the trainees interviewed provided a clear statement. Most admitted to having little or no idea.

I have noted already that personal attributes need considerable sensitivity to assess. Further, personal attributes and the associated professional values probably need a three-stage developmental sequence to support trainee's development :

I. Recognition → II. Acquisition → III. Practice/Improvement

The GTCE Code of Practice could, itself, form a useful discussion document in training. It is not a Code of Conduct, and so discussion could explore what a code of conduct might be in that particular school, that department and for that new teacher. In other words, how are aspects of the Code being interpreted by the trainee? It would provide an opportunity to reflect on what it means, for example, to be ethical in one's teaching. As it stands, as I have noted in my Introduction, the norms and expectations of the Code (and, in turn, Standard One) are ambiguous; their obligations unclear.

(3) Issues for school tutor training

I conclude that Standard area 1.7 is of central importance in Standard One for a number of reasons. The survey has flagged up the lack of focussed training for these new entrants on aspects of socialisation into the profession and the acquisition of professional values. Thus the values dimension must become a focus for reflective practice in order to avoid reflection only on the technicalities of the job.

The whole point of specifying 'outcomes' is to promote learning (Jessup 1991), rather than bring about compliance. Critical reflection on practice allows the route to proficiency to be negotiated and for staged help and support to be put in place during the journey. Standard 1.7 is actually a form of practical problem-solving; it is rooted in reviewing and improving personal performance (Schon 1983, 1987), and builds on Dewey's (1933) belief that reflectivity and problem-solving are intrinsic to learning and action. Thus the school tutor, acting as coach, tutor or trainer, is on hand to accelerate this process. An underlying assumption here is that the *performance* is the focus of attention and mentors act within the parameters of their particular school.

This problem-solving approach provides a somewhat restricted view of performance however. Professional and educational values are intrinsic to what teachers do -teachers do what is right as well as what is technically correct or acceptable. Values influence how priorities for future actions are determined. Values are used for actually posing problems in the first place. Thus reflection on practice involves accepted professional values but, since school ethos is variable, individual schools (and, in turn, their mentors) cannot be used for conveying accepted core professional values to trainees. Carr and Kemmis 1996 refer to praxis as 'wise and prudent practical judgement'. It is therefore the reflection that provides the way for clarifying the values that lie at the heart of successful practice.

Standard One therefore provides considerable opportunities for reflective practice and self-evaluation to be given greater prominence by school tutors. As O'Brien and Christie (2005) argue for a more extended model of mentoring in Scotland,

'Using mentor training to identify and challenge teachers' core belief about values and practices associated with teaching could raise awareness of the nature and purpose of socialization and allow it to take place at a more conscious level.' (p.201)

this would provide an opportunity - a way forward - and start to disturb the flattening of the complexity in professional education (Furlong 2005).

V References

- Arthur, J., Davison, J. and Lewis, M. (2005) *Professional Values and Practice. Achieving the Standards for QTS* Abingdon, RoutledgeFalmer
- Bhatia, V. (1995) *Analysing Genre: Language use in professional settings* London, Routledge
- Bonnett, M. (1996) 'New era values and the teacher-pupil relationship as a form of the poetic', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 44, 1, 27-41
- Carr, W. and Kemmis S. (1986) *Becoming Critical. Education, Knowledge and Action Research* Lewes, Falmer
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2000) 'The future of teacher education: framing the questions that matter', *Teaching Education*, 11, 1 13-24
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2001) 'The outcomes question in teacher education', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 5, 527-546
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1994) *Professional Development Schools: Schools for developing a profession*, New York, Teachers College Press
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. and Klein, S. (1999) *A Licence to Teach: Raising standards for teaching*, San Francisco, Jossey Bass
- Dewey, J. (1933) *How We Think: a restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process* London, D.C. Heath
- Downie, R.S. (1990) 'Profession and professionalism', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 25, 2, 147-159
- DES (1992) *Initial Teacher Training (Secondary Phase) (Circular 9/92)* London, DES
- DfEE/TTA (1998) *Requirements for Courses of Initial Teacher Training; Teaching: High Status, High Standards (Circular 4/98)* London, HMSO
- DfES/TTA (2002) *Standards for the Award of Qualified Teacher Status*. London, HMSO
- Furlong, J. (2005) 'New Labour and teacher education: the end of an era', *Oxford Review of Education*, 31, 1, 119-134
- General Teaching Council for England (GTCE) (2002) *Code of Professional Values and Practices for Teachers* London, GTCE
- Halstead, J.M. and Taylor, M.J. (2000a) 'Learning and teaching about values: A review of recent research', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30, 2, 169-202
- Halstead, J.M. and Taylor, M.J. (2000b) *The development of values, attitudes and personal qualities: A review of recent research* Slough, NFER
- Hayes, D. (1993) 'The good, the bad, the ugly and the memorable: A retrospective view of teacher-pupils relationships', *Education 3-13*, 21, 53-59
- Helsby, G. (1996) 'Defining and developing professionalism in English secondary schools', *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 22, 2, 135-148
- Hoyle, E. and John, P.D. (1995) *Professional Knowledge and Professional Practice*, London, Cassell

- Jessup, Q. (1991) *Outcomes: NVQs and the emerging model of education and training*, Lewes, Falmer Press
- O'Brien, J. and Christie, F. (2005) 'Characteristics of support for beginning teachers: evidence from the new Teacher Induction Scheme in Scotland', *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 13, 2, 189-203
- Schalock, D. and Imag, D. (2000) *Shulman's union of insufficiencies. New dimensions of accountability for teachers and teacher educators* Washington DC, American Association of colleges for Teacher Education
- Schon, D. (1983) *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action* New York, Basic Books
- Schon, D. (1987) *Enhancing the reflective practitioner* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass
- Taylor, M.J. (1996) 'Voicing their values: Pupils' moral and cultural experience', in: J.M. HALSTEAD & M.J. TAYLOR (Eds) *Values in Education and Education in Values* London, Falmer Press
- TTA (2003) *Handbook of Guidance* London, TTA
- Wright and Bottery (1997) 'Perceptions of professionalism by the mentors of student teachers', *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 23, 3, 235-252

The School provides high quality training in research methods, and organises regular research seminars with external and internal speakers, including post-graduate students. Our active involvement in research nationally and internationally, enables staff to provide expert supervision in a wide range of areas, and our community of international research students and tutors provides a stimulating intellectual environment, in a multicultural city. Private loan companies usually require the education provider to have a 'Federal School Code': the University of Leicester's code is G22291. Studyportals Tip: Students can search online for independent or external scholarships that can help fund their studies. Check the scholarships to see whether you are eligible to apply.