



A new, member-driven College of Teaching

A Blueprint

Appendix B: Consultation responses: Written submissions

February 2014



Contents

Association for Achievement and Improvement through Assessment (AAIA)	02
Anonymous	07
Association of Colleges (AoC)	11
Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL)	15
The Association for Science Education (ASE)	22
Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)	25
Association of Teachers of Mathematics (ATM)	32
Anthony Barlow	34
Bethnal Green Academy	39
Geographical Association (GA)	42
Adrian Hilton	45
Institute for Learning (IfL)	51
Dr Lawrence Ingvarson, BSc (UWA), MA (Lond.) PhD (Monash)	61
Peter Mattock	67
National Association of Headteachers (NAHT)	71
National Association for Primary Education (NAPE)	77
The National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers (NASUWT)	80
National Education Trust (NET)	97
The National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)	100
National Union of Teachers (NUT)	103
Toby Osborne	116
Pearson	119
The Policy Consortium	125
Royal Geographical Society	128
Teacher Development Trust	132
Teach First	136
Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET)	143
University of Roehampton	150
Voice: the Union for Education Professionals	156
Dr Raphael Wilkins	161

Association for Achievement and Improvement through Assessment (AAIA)

For almost 25 years, the Association for Achievement and Improvement through Assessment (AAIA) has been promoting and supporting the learning of students of all ages through the use of principled and effective assessment. A voluntary, non-profit-making organisation, it works at national, regional and local levels to influence policy and practice and has become one of the leading organisations in the field of educational assessment. Its membership encompasses teachers and their leaders in schools and colleges, LA staff, independent consultants, lecturers and researchers. Regional groups form the heart of the organisation, providing a valuable structure for supporting members by networking and sharing information through meetings and email contact. AAIA is represented on the board and members' committee of the Council for Subject Associations (CfSA) and maintains a productive dialogue with Ofqual, Ofsted and the DfE, thereby championing assessment that is specifically designed to promote learning and empower students to become lifelong learners.

Consultation on the proposals for a Royal College of Teaching – response from the Association for Achievement and Improvement through Assessment (AAIA)

Q1 Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

Yes. Independent representation for teachers in terms of the standards, values, status, pedagogy, professional integrity and collective purpose that they espouse is long overdue. As many of the contributors to the booklet '*Towards A Royal College of Teaching*' point out or allude to, the impetus and drive for a Royal College must come from the profession itself; no top down and/or politically initiated construct will succeed. That path has been trodden and found to lead nowhere.

The teaching unions exist to protect and speak on behalf of their members. However, they a varied clutch of organisations, presenting no single, concerted voice that commands respect, instils confidence and reclaims the status that has seeped out of, arguably, the most important profession over the years. We cannot continue to lament the past or consider enviously the standing within society that teacher colleagues in Europe and other parts of the world enjoy. If ever there was a time when a body such as the proposed member driven Royal College of Teaching was needed, it is now, when so much is at stake.

Q2 Do you agree with this Vision? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

The Vision articulates the raison d'être of the RCT and though it is not yet a reality, a modicum of diffidence appears to detract from the aspirational nature of the rest of the text. We would suggest that the second half of line 7 read '*It is envisaged that the College, in doing its job fully and effectively, would encourage teachers nationally to become members ...etc.*'

The deep sense of "moral and intellectual purpose" of which the Vision speaks seems to lie at the heart of the concept of the College. Without this being rooted and grounded in its development and ethos and communicated unequivocally, there is a danger that it will be misunderstood and, potentially, mistrusted by those it seeks to support. How the RCT is 'marketed' is as important as ensuring that this is done.

Q3 Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

Absolutely! As the Vision text states, standards and values need to be defined and exemplified by the profession and based on evidence from authoritative, reputable research. For too long now the control of what teachers do and how they do it has been unduly and negatively influenced by selected aspects of unproven, discredited or out of date 'research' which has been used in support of political interference. A RCT needs to aim to regain the moral high ground and speak with an 'authoritative voice' for what members consider is proven to work for the benefit of learners and teachers alike.

Q4 Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

The sentiment underlying this question is both the strength and, regrettably, the potential Achilles Heel of the RCT. To coerce or make membership obligatory renders the organisation suspect in the eyes of those who must join. It requires little imagination to anticipate the reaction of teachers to being railroaded into membership and even less to envisage the difficulties that would have to be surmounted in order to secure their support. To enter into voluntary membership means an informed choice has been made by

individuals to belong to a body that they are convinced has much to offer them and which they are prepared to support with their subscription.

Conversely, the RCT needs to persuade a significant number of teachers to subscribe and to keep their membership live over time to survive and prosper. We would echo Deborah Lawson (Voice) in her concerns about the ability of teachers to meet membership fees, especially those starting out on their careers and possibly needing the support of the RCT more than others. For them it may be a choice between union membership and membership of RCT, where the 'insurance' feature of the former wins out in the end. This has to be addressed effectively in appropriately targeted promotion and marketing.

Q5 What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

The three main activities stated, i.e. Setting standards, enhancing professionals' development and informing professional practice, standards and policy with evidence constitute a powerful and comprehensive trio, especially when their implications are considered. With respect to the second activity, (enhancing professionals' development .. etc.) we would wish to emphasise that any professional development undertaken /commissioned/promoted by the Royal College of Teaching, must have demonstrated that it improves student learning rather than teacher practice.

A further activity that could be considered is brokering opportunities for teachers to learn from each other. We would point out that though this is an element of most good CPD, it is often transitory, not well encouraged and made possible yet can be hugely effective. It stands alone in terms of mutual professional learning and confidence building. Models such as Dylan Wiliam's teacher learning communities, Shirley Clarke's learning teams and the lesson study approach that has its origins in Japanese education are established examples of this.

Q6 Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

The information regarding mentoring is sparse; without further detail it is difficult to arrive at any informed response.

Q7 Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

Whilst the tiering and certification seem to have been thought through, we would reiterate part of our response to Q5 and stress that the development of any teacher's skills is judged by the degree to which students' learning improves, i.e. as an individual develops expertise in the Professional Areas, so an enhanced impact is evident in student learning. Thus it follows that the student perspective should be part of the certification and though there is no universally supported system currently in existence to facilitate this, it should not be a hindrance to the inclusion of the students' views. As Russell Hobby observes in *Towards A Royal College of Teaching*, '*teachers will need to invent their own model of professionalism*' and the creativity of teachers will not let the fact that there is no precedent stand in the way of gaining a valuable perspective.

It is suggested that college members '*are trained as assessors*' and that '*they will use their judgement when making assessments*'. This is crucial. Good judgement is the main prerequisite of all assessors and that this will have been endorsed by both their peers and those that they have assessed whilst they are training. Over the years our organisation has gained considerable knowledge and experience of the appointment and training of assessors. Our members affirm how vital it is that this is open and transparent and that

assessors have both first - hand experience of what they are assessing and the credibility of their colleagues.

We would urge that the '*robust set of behaviours and practices that derive from the standards agreed to by the College*' are open to consultation with members before they are used as are the standards themselves. In addition, that all these guides are reviewed and evaluated regularly in the light of experience to maintain their credibility and utility.

We would also suggest that when considering courses for 'key moments' this is not the sole focus of such support. Many teachers, even those with experience, find aspects of their job such as report writing, parent consultations, classroom talk, marking and feedback taxing. In many cases little or no training is available before starting to teach or even during their careers, and they are expected to muddle through, often with conflicting advice from colleagues.

Q8 How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

Vital. We would reiterate part of our response to Q3, i.e. practice must be based on evidence from authoritative, reputable research which is considered in its entirety, not simply on aspects that are selected to support a favoured model or ideology.

Q9 Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Yes. It is only by policy makers and the inspection regime engaging with an organisation that is morally and intellectually grounded and devoted to raising the profession's status, that it the worst excesses of policy making and crippling, distorting accountability can be countered. However, it is not only neutralising the damaging effects, but also working towards mutually understood and valued goals for the benefit of students. The latter seem to have been forgotten in the avalanche of ill – constructed, poorly thought through change that has been foisted on schools in the last 15 years.

Q10 Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

The structure as laid out seems unusually top – heavy and, potentially, very expensive, especially as external experts are identified as advisers. Why have permanent sub – committees when the business of the Board could deal with the aspects (Membership, PD etc.) in a strategic manner, thus setting direction. In turn, designated Board members (possibly duos, trios?) would convene as necessary to consider and make recommendations, ratified as appropriate by the full Board and actioned by the CE.

Executive Team – no details are given, thus it is difficult to determine what this might mean, i.e. numbers, roles, F/T, P/T? Where would they be based? Costs?

Partnership forum of 20 – 30 members. In our organisation, Executive members maintain a regular dialogue with external 'partners'. Endeavouring to call together 20 – 30 individual representatives is impossible. No date or venue suits everyone let alone a majority.

Trustees – We find it inappropriate and somewhat dangerous to have individuals with no direct knowledge and experience of education, apart from the fact that they went to school, appointing Board members. We fully appreciate the need for excluding from amongst the Trustees those with a conflict of interest or vested interest in education. Requiring that such concerns are declared by proposed Trustees, should act as a first line of defence. In addition it would be essential to ensure that Trustees have no connection with, for example, commercial educational interests, such as educational software companies,

classroom/playground apparatus manufacturers or published teaching schemes (for reading, maths, phonics etc.) or have educational credentials that are in doubt.

Q11 Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200

b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250

Please explain your answer

These fees compare favourably with those of other professional associations that teachers might consider joining. However, tempting them to join must mean that they are offered clear and attractive benefits that they would be unable to obtain elsewhere.

Q12 Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

It is the quality of the certification process and the value and status that the teaching community affords becoming a College Member or Fellow that will determine whether or not these fees are viewed as reasonable. Whilst secondary establishments may be persuaded to support staff in securing certification, this would be beyond the budget constraints of most primary schools. In many cases, if a teacher wanted to take this route, then they would have to fund themselves.

Q13 Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

In our experience, teachers are very generous with their own time, especially if it helps a colleague. However, the time they devote to this task may not be represented exclusively by that given to the actual certification, but involve prior preparation time and subsequent writing up/finishing work. Would this also go unremunerated?

Q14 Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

Again, this would depend on the value that schools place on what it represents in terms of PD for the College Member/Fellow and benefits for their school more generally. Other crucial factors are the staffing situation and circumstances of the school. These will determine whether or not the staff member concerned could be released without adversely affecting students/other members of staff/the school.

Anonymous

The author of this submission has elected to remain anonymous.

Response to the Discussion Document about a College of Teaching

Q1 Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching?

Yes, there is a role, but whether teachers would want to enrol is another thing. The profession has taken a considerable battering over the past few years with changes to the national curriculum, Ofsted, pension reform etc. and a further initiative is unlikely to find favour amongst the ranks. The consultations that have been many have often ignored the advice received which has been demoralising. The profession needs a period of calm and consolidation to raise morale and during that time a College of Teaching could put down plans to engage with the teaching force when it is ready. Too much haste and things will go off half-cock and flounder.

Q2 Do you agree with this Vision?

Yes, the vision is admirable and much needed. Morale would be raised provided the advice given by its members was seen to be followed. I would like to know more about how it will raise the status of teaching in society however: that is not made clear. As usual, the devil will be in the detail!

Q3 Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

Yes, in conjunction with the professional associations and learned societies. All these organisations need to work together to present a united front. For far too long there have been different groups with different ideas, which fragments the profession.

Q4 Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary?

Yes: the failed GTC shows that something which is imposed without independence and teeth will not work. It needs to be seen as something teachers value and compulsory enrolment does not ensure that. Senior leaders in schools would need to value membership for themselves and for them to appreciate membership amongst their teachers and prospective teachers.

Q5 What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

Enhancing professional development is of paramount importance. Setting the standards for membership at different grades would be important and to do so would involve informing teachers how to achieve those grades. The College needs to evaluate any evidence very carefully as 'evidence' based on small samples and/or biased samples is worth very little: unfortunately this is often overlooked.

Q6 Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

Yes. However I think Associate membership should start with those who have successfully passed their NQT year: PGCE students and those in their first year of teaching still have much to learn and are faced with many opportunities for professional development. I think it would dilute the status of Associate membership if they were allowed it. Perhaps a Student membership needs to be added?

Q7 Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning?

Yes, though the certification process would need to be rigorous and would (not might!) include the aspects mentioned.

There is some regulation in the CPD market: the National Centre for Excellence in the Teaching of Mathematics (NCETM) has a standard that is regulated (I know as The Mathematical Association (MA) holds that standard and I was observed for a day last year when I organised a day's CPD for primary school teachers of mathematics)

Q8 How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

Very important. Unfortunately some research is picked up inadequately by schools and not done according to what research suggests as corners are cut and so the good practice suggested fails to materialise. Dylan William has much to say on the matter. The College could emphasise that if the findings based on research are to be replicated then the recommendations need to be followed faithfully, not superficially.

Q9 Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Yes – and ensure that the advice is followed through and not ignored.

The part about sabbaticals is important: this is an area that the College should support fully. Currently the teaching profession in England is under immense pressure to work harder and increase results with little importance being given to professional development or research. What PD is done in schools is often generic and not subject specific. The College needs to support subject specific PD and encourage its members to undertake the equivalent of a term's sabbatical every 5 years.

Q10 Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

Sounds as good as any I've experienced.

Q11 Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200

b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250

I do not think teachers would support any of these structures. Member and Fellow status should be based on merit and I suspect teachers would think that people would be paying for those categories of membership. I think the same flat fee of £135 should be payable. Teachers would need more information about what they would get for this annual subscription. Some teachers are members of other professional associations already and subscribe to them, getting subject specific PD from them. I doubt whether the take up would be great. Personally I believe that education in the UK should be free and that teachers should be entitled to free quality PD and be given the time in which to undertake it. The biggest obstacle to a College will, I believe, be getting teachers to pay!

Q12 Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

Not unless schools pay this. Schools need to invest more in their teachers and this cost should not be borne by the teacher.

Q13 Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

No. There should be some incentive for doing it, such as a reduced membership fee.

Q14 Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

No – currently it is a battle for teachers to be released as schools have to bear the cost of cover. Perhaps if the school of the person being assessed paid for the cover it might be possible.

Association of Colleges (AoC)

The Association of Colleges (AoC) represents and promotes the 341 Colleges in England incorporated under the Further and Higher Education Act 1992, including 94 Sixth Form Colleges and 247 Further Education Colleges which:

- Educate 853,000 people aged 16 to 18, almost twice as many as school sixth forms. This includes 185,000 young people taking A-levels;
- Train over one quarter of the total 240,000 apprentices aged 16-18.



College of Teaching consultation

A submission from the Association of Colleges to the Prince's Teaching Institute

July 2013

The Association of Colleges (AoC) represents and promotes the 341 Colleges in England incorporated under the Further and Higher Education Act 1992, including 94 Sixth Form Colleges and 247 Further Education Colleges which:

- Educate 853,000 people aged 16 to 18, almost twice as many as school sixth forms. This includes 185,000 young people taking A-levels;
- Train over one quarter of the total 240,000 apprentices aged 16-18;

We respond to each of the consultation questions in turn.

Question 1: Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching?

We would give a cautious welcome to a College of Teaching for teachers in Sixth Form Colleges (SFCs). Many initiatives for a professional body for post-16 education have faltered for logistical reasons. There is also the parallel development of the new Education and Training Foundation¹ for post-16 teachers in organisations funded by BIS, including Further Education Colleges. However, the case for an independent body remains strong.

Question 2: Do you agree with this Vision?

Yes, this is a compelling vision as it will need to be in order to convince teachers of its value as an organisation.

Question 3: Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

Yes, the teaching profession has an appetite for less political interference and would like to see a long term framework for teaching.

Question 4: Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary?

Yes, a compulsory scheme would be resisted by many and become a distraction. An alternative could be a small top slice of funds to schools and SFCs to fund membership.

Question 5: What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

The most important activity would be to informing professional practice.

Question 6: Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

Clearly, the creation and development of trust is critical within any mentoring model.

Question 7: Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning?

¹ The Education and Training Foundation will provide training and set professional standards in Further Education.

Yes, this would give appropriate recognition and incentive for wider professional qualities and contribution.

Question 8: How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

The current education and skills environment is very fragmented, and becoming increasingly so. This makes access to dissemination of practice uneven, impairing student entitlement. Therefore the College could provide an important, independent voice.

Question 9: Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Yes.

Question 10: Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

The structure should be slim, flatter and therefore more sustainable.

Question 11: Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200 b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250

In the present economic climate and constraints on teachers' pay, the initial rates should be lower.

Question 12: Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

Again, for reasons stated above, certification costs should be lower.

Question 13: Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

There is goodwill and a sense of collegiality but mentoring maybe difficult to sustain over a long period.

Question 14: Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

On the whole, yes but there will be resistance in some institutions.

Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL)

The Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL) represents over 17,000 heads, principals, deputies, vice-principals, assistant heads, business managers and other senior staff of maintained and independent schools and colleges throughout the UK. ASCL has members in more than 90 per cent of secondary schools and colleges of all types, responsible for the education of more than four million young people. This places the association in a unique position to consider this issue from the viewpoint of the leaders of secondary schools and of colleges.

The proposed College of Teaching

Evidence of the Association of School and College Leaders

Introduction

The Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL) represents over 17,000 heads, principals, deputies, vice-principals, assistant heads, business managers and other senior staff of maintained and independent schools and colleges throughout the UK. ASCL has members in more than 90 per cent of secondary schools and colleges of all types, responsible for the education of more than four million young people. This places the association in a unique position to consider this issue from the viewpoint of the leaders of secondary schools and of colleges.

ASCL has always believed that teachers, like other professionals, need an independent professional body. For many years we campaigned for a General Teaching Council and, whilst we would have strongly supported significant changes to the remit and operation of the now defunct General Teaching Council for England, we viewed its abolition as a retrograde step. For this reason we support the movement towards the establishment of a College of Teaching and welcome the opportunity to engage in the debate about its precise nature and function, and this inquiry as an important contribution to that.

With reference to your specific questions

Q1: Do you think that there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching?

Yes, for the reasons set out in paragraph 0 above. A contribution by ASCL General Secretary Brian Lightman in the recent publication 'Towards a Royal College of Teaching'¹ sets out the association's position in more detail.

¹ *Towards a Royal College of Teaching*, 2013, Royal College of Surgeons ISBN 978-1-904096-22-1, p78

Q2: Do you agree with the vision set out in the consultation document?

ASCL welcomes the vision for the College of Teaching outlined in the discussion document.

In particular we support the emphasis upon:

a clear moral purpose rooted in developing educational opportunities for all students

developing the status of the profession

evidence based policy and practice

giving teachers rather than politicians the central voice in establishing standards, values and classroom practice.

Q3: Do you think that the College of Teaching should provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters such as teaching values, standards, practice and research?

ASCL supports the development of a role for the College of Teaching in defining and regulating the highest professional standards. In an increasingly fragmented and autonomous education system there is a risk that wide variations in the quality of provision can develop without some kind of coherent framework of professional standards and expectations. Similarly, we welcome its potential role in communicating the latest research into effective teaching and in capturing and sharing effective practice that is having a demonstrable impact upon student learning. We would hope that in this role the College of Teaching would act as a bridge between recent and relevant educational research and the profession. However, we would not wish to lose the important work already undertaken in this area by the National College of Teaching and Leadership.

Q4: Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary?

The view of ASCL is that the development of the College of Teaching cannot be imposed on the profession by government or by any other constituency. For this reason compulsory membership would not be realistic and would risk stifling the new institution before it had a chance to develop. It may be that at a future point a consensus emerges that membership of the college is so beneficial that it should become automatic, but until we reach that point any attempt to impose an automatic membership would be likely to be highly counter-productive.

While membership is voluntary then the college cannot take over regulatory functions, but it can set standards that can be applied by others to determine who is or is not suitable to be a teacher. If the college's classes of membership are to gain and retain high status then it must be possible to revoke as well as award them, and the college will need to address this, but it should be able to avoid being drawn into setting up what amounted to courts as the GTCE was.

Q5: What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

In ASCL's view an effective College of Teaching would display the following characteristics.

It should:

- be self-regulating to exacting standards, attractive and oversubscribed, bringing in the highest quality of entrants in terms of qualifications and skills
- promote, develop and champion the very best evidence based practice in subject knowledge, pedagogy and assessment
- be in control of professional duties such as curriculum planning, methodology and in-service training, underpinned by a rigorous qualifications system to promote attractive career progression for the best teachers
- maintain, as part of rigorous self-regulation as well as professional reflection, an Ethics Committee to which issues of concern for the development, regulation or public understanding of teaching may be referred so that the profession may be guided in its moral purpose by the best ethical principles
- enjoy high levels of autonomy and self-regulation, whilst embracing full acceptance of its public accountability
- be highly respected by public and government.

Q6: Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for establishing the College?

ASCL welcomes the focus upon support and professional development that is contained within the proposals. In principle the concept that 'juniors receive more and seniors give more' seems a strong one. However, we feel that existing structures for providing mentoring should be integrated into this structure rather than being simply discarded. Schemes as diverse as 'Future Leaders', 'The Improving and Outstanding Teacher Programme' and 'Professional Partners' have all relied upon significant elements of mentoring, and it is important to harness this existing expertise in any new arrangements that emerge.

Q7: Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process will enhance teacher's professional learning?

The principle of undertaking a series of steps in order to achieve the status of fellow has a logical coherence. However, we are concerned by similarities to the Teaching and Learning Academy which was operated by the General Teaching Council. Whilst this scheme also had many strengths, it foundered because it became just one more source of professional learning amongst a myriad of other schemes. It was also perceived as bureaucratic and unable to accredit prior learning from other providers. If these problems are not to be repeated the certification process will need to:

- be easy to access
- have a high value to members of the profession
- be able to accredit relevant prior learning
- be fully integrated into a coherent framework for the professional development of teachers at all stages of their careers.

Q8: How important do you think that it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

ASCL strongly welcomes the intention that the College should
curate research,
share knowledge, and
provide forums for teachers.

There is a strong feeling within the profession that educational policy is excessively influenced by ideas and political whims that have not been fully tested, and which then go on to be discarded when there is a change of government or a ministerial reshuffle because they prove to be unworkable in practice. Hence there is a role for the College in acting as a robust critical friend to new policy initiatives in order to test their efficacy in the light of current research and practice. However, this role could only be undertaken if there were a reasonable likelihood that the voice of the College would be listened to. Hence, in addition to many other groups, the government needs to be clear in outlining the status and credibility that it would attach to the College of Teaching. This would suggest that legislation would need to underpin the remit of such a body.

There is a need to express very clearly the extent to which all the main political parties would support a college of teaching, even when its voice is uncomfortable for a current government. There are positive signs of political consensus over this issue at present, but this needs to be turned into statements of policy and intent that would be hard for each party to abandon when there are differences of opinion between the college and for example a new secretary of state seeking to make a mark. This would also help to maintain more consistent policies when governments change.

Q9: Do you think that the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Once again, ASCL would welcome the College seeking to influence policy through evidence based proposals relating to curriculum, assessment and inspection. For example, ASCL believes that significantly more could currently be done to learn from effective international practice in areas such as curriculum and inspection. The College could also profitably research the inter-relationship between these areas. For example, many countries that perform highly in PISA tests also have inspection systems which are very different from those that currently exist in England. By seeking to articulate a fuller and more rounded understanding of what 'excellence' means and how our system can move towards it, the College could perform a hugely valuable service to the nation.

Q10: Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure?

The recommended structure would ensure wide accountability and the involvement of a wide range of different stakeholders. Nevertheless it will be essential to ensure that the structure does not become overly bureaucratic or costly. In seeking to develop these proposals further, we suggest that the College should focus upon:
exploring how time could be made available for 'ordinary' teachers and school leaders to take part in governance functions. If membership of the Board is seen as excessively time consuming or bureaucratic, it is likely to lose the broad appeal which its democratic function requires.

providing greater clarity about 'appointed non-executives' who are to be 'independent people from non-educational professions'. A clearer explanation is required as to the role which these non-executives would play and the College needs to outline how many of them there would be and how and by whom they would be selected. If, for example, the Board was perceived as being dominated by representatives from outside education, its credibility would be fundamentally undermined.

examining how the democratic identity of the Board can be protected. It is important that members of the Board are seen as representative of the profession as a whole rather than certain sectional groups. At the same time each group of teachers need to feel that their particular concerns are heard if there are not to be pressures to set up sectional colleges. For this reason it is crucial that a wide cross-section of the profession takes part in elections. The General Teaching Council struggled with this issue and it is important that the College of Teaching seeks to develop a broad democratic mandate if it is to secure the support of the whole profession.

**Q11 and 12: Would teachers be willing to pay the suggested subscription rates?
Are the costs of certification reasonable?**

ASCL accepts that there is a need to fund the College and that independence implies that members self-fund the institution rather than seeking a grant from central government. However, we are concerned that funding proved to be a major stumbling-block to the General Teaching Council and we are anxious that the same problems are not faced by the College of Teaching. Organisations such as the General Medical Council have access to significant historical endowments which can be used to support member subscriptions. Even at the lower rate it is likely to prove a challenge to persuade significant numbers of teachers to pay the required subscription. Given the current period of austerity, increased pension contributions and a pay freeze, even associate membership might prove a struggle for many. For similar reasons, whilst we do not think that the costs of certification are unreasonable in principle, we are concerned about who would actually pay these costs. We do not think that it is reasonable to pass them on to College members and struggle to see how employers could meet these costs in a period of tight budgetary controls. In our view this is likely to be a major barrier to the development of a College at this time. So in order to have a sustainable future the College is likely to need some start-up funding from central government or elsewhere.

At present the college proposal has little profile amongst ordinary teachers, though more senior staff such as ASCL members know about it. It is viewed with wariness by classroom teachers when they are told about it. If membership is to grow there is a need for sustained marketing to ordinary teachers. But more significantly teachers need to see that there is a real, direct and immediate benefit to them in joining the college.

The classroom teachers' unions are supportive of the idea of a college of teaching; along with leaders' unions such as ASCL, they are key to getting the message to teachers and need to be kept fully involved.

Q13: Do you think that College members and fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

Q14: Do you think that schools and colleges will release College members and fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

It is hard to escape the conclusion that the answers to these questions will vary depending upon local context. For example, a school facing a deficit budget, or with a college member teaching in a department adversely affected by staffing problems, would be less willing to release. Similarly, institutions might be more willing to release staff if only relatively small numbers of teachers were involved; but if a particular school or college had several staff wishing to undertake this role, potential disruption would obviously be more significant.

Whilst it is possible that College members and fellows would be willing to certify others without financial compensation, we wonder if it is wise to base the new College on this assumption. Other forms of school to school support are now commonly associated with some form of remuneration. For example, those undertaking Specialist Leader of Education roles are commonly offered a fee for their work which is either paid directly to them or to their school, depending upon when the work takes place and what it involves. If the College of Teaching is to establish a distinctive, high status role, then expecting members to give their time and talents for free may not be the ideal way to achieve this.

This highlights the need for this proposal to be considered alongside other current developments and systems and not in isolation. The proposals need to be progressed in consultation with the Department for Education (DfE) in order to avoid overlap and to put in place a strategy which is compatible with a vision for the development of the whole education service which is shared between the profession, the public and policymakers. Work needs to be done to establish such a shared vision, and ASCL remains willing to assist with that.

Martin Ward
Public Affairs Director
Association of School and College Leaders
23 July 2013

The Association for Science Education (ASE)

The Association for Science Education is the largest subject teaching association in the UK. As the professional body for all those involved in science education from pre-school to higher education, the ASE provides a national network supported by a dedicated staff team. Members include teachers, teacher educators, laboratory technicians and advisers.

The Association plays a significant role in promoting excellence in teaching and learning of science in schools and colleges. Working closely with the science professional bodies, industry and business, the ASE provides a UK-wide network bringing together individuals and organisations to share ideas and tackle challenges in science teaching. The ASE is an independent and open forum for debating science education, with unique benefits for members. It provides a range of services to promote high quality science education by developing resources and fostering high quality Continuing Professional Development. ASE is particularly well known for a large Annual Conference, which, with its associated exhibition, forms a focus for science education initiatives.



The **Association**
for **Science Education**

Promoting Excellence in Science Teaching and Learning

FAO Chris Pope
College of Teaching Consultation
The Prince's Teaching Institute
40 Grosvenor Gardens
London
SW1W 0EB

Dear Chris

College of Teaching Consultation – Association for Science Education response

Rather than complete the online consultation as an organisation, I am sending ASE's comments in a letter. I have encouraged our members to fill in the online version so you may get responses from them directly. I hope that these responses will contribute constructively to the debate.

Introduction

Firstly, ASE is firmly of the opinion that the teaching profession should be held in the highest regard. Convincing research evidence tells us that the most important feature of good education is good teaching and those in the profession should be celebrated for their commitment and expertise. A College of Teachers which was truly led by the profession – by classroom teachers with the respect of senior leaders, which celebrated professionalism and demanded the highest standards of continuing professional learning could be a force for good in teaching, but we feel that there are significant questions that must be answered before much more energy is expended on the idea.

Purpose

A clear purpose for a (Royal) College of Teachers is essential. If it were compulsory to join and it was the body which held the "licence to practise" then it would be seen as an attempt to reconstruct the not-much-mourned General Teaching Council. It would also be comparable with the General Medical Council, with a remit to regulate the profession and the power to strike people off the register. We would understand the need for such a body in a new profession, but as teaching has developed its structures over many years, it is difficult to see a clear purpose that is not covered elsewhere.

Existing structures

The existing structures obviously include subject associations, and here a Royal College could help. Some of my colleagues operate tiny organisations, and although they have valuable expertise and experience among their members, they have practical problems in keeping going. These organisations would benefit from a friendly umbrella which could provide practical support so that they could contribute their expertise to the profession. However, the varying structures also bring a challenge. Some subject associations are also trade unions, many others are charities, some are solely for teachers, others for professionals in



The **Association**
for **Science Education**

Promoting Excellence in Science Teaching and Learning

their fields so they are difficult to fit neatly under an umbrella. Alongside these are some combined organisations such as SCORE and ACME which have a significant voice for science and maths education. There is also a concern about subdivisions of the teaching profession – I have made comments above about the subject associations, but teachers can also be subdivided by the age group, or the nature of the children being taught (gifted, special educational needs etc.). This subdivision proved problematic in GTC days.

So, the picture is complex and not easily rationalisable. Placing another organisation on top of it or alongside it might just produce another small outfit, operating in a crowded area.

Non-teaching staff, teaching assistants

ASE has technician members, so we have always taken the view that these people are vital to our profession and we would resist their being excluded from an organisation which was promoting good teaching of science. A College of Teachers would need to be very clear about its attitude to non-teaching school staff.

Charters

Presumably, one benefit of a Royal College with a Charter, would be the opportunity to offer Chartered Teacher status. Needless to say, those of us who already hold Charters and offer the status in our subjects would like the title to have high standing and currency and that could be achieved more readily, probably, if more subjects were able to award proper Chartered status. The term has been abused in the past, so we would be very keen to keep the standard high. Again, there are some issues – for example, Chartered Science teacher is a special section of the Chartered Scientist register so it aligns with science rather than teaching currently.

Costs

When talking to members of ASE about a proposed College of Teachers, the chief concern is financial. Teachers were not in favour, in the past, of being required to join GTC and the subscription spend of the most active is possibly exhausted with their subject teaching association, their union and possibly a learned society. It is difficult to see how the on-going costs of a College of Teachers could be met, even if there were large funds available for initial set up. I haven't found much enthusiasm in the profession for the prospect of a College of Teachers, largely for this reason.

I'm sure that these issues will have been highlighted by others, and I'd be very willing to engage with further debate on the subject.

Best wishes

Annette Smith
Chief Executive

Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)

ATL, the education union, is an independent, registered trade union and professional association, representing approximately 160,000 teachers, head teachers, lecturers and support staff in maintained and independent nurseries, schools, sixth form, tertiary and further education colleges in the United Kingdom. AMiE is the trade union and professional association for leaders and managers in colleges and schools, and is a distinct section of ATL. We recognise the link between education policy and members' conditions of service.

ATL exists to help members, as their careers develop, through first rate research, advice, information and legal advice. Our evidence-based policy making enables us to campaign and negotiate locally and nationally. ATL is affiliated to the Trades Union Congress (TUC), Irish Congress of Trade Unions (ICTU), European Trade Union Committee for Education (ETUCE) and Education International (EI). ATL is not affiliated to any political party and seeks to work constructively with all the main political parties.

ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS AND LECTURERS

7 NORTHUMBERLAND STREET, LONDON WC2N 5RD TEL: 020-7930-6441 FAX: 020-7930-1359
e-mail: info@atl.org.uk web site: <http://www.atl.org.uk> VAT REG NO 539 0866 17
GENERAL SECRETARY Dr MARY BOUSTED B.A.(Hons) PhD



A new member-driven College of Teaching: Discussion document *Response from the Association of Teachers and Lecturers* *July 2013*

About ATL

ATL, the education union, is an independent, registered trade union and professional association, representing approximately 160,000 teachers, head teachers, lecturers and support staff in maintained and independent nurseries, schools, sixth form, tertiary and further education colleges in the United Kingdom. AMiE is the trade union and professional association for leaders and managers in colleges and schools, and is a distinct section of ATL. We recognise the link between education policy and members' conditions of service.

ATL exists to help members, as their careers develop, through first rate research, advice, information and legal advice. Our evidence-based policy making enables us to campaign and negotiate locally and nationally. ATL is affiliated to the Trades Union Congress (TUC), Irish Congress of Trade Unions (ICTU), European Trade Union Committee for Education (ETUCE) and Education International (EI). ATL is not affiliated to any political party and seeks to work constructively with all the main political parties.

ATL policy

ATL's education policy is underpinned by the professionalism of teachers. Teachers should be recognised for their knowledge, expertise and judgement, at the level of the individual pupil and in articulating the role of education in promoting social justice. Development of the education system should take place at a local level: the curriculum should be developed in partnership with local stakeholders and assessment should be carried out through local professional networks. Schools should work collaboratively to provide excellent teaching and learning with a broad and balanced curriculum, and to support pupils' well-being, across a local area. This means that mechanisms must be developed that ensure a proper balance of accountability to national government and the local community, and which supports collaboration rather than competition.

Executive Summary

ATL supports the existence of a professional body for teachers, which aligns to our vision of teacher professionalism. Our response endorses the document's vision of career-long professional development for teachers and makes the following key points:

- ♦ such a body must have authority, challenge educational orthodoxy using high-quality evidence and promote teacher agency and autonomy;

- ♦ the College needs to be non-party political, in order to challenge government policy and school practice, where they go against research evidence;
- ♦ the activities of the College need to promote the autonomy and voice of teachers rather than risk teachers feeling 'done to' and we welcome the focus on CPD and mentoring in order to promote that;
- ♦ the equal weighting across five identified Professional Areas is welcome and will ensure breadth and diversity of experience across all tiers of membership;
- ♦ the governance structure needs to be broadly representative, across sectors and stakeholders, to strengthen the authority of its voice;
- ♦ we know from member feedback that the high fees outlined may deter many potential members; the College needs to make an extremely strong offer to balance against the high membership and certification fees it is proposing, particularly in time of pay freezes and school budget cuts in real terms.

Introduction

"Teachers, like members of any profession, want to feel in control of key elements of their practice". Dr Mary Bousted, ATL General Secretary

As the education union representing teachers, school leaders and support staff across a range of professional issues, ATL has long worked for appropriate levels of autonomy for teachers, supporting high-quality teacher professionalism and the use of member and research evidence in decisions around curriculum, assessment, initial teacher education, CPD etc. A professional body of teachers, for teachers, is a key part of this vision.

An independent member-driven College of Teaching

In a recent ATL survey, 95.4% of respondents stated that there should be an independent member-driven professional body for teachers and ATL believes that an independent College of Teaching has a strong role to play in the world of education and teacher professionalism.

ATL believes that this proposal is particularly important at this time when teacher professionalism is being increasingly undermined. Our members are concerned that the attack on the HEIs' role in initial teacher education weakens the pedagogical basis of teacher professionalism. ATL also deplores the dropping of the QTS requirement for many schools, questions the revised professional standards which presume to tell teachers which particular teaching strategies to use, and challenges curriculum plans which largely ignore views and evidence from the profession. ATL's support for a College of Teaching is part of our work in driving forward a more positive view of teacher professionalism.

The vision for the College

ATL shares the College's vision of a professional body role which supports the professional career-long development of teachers. ATL's policy [Teacher professionalism](#) outlines a vision of teacher professionalism which builds on the foundations of teachers' initial professional education and recognises the stages of development throughout teachers' careers. We believe that the proposals

outlined in the discussion document will provide a structure which will promote and ensure this development for members.

ATL supports the proposal that the College “change[s] educational orthodoxy to one in which the standards are determined by teachers and based in evidence, not determined by political cycle”, and provides an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research. However, for the College to achieve this, we believe that it will need to take a more explicit political role, in terms of directly challenging government policy (as a ‘critical friend’) where evidence is not supportive of their proposals.

The Teachers’ Standards are an example of Government retaining the authoritative voice on a key matter of teacher professionalism, backed up by regulation. If the College’s professional standards are to have meaning across the teaching profession, then the College should be prepared to claim that authority, and build a strategy towards this aim. Otherwise, the very definition of teaching quality, against which teachers will be judged through performance management, will continue to be vulnerable to the political cycle.

The College will not be the only voice for the profession and for education and it is vital that it builds partnerships and networks in order to support its work, creating political momentum and stimulating dialogue with education unions, subject associations, HEIs, SEN organisations, the Office of the Children’s Commissioner etc. It will need to be mindful of organisations such as the IfL where their work may parallel the College’s proposed activities. Most importantly, it will need to create structures which facilitate networks and gathering of member evidence at all levels of membership, and across the profession. It will also need to develop a distinctive brand so that it is not confused with existing organisations such as the National College.

Activities of the College

ATL members strongly support the CPD element of the College’s proposed activities; an important role for the College will be as an advocate for teacher professionalism and promoting high quality CPD opportunities for teachers is a key part of that. We also support the evaluation of existing CPD courses through teacher feedback, against identified criteria; it gives agency to teachers and will make course leaders more accountable to participants, rather than purely to course commissioners. Our members hope that this similar rigorous review would be applied to any CPD provision by the College.

ATL supports mentoring as a professional vehicle for reflection and development and its fit within the College’s model of development for the profession, by the profession. We welcome the proposal that the College would provide training for mentoring and guidelines for the use of all participants within the mentoring relationship.

One of ATL’s core messages is that evidence should support education practice and policy. We therefore support the proposal that the College seeks to inform practice with evidence as part of its activities. The proposal that the College curates research, reviewing and selecting relevant research is a good one, particularly as it will support teachers who want to access relevant and useful research but do not have the resources, especially time, to conduct broad research investigations. It is key that such selection is done on the basis of clear and transparent criteria, to avoid any unintentional drift towards any particular

school of thought/research and to ensure rigour. It is also important that the College collaborates with, and builds on, the work of other organisations working in this area such as the NFER, CUREE, the Educational Endowment Foundation, rather than wastefully duplicate activity.

Teachers of course should not only have access to research to support their practice, they should also be a source of evidence and research. We particularly welcome the proposal that teachers are provided with forums to debate issues of professional practice and to identify solutions for teachers and schools.

The development, curation and promotion of research was an area of excellence at the GTCE, although it suffered from this aspect of their work being insufficiently visible to teachers. The College will need to ensure that this aspect of their work, alongside the CPD element, is highly visible to its members and to the teaching profession as a whole. To increase the College's influence and visibility, leading and commissioning of research including activities such as sponsoring teachers to undertake research sabbaticals would be key.

If the College fulfils its vision to be a proponent of evidence based practice, then it should seek to advise policy-makers on the results, in whatever area of teaching practice, from initial teacher education to curriculum, assessment, school inspection, teaching pupils with SEN and so on. It should work with other organisations to further increase its influence and to spread research outcomes most effectively, not only to policy makers but very importantly, to the profession.

ATL members are less positive about the proposals around the certification role of the College and related activities. Within the current political context of imposition from on high, teachers are wary of imposition by professionals who are deemed to "know best" and the College will need to build the professional standing of those fulfilling this position in order to allay this anxiety. The elements of College work most favoured by ATL's members are those which promote the autonomy and voice of teachers while those which provoke a more divided response were those where teachers feel that they are being "done to".

Standards and structures

ATL recognises the benefit in having a structure which reflects some professional progression aligning with the College's vision to promote the professionalism and progression of teachers. We strongly welcome the path to seniority lying across the five identified Professional Areas and the equal weighting given across the areas in terms of advancement. We believe that this will ensure a breadth and diversity of experience across all tiers of membership. However, we are currently in a political context which can be perceived as favouring subject expertise over pedagogical knowledge so any presentation by the College of those five areas should balance against that particular narrative and place pedagogical knowledge at the top of the list (while recognising that equal weight is applied to all).

ATL members however have some concerns that the tiered membership structure outlined may be divisive. Furthermore, the certification process is very resource-intensive. College Members and Fellows will need to be trained as assessors; will all of those members be expected to have this training? Who would be responsible for re-certification at Fellow level? The College would also need to develop mechanisms for appeal should teachers wish to raise an issue

about the level of support they have received from the mentor. Further, ATL is concerned that many schools might not have the capacity to release College Members and Fellows for their mentoring and certification responsibilities which might prove to be substantial.

The proposals outlined in the discussion document raise the issues of different tier levels for non-teaching staff and of honorary membership. It would be useful to have further detail on this aspect and the opportunity to respond once that detail is provided, which should include the question of QTS or QTLS as a potential prerequisite for particular levels of membership, key in a sector where the lack of specific qualification, eg QTS, is no barrier to teaching. It is important to get more detail on what is envisaged for the level of honorary membership. Furthermore, as part of that exercise, we urge that the College considers the professional profile of teaching staff across all education sectors, including Early Years and Further Education.

To ensure breadth of representation and validity of voice across the education sector, ATL believes that the governance structures of a professional body for teachers should reflect the range of its membership and key stakeholders; primary, secondary, SEN, early years, FE, independent, support staff, unions, headteachers, other UK GTCs.

Membership and fees

In order for the College to have authority around key aspects of teaching and the role of teachers, it will need to be independent and have a substantial membership. The latter would of course be guaranteed if membership were compulsory and linked to licence to practice. However, ATL members recognise that this could be very unpopular amongst the teaching profession; a lesson from the GTCE is the importance of teachers having agency around their membership. A reassuring finding from our survey is that 86.3% of those who responded said that they would join a professional body, if membership was voluntary.

However, that willingness to join will be affected by the cost of membership. Our most recent survey of members, in relation to the specific College of Teaching proposals, indicates that teachers will be very concerned about the proposed cost of membership. They completely rejected the higher end of the scale proposed (Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250) and were cautious about the lower cost option. ATL is very concerned about the impact of high fees on the likely membership levels of the College and therefore on the authority it can claim. Too small a membership also risks detriment to the representativeness of the College's membership.

Members' concern regarding fees also extended to the outlined costs of certification with their rejection of the higher rate of £500 and no consensus on who should bear the brunt of the cost of certification, no matter the exact amount. Their caution is particularly heightened in the current context of austerity, pay freezes, school funding cuts etc.

ATL members believe that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation with the key issues rather being the availability of class cover and balancing the demands of their role against their workloads as teachers. The issue of their being released from their schools/colleges is dependent on the willingness and capacity of their employers to do so, and that is likely to be varied.

The high fees outlined, for membership and certification, whether to individual teachers or their employers, are an issue particularly as the organisation is in early stages of development, when its benefits are still to be established.

Conclusion

ATL absolutely supports the principle of a College of Teaching for teachers. Maintaining the high-quality of teacher professionalism is vital to the development and maintenance of an education system which ensures every child and young person's entitlement to a broad and balanced education which meets their and society's needs. The GTCE experience provides lessons around the need for teacher agency in decisions around membership and the need for that to be balanced against building a sufficient membership in order for the College to project authority on key professional issues. We agree with the College's vision and hope that there will be consultation on further details, as they emerge, so that this truly is a body of teachers, for teachers.

Association of Teachers of Mathematics (ATM)

The Association of Teachers of Mathematics was established in 1950 to encourage the development of mathematics education such that it is more closely related to the needs of the learner. The ATM is governed by its General Council.

There are about 4 000 members - mainly teachers in primary and secondary schools. It is a registered charity and all profits from subscriptions and trading are re-invested into mathematics education.

The ATM provides opportunities to bring together all concerned with mathematics education for all age ranges. It supports local branches, informal support networks, professional development and conferences.

The Association of Teachers of Mathematics produces policy statements and publishes response to National and Government initiatives. Past statements and responses are archived [here](#).

The ATM has a number of 'Working Groups' whose function is to examine particular areas of the mathematics education field to develop policy, resources and action.

The high point of the year is the annual Easter conference which is a celebration of mathematics teaching by hundreds of people who still get great enjoyment from their chosen career.

ATM response to PTI College of Teaching consultation

The Association of Teachers of Mathematics (ATM) is supportive of a College of Teaching. It is vital that the college raises awareness of teaching as a profession akin to law, medicine, engineering and so on. Any teacher should be able to join the College of Teaching and subscriptions for associate membership should be modest. The fee for full membership could include membership of a subject association, or a highly discounted personal rate, the discount being borne by both the college and the subject association.

Subject knowledge and pedagogic knowledge emerge as crucial factors in teacher effectiveness. Consequently, membership of a subject association, either by individual teachers or institutions should be promoted by the College of Teaching. Institutional membership of a subject association demonstrates a commitment to on-going professional development for all teachers of a particular subject. The College of Teaching should work with subject associations to explore a means whereby all members are members (possibly through their institution) of at least one subject association. The College should ensure that any subject specific professional development opportunities are developed collaboratively with subject associations.

Where a teacher has particular expertise in a subject, ensuring high achievement from learners, supporting colleagues both within school and beyond, they should be encouraged to seek Chartered Teacher status (e.g. CMathTeach and CSciTEach). Chartered Teacher status is recognition of excellence as a teacher, leader and facilitator of professional development and a personal commitment to on-going personal professional development. The College of Teaching should actively promote Chartered Teacher status for all subjects/disciplines and encourage schools to indicate it as a desirable feature when advertising for teachers with leadership and management responsibilities. Chartered Teacher status should be considered sufficient to become a fellow (as proposed) of the College of Teaching.

ATM looks forward to receiving further information about the development of a College of Teaching as it emerges, and would be happy to join discussions as appropriate.

Sue Pope and Tony Cotton
Chair of ATM's general council and Honorary Secretary

Anthony Barlow

Anthony Barlow is Senior Lecturer in Geography Education at the University of Roehampton. He worked in Primary schools for eleven years in London and Bolton before joining the University in 2011. Anthony is Vice-Chair of the Early Years and Primary Committee of The Geographical Association (GA). He has led many teacher development sessions for teachers in the humanities, Geography and ICT both for the GA and as a Primary Geography Champion. Anthony has been involved in funded projects such as Making Geography Happen (DFES/ Geography Action Plan) and Young Geographers (TDA). He has written a chapter in the book Teaching Geography Creatively ed. Scoffham (Routledge, 2013) and curates a website for primary geography teaching support. His research interests are pupils' understanding and perception of their immediate school surroundings, students' ability to undertake exploratory enquiries and the links that can be made between the humanities subjects. He is a fellow of the Royal Geographical Society.

Response from Anthony Barlow

Q1 Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

Only if it is split into two or three distinct sections – Early Years and Primary, Secondary and FE.

The different phases of education are different and are often not seen as such.

Different parts of medicine have different colleges, you could even argue that each subject should have a small ‘college’ (see below on role of subject associations).

Q2 Do you agree with this Vision? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

Yes I do believe that ‘the lack of an independent body matters because its absence has resulted in governments stepping into the vacuum.’ There is a lack of understanding that there are many independent voices out there already. We don’t really need another independent NGO.

Q3 Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

It is too much for one body to do. It should be government funded or be a joint venture between subject associations/university departments who already have expertise in these areas. The evolving GTC – far from perfect – was getting better at doing this and could have been reformed. The QCA also did this to a limited extent. These were abolished.

Q4 Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

If established, no. We all need to be in it together or not at all.

Q5 What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

1 Setting standards

The way this is written suggests that the ‘regulatory minimum standards’ are not good enough. Why are they not? This is like Ofsted removing satisfactory as not being good

enough anymore. This is the opposite of grade inflation. This is not about raising standards it is about a subjective expectation that becomes so unattainable (and, of course, is always ultimately subjective anyway).

All good teachers aspire to be better and know there are ways they can improve. However, they do want a work life balance. They do not want to have to pay for another body producing guidelines telling them that they are not good *enough*.

2 Enhancing professionals' development

This is already done by teachers who have time, energy and aspiration for themselves and their pupils/ school. Subject associations through many Quality Marks (eg Primary Geography Quality Mark) promote this.

3 Informing professional practice, standards and policy with evidence.

Again Quality Marks and certified CPD already does this but patchily because of lack of funding.

Q8 How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

Extremely important. This is what universities already do through the way that they teach trainees but this is being eroded. There are different ways to teach the same subject content. If this goes beyond the 'best' way to do Phonics, teach reading or mathematics I am very positive for it.

Q9 Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

On the curriculum: No. There is plenty of expertise already in many vibrant and forward-thinking, and (crucially) *independent* subject associations and this would simply duplicate what is already out there. The government already uses them in consultations and the starting budget would be better spent on supporting and promoting them. They also already run CPD courses/ conferences etc so a national body There is only one teacher on the committee who has drawn up this document from outside London and this is a secondary teacher. What about enhancing the role of the CfSA <http://www.subjectassociation.org.uk/>.

School inspection: Again use/involve subject associations in the governance role to support what the QCA and Ofsted do in writing yearly subject reports.

Q10 Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

It must be based outside London.

Q11 Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

- a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200
- b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250

Please explain your answer

They are very unlikely on a voluntary basis unless they are forced to unless there were significant member discounts and benefits. Again, with the wealth of 'back catalogue' benefits a current subject association (like the Geographical Association) could offer there is a possibility teacher might pay at Associate level. It would have to offer free/ heavily discounted Masters level or accredited study to get you interested in paying at Fellow level.

Q12 Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

No. Unless they are paid by the school. The universities/training providers already certify a certain standard; it is then up to schools to use the usual performance management systems to ensure their staff are still qualified to teach.

Q13 Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

Very unlikely unless they were given time away from their jobs to do it.

Q14 Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

As long as there is some benefit to them.

Bethnal Green Academy

Bethnal Green Academy is a fantastic success story. With hard work, passion and dedication from the school leadership, staff, students, parents and other stakeholders, they have been recognised as the most improved school in London and the 2nd most improved school nationally (2011). Further to their Ofsted Inspection in December 2012, Bethnal Green Academy was judged 'Outstanding' in all categories. Their success is driven by hard work, high expectations, clear boundaries and excellent learning and teaching.

The Academy serves a severely deprived community in the heart of East London. It has a high number of students with special education needs and who speak English as an additional language. Over 30 languages are spoken within the academy and free school meal entitlement is high at 55%.

Examination results have risen dramatically since 2007. For three successive years students have attained above 70% for A* to C grades including English and Maths. In 2013, provisional summer examination results show that 89% of Year 11 students achieved five or more grade A* to C passes at GCSE and for 74%, this included English and Maths.

Bethnal Green Academy is committed to the principles and practices of inclusive community education.

Q1 Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

Yes, the teaching profession needs an independent voice. This needs to be entirely independent of changing government and political agendas and climate. Teachers must be able to create models for personalised training, leading on development of policy and practice. It should also provide a platform for international recognition and influence.

Q2 Do you agree with this Vision? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

The opportunity to develop practice and policy through evidence based research is exciting. It will enable practitioners to enter into debates that will support practice on every level. It will provide the platform for teachers to support each other and develop. It is a further opportunity to be involved in evaluation and research, which can be shared and disseminated.

Q3 Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

Yes.

Q4 Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

Yes. This ensures practitioners are driving improvements and have autonomy.

Q5 What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

- *To commission research which will inform professional practice*
- *To provide an independent voice – research evidence that is evaluated by the professional body to develop policy and practice and not just for Government to interpret to meet its own political agenda*

Q6 Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

Yes.

Q7 Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

Yes. Teachers know that they are continually learning and developing. This process will support them in doing so. It will enable them to recognise what they have achieved and how their professional contribution has made an impact.

Q8 How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

Very important.

Q9 Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Yes.

Q10 Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

Agree.

Q11 Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200

b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250

Please explain your answer

Subscription should provide opportunities for teachers to commission and/or lead research. In addition, they should be able to lead on professional development. This will support schools as they would share evidence and this would impact on the schools own policy and practice.

Q12 Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

Schools and colleges may support costs.

Q13 Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

Yes. This is an opportunity for excellent professional development and sharing practice. This is being delivered within and across schools currently, so should continue.

Q14 Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

Yes.

Geographical Association (GA)

The Geographical Association is a subject association with the core charitable object of furthering geographical knowledge and understanding through education. It is a lively community of practice with over a century of innovation behind it and an unrivalled understanding of geography teaching. The GA was formed by five geographers in 1893 to share ideas and learn from each other. Today, the GA's purpose is the same and it remains an independent association.

Chris Pope
The Prince's Teaching Institute
40 Grosvenor Gardens
London
SW1W 0EB

19th July 2013



160 Solly Street, Sheffield S1 4BF
Tel: 0114 296 0088; Fax: 0114 296 7176
Web: www.geography.org.uk
Charity No. 1135148; Company No. 07139068

Dear Chris

Royal College of Teaching

Many thanks for sending me a copy of the RCT discussion document, as well as the booklet 'Towards a Royal College of Teaching'. I found much of interest in both documents.

As you know, the Princes' Teaching Institute and Geographical Association (GA) enjoy a close working relationship and indeed share an interest in developing and promoting high quality teaching, which is based on expert subject and pedagogical knowledge.

It therefore won't surprise you to learn that the GA supports the aspirations for teaching set out in the discussion document. We support the notion that 'teachers must have a depth of understanding of the subject or subjects they teach; must be able to present and share that knowledge in ways that capture the imagination and generate deep thought; must be skilled in assessing work in ways which allow young people to develop; must manage ever-changing groups of children to produce good-quality work in the classroom and outside; and much else besides' (p.5).

In particular, the GA is supportive of the third element of the discussion 'blueprint' (pp.11-12). The status and awareness of research evidence should be higher in education – amongst policy makers as well as school leaders and teachers. It is also true to say that educational research has 'limits' – we do not operate in a sector which allows solutions to be transferred into local settings without taking account of a complex range of factors. However, more could be done to clarify and disseminate both the science and art of teaching.

A key concern with the materials is the breadth of the remit of a proposed College. Whilst the discussion document sets out three principal activities (p.7), each of these is very broad in its nature. Very different interpretations of activities such as 'setting standards' are entirely possible and so the nature, scale and potential influence of a College remains difficult to gauge from the proposal. For example, under 'enhancing professionals' development', the discussion document hints at a regulatory function for the 'unregulated' CPD market. This aspect of a College's work is emphasised by several contributors in the accompanying booklet, 'Towards a Royal College of Teaching'. The discussion document even suggests a role in offering CPD. These activities would be extremely ambitious and resource-intensive. They would take the College well beyond the stated aim of enhancing CPD.

This illustrates a question which does need very careful thought: can a meaningful and unique role be defined for a College, which would complement the work of organisations already playing vital roles in teaching? Subject associations, such as the GA, already make a very significant contribution towards developing and enhancing subject and pedagogical knowledge and leadership, as well as helping to define standards and produce authoritative advice and guidance on curriculum and assessment. We do this by cross-fertilising ideas between networks of schools, but also by enriching

Strategic Partners:



their subject knowledge by reinforcing the connection between HEI's and schools. At present, it is not clear how a College would help to build on and disseminate this work, rather than reproduce it. For example, the GA already runs a highly successful Quality Mark scheme in both primary and secondary phases. Through a process of self-evaluation and professional reflection, Quality Mark schools undertake an improvement journey which is carefully moderated and certificated. They then join a community of similar schools in which both practice and evidence is exchanged, through virtual and face-to-face peer networking. In this sense, the quality mark complements the many other activities (such as journal articles) that help the geography subject community to set demanding standards for itself. This 'bottom up' approach contrasts with what appears to be a more regulatory view of standard setting, set out in the drafts I received. The current College blueprint therefore appears to take little account of the successful approaches already operating across the system.


A more practical question, but one of fundamental importance, is the question of financing a College. This is of course linked to the points made above: a more ambitious blueprint for a College implies greater costs and higher fees. My own view is that a leaner, less ambitious model would be more likely to succeed. Despite the (unevidenced) claim by one contributor to the accompanying booklet that 'teachers are notoriously careful with their money' (p.45), many thousands of teachers already pay to be members of both a union and a professional subject association. If the current blueprint is pursued, I suspect that the very least we should do is to award teachers who are members of their subject association Associate membership of a College, in recognition of their commitment to 'upholding professional standards and personal development'.

In conclusion, whilst there is a great deal to work out and the devil will very much be in the detail, the GA wishes to recommend that future discussion for a proposed College is focused on three aspects in particular:

- the entitlement to CPD for all teachers.
- articulation of strengthened teaching standards.
- dissemination of evidence (of research and practice).

I do hope that this feedback is useful to your ongoing discussions and would like to thank both you and the PTI for undertaking this challenging work.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Alan Kinder', with a stylized, cursive script.

Alan Kinder
Chief Executive

Adrian Hilton

Adrian Hilton is a researcher in education at Oxford University, where he is currently examining the historical development and political philosophy of 'Free Schools'. He holds four degrees and has spent more than 20 years in secondary and university education, teaching, writing and lecturing in politics, philosophy and theology. He was head of faculty at Slough Grammar School, where he was appointed assistant principal with responsibility for whole-school Learning & Teaching. During this time he was also an adviser in education to ministers and shadow ministers. An alumnus of the Royal Shakespeare Company, he has directed numerous theatre productions and holds a Guinness World Record for performing the Complete Works of Shakespeare non-stop. He also regularly writes on matters relating to politics, religion, arts, culture and education for ConservativeHome, the Spectator and MailOnline.

Comments on the proposal for member-driven College of Teaching: a blueprint for discussion.

Submission by:
Adrian Hilton MSc MTh (Oxon) FRSA
Doctoral Researcher
Department of Education
Oxford University

30 July 2013

Before I begin, I'd like to make an observation on this:

'We acknowledge that there are plenty more issues to address. For example, should it be a "Royal" College or not?'

Which is reported in *The Times* to have been already determined (noting this discussion document has dropped 'Royal' from its title):

<http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/education/article3788882.ece>

I understand from Chris that the *Times* report is erroneous, yet it is a disturbing misreport, though not an unreasonable assumption to make given the title of this current discussion document which is clearly a departure from previous circulations. A Royal college is intrinsically politically impartial. Royal patronage is not merely a symbol of ideological neutrality; it is a foundational and constitutional prerequisite. To read that the NUT (or any union) has allegedly applied pressure to get this dropped risks jeopardising the project at the outset. The NUT (whatever it claims) is centre-left (some would say further left) and ideologically opposed to certain education reforms – certainly (and vociferously) to the Adonis/Blunkett Academy reforms and also to the Free Schools being promoted by the Coalition. Royal charters are still sought by (and granted to) institutions considered to be in the public interest; typically learned professional societies. Political parties in a liberal democracy seek to improve the framework of state education in the public interest. If there is even a hint of a trade-union veto on proposals, you risk alienating many professionals from the outset. The integrity of the College is manifestly enhanced and by a 'Royal' prefix: indeed, it renders the conferred post-nominal titles (Associate, Member, Fellow) more prestigious, and so are likely to be more highly sought.

Q1 Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

Yes, but the challenge will be ensuring that it is free of 'political ideology' (and I use the term in the vernacular sense of left-right polarisation, especially in policy). Academic educational research and the teaching profession are well-known for possessing a centre-left bias, endemic to the social sciences generally, which some politicians view as an 'establishment' to be countered ('the Blob'). The College must avoid becoming (or being perceived as being) a sizeable bloc to challenge whatever government 'ideology' teachers and/or teaching unions may oppose.

Q2 Do you agree with this Vision? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

Yes, but a body which purports to set and uphold standards of performance must be prepared to act in a quasi-judicial fashion and (*in extremis*) expel members for bring the profession into disrepute. A teacher dismissed for gross professional misconduct must forfeit their association with the College. This necessitates formal hearings with the right of appeal. It is unavoidable. Your plans to advocate for meaningful CPD are laudable – I would like all teachers to work towards Masters-level qualifications, encouraging reflexivity and keeping them in touch with the latest research. Indeed, a Masters-level qualification ought perhaps to be a prerequisite for Fellowship. If, as you say, the College will be ‘motivated by a deep sense of moral and intellectual purpose’, it will be important to set this out in a succinct statement (morality implies values, and those values in education are often defined by government as ‘the common good’).

Q3 Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

On values and standards in pedagogical practice, yes. But I am wary of Member-driven College assuming an authoritative voice on research. As Phillip Blond recently observed, ‘most academics are soft left in orientation and conventional in terms of how they think society should be organized. Their ideas are often little more than the state should spend more or regulate more’. As a consequence, our politics or public policy departments tend to stress vast systemic forces over which individual innovation or initiative can exercise very little effect. There is almost no intellectual recognition of the role that ideas or individuals play in the constitution of history and the decisions made. This is a moral-political issue.

Q4 Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

Without a doubt. It would be invidious (and unacceptably illiberal) to coerce professionals into becoming Members, thereby instituting a mandatory taxation on earnings. The age of the ‘closed shop’ is long gone, both in union membership and non-regulatory professional bodies. It will be the task of the College *to persuade* people to join – ie, of the merits of association and the prestige of Association, Membership and Fellowship. Post-nominal letters only go so far. But please note without the ‘Royal’ status an Associate would place ‘ACT’ after their name (which happens also to be the acronym of the Association of Christian Teachers). MCT is already a post-nominal qualification of the Association of Corporate Treasurers (<http://www.treasurers.org/qualifications/mct>). More concerning, a Fellow would be ‘FCT’, with all the childish tabloid jollity that would doubtless engender. ‘ARCT’ or ‘FRCT’ conveys gravitas; consistent with so many other professional bodies – FRCA, FRSC and FRSA, for example).

Q5 What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

It should set standards and promote excellence in education. It should be committed to improving the understanding of what goes on in schools. It should engage in the interaction between education and the wider socio-cultural context. It should be at the forefront of setting and achieving the highest standards through education, training and research. It should promote research and publish the results in respected education journals. The College should also actively promote teaching as a career, providing support to its Associates, Members and Fellows. There would be a vital role in

representing the expertise of the education profession to governments and other agencies. It must be different and distinguishable from the trade unions – its conferences and lectures might perhaps focus on Continuing Professional Development instead of attacking politicians with the political grievance du jour.

Q6 Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

No – see below.

Q7 Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning? *Please give reasons for your answer.*

This is difficult. Teachers have long had to produce professional portfolios in order to become an NQT or acquire QTS or progress through the pay-scales. It is difficult to know why an Associate teacher who has (say) gone through Threshold (to U3) should be re-assessed by the College, and so (presumably) potentially be denied Membership or Fellowship. There is a tension here: not all headteachers will agree with the rigour of College certification, especially if teachers then adduce College certification as evidence that (say) Threshold has been unreasonably withheld. And what if a headteacher uses lack of College Membership as evidence that a teacher does not merit promotion to leadership? I'm also wary of the sheer bureaucracy being proposed here. I've mentored many dozens of PGCE and GTP students (including two very experienced masters [20+ years' teaching] from Eton College who came to me for state accreditation, being the nearest Training School). Mentoring is hugely time-consuming even *within* an establishment: the proposal for Members of the College from outside the teacher's school to carry out assessment through school visits duplicates much of the PGCE/GTP/Main-scale/Threshold process. Who is carrying out the classroom observations and colleague interviews, for example? Who is arranging access to institutions? Who is ensuring VBS accreditation? The pursuit of qualitative data takes a lot of time to arrange and properly assess. If you're talking of a College with 80,000 members with a healthy interest in progression, that requires a considerable bureaucracy and time-commitment from those doing the assessing. Presumably, in accordance with natural justice, there will also need to be an appeals process for aggrieved teachers who fail in an assessment for progression. This implies that 'colleague interviews' must be recorded for the independent appeal body to reconsider. The ethical considerations are manifest and complex. Finally, even a training school rewards teacher-mentors (or their departments), but I understand you're prosing all this to be undertaken *pro bono*. This is unlikely. And the proposal for Fellows to re-certify every five years is unlikely to attract the busiest and best in their fields. Indeed, if Fellows need to be recertified, why not all Members, since they too are to be involved in the assessment and certification process?

Q8 How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

I'm not entirely sure of the purpose of this question. If practice is not to be informed with evidence, I'm not sure what the alternative should be. Evidence may be persuasively quantitative, but it may also be anecdotally qualitative: the singular and unrepresentative may enhance the plural and normative. The rare may be revolutionary.

Q9 Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Yes. As a former advisor to the present Secretary of State, I can attest to the necessity and value of professionals advising policy-makers. It should inform and enhance the work of Ofsted, since they have a shared mission to improve the education of children and young people.

Q10 Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

I agree with these proposals.

Q11 Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200

b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250

The benefits of membership have yet to be fully quantified. This is to be an annual professional subscription on top of annual union fees, jointly amounting (for a member) to c£300 per annum. That is a sizeable chunk of money. I think there are ways of making membership more attractive and worth the fee, but noting the NUT article in the *Times* and the ATL membership of your Commission, this probably isn't the place to expand.

Q12 Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

See responses to Q11 and Q7. I certainly wouldn't have paid this sum on my initial salary.

Q13 Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

Some might, but on the scale necessary I think this is highly unlikely. See response to Q7.

Q14 Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

Headteachers are guided by the Burgundy Book on these sorts of matters, which embraces paid 'public service' leave for teachers (for sitting magistrates or jury service, for example). There's a clear tension here: the more College members and fellows a school has (which will enhance its reputation), the more a headteacher might feel obliged to free them for (up to) five days a year. If half a school's teaching staff are members, that might amount to (under your estimates) anywhere between 100-250 days which will need to be covered. Of course, not all members will be mentors, and yet that pursuit must be a prerequisite for progressing to Fellowship. There's a danger of the

best schools with outstanding teachers perceiving external College mentoring as something of a logistical burden. It might be easier if it is arranged via the emerging MATs or Learning Trust networks.

Institute for Learning (IfL)

The Institute for Learning (IfL) is the independent, voluntary professional body for teaching and training practitioners in the further education and skills sector. Established 11 years ago, our role is to enhance the delivery of brilliant teaching, learning and assessment opportunities through professional body membership. Our members, in their tens of thousands, are dedicated professionals committed to continuing professional development and aspire to achieve excellence as dual professionals – expert in their vocational or subject specialism and expert in the practice of teaching, training and learning.

IfL is pleased to be able to contribute to the development of the College of Teaching, an organisation which we believe can significantly enhance the professional interests of school teachers throughout their careers. IfL and the College of Teaching will share much in our aspirations and vision for teaching as the noblest of professions and, together, can achieve much on behalf of our mutual memberships.

Introduction

The Institute for Learning (IfL) is the independent, voluntary professional body for teaching and training practitioners in the further education and skills sector. Established 11 years ago, our role is to enhance the delivery of brilliant teaching, learning and assessment opportunities through professional body membership. Our members, in their tens of thousands, are dedicated professionals committed to continuing professional development and aspire to achieve excellence as dual professionals – expert in their vocational or subject specialism and expert in the practice of teaching, training and learning.

IfL is pleased to be able to contribute to the development of the College of Teaching, an organisation which we believe can significantly enhance the professional interests of school teachers throughout their careers. IfL and the College of Teaching will share much in our aspirations and vision for teaching as the noblest of professions and, together, can achieve much on behalf of our mutual memberships.

The Vision

Q1: Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching?

IfL believes that the time is right for a new independent member-driven organisation dedicated to advancement of the professional interests of teachers in schools. There is a clear economic benefit but also a clear mandate from teachers themselves that this new organisation will be of value to them and their learners.

The role of those individuals who are educators in our society can be too easily dismissed as functionary. Changing economic climates, political ideologies and demand from learners, parents and wider society places great strain on those teaching children and young people to thrive in an ever-changing world. Therefore, providing teachers with every opportunity to access development

opportunities, to influence those in positions of power in education and beyond and to demonstrate publicly the virtues of professionalism in teaching should be welcomed and encouraged.

In the further education and skills sector, the presence of IfL as the professional body has meant that there is a dedicated voice in the sector for excellence in teaching and learning. We are raising the status and public standing of our members as professionals by providing opportunities to gain recognition and professional status through our various programmes and partnership with higher education institutions and through the conferral of Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills (QTLS) status. A long standing objective of teachers in our sector was that their skills, expertise and professionalism were recognised alongside that of qualified teachers in schools. The presence of an independent professional body was able to see that objective achieved when, following the Wolf Review, regulations were changed which meant that QTLS was recognised as equivalent to Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) in April 2012.

A further strength of an independent professional body is its democratic legitimacy through governance. Members, associates and fellows of IfL have the opportunity to stand and vote in elections to the Advisory Council¹, the body which represents teaching and training professionals to shape IfL's policies and strategies. The value member-led governance adds to the work of IfL and our relationship with our members is crucial and is something that members of the College of Teaching will also benefit from.

Q2: Do you agree with this Vision?

IfL strongly agrees that the focus of the proposed vision for the College of Teaching is in exactly the right place – in improving the education of children and young people. This aligns well with IfL's vision as stated in our recently published strategy update².

Q3: Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

¹ <http://www.ifl.ac.uk/about-ifl/ifl-council>

² http://www.ifl.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0014/32153/IfL-strategy-update-July2013_final_web.pdf

IfL agrees that the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice for the school teaching profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research not least because there are areas that should be discussed and debated by the profession itself rather than politicians, government departments and agencies.

There is a clear and valuable space for the championing of professional teaching. As a society where education is highly politicised and where traditional models of professionalism are being challenged, there are clear advantages to having an independent and professionally-focused organisation informing the debate on behalf of teachers.

A blueprint

Q4: Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary?

IfL sees the pragmatism and benefits of voluntarism but also the need to represent the profession as a whole in order to preserve the standards and reputation of teaching professionals in schools.

Furthermore, seeking for full membership through regulation is unlikely to be achieved in the current political climate. Presenting an enticing offer for individual teachers is therefore the best way to work towards full membership as will be coming to position on the role of schools as employers.

Q5: What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

IfL believes that all three proposed principal activities are important for a new professional body.

Fundamentally, it is not the place of IfL or any external organisation to determine what the ‘most important’ activities of the College of Teaching should be. Taking the time and creating the space for members to debate and discuss the role and activities of the College of Teaching should be the most important proposed activity at this point.

Enhancing professionals' development

Q6: Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the college?

IfL views the proposed mentoring and associated membership and certification structures to be both robust and laudable; however serious consideration would need to be given to its practical implementation. Clearly, it will be a decision for the College's governance structures/

All membership organisations have to carefully manage the expectations they place on their members to engage and comply with their structures against the realities of the time that members are able to commit. Alongside this is consideration for the proportion of organisational resources that are allocated to these processes against the return for individual members. The mentoring and tiered membership and certification processes proposed in the consultation document would appear to be resource intensive both for individual members and prospective members, and indeed the College itself. On the one hand, this presents a strong and robust membership structure that stands up to scrutiny and in itself requires a high level of commitment that demonstrate a member's dedication to their professionalism. On the other hand, it could be argued that the proposed processes detract resources away from other priority areas for the College. The benefits of a governance structure with strong representation from the sector will mean the College is able to demonstrate and account for how it decides to balance these issues.

Q7: Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning?

As above.

Informing professional practice, standards and policy with evidence

Q8: How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

IfL knows well the importance our members place on evidence-based practice in teaching and learning and we are sure this commitment is shared with colleagues in the school sector. There are clear opportunities for IfL and the College of Teaching to work together on areas of mutual interest where our respective memberships can learn from each other, such as the utilisation of learning technology, practitioner research and innovations in pedagogy and assessment.

Q9: Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Alongside informing practice with evidence, is the ability of the College to use the vast expertise and diversity of its membership to allow practice to provide evidence. In the same way, IfL regularly uses its position as the independent professional body for teaching and training practitioners to provide evidence to inquiries, consultations and research studies such as the Commission for Adult Vocational Teaching and Learning³.

Ensuring rigorous governance

Q10: Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

IfL has made clear throughout this consultation response that there is a crucial role for governance arrangements in shaping the strategy of the College and the experience of its members. Furthermore, in a profession as diverse and dynamic as teaching, it will be important for the College's reputation and credibility that all members have a stake in the organisation's governance so it is pleasing to see that College members will have the opportunity to stand, and presumably vote, in elections for Board members and Trustees. For this to work successfully, IfL feels that a clearer distinction may need to be

³ http://www.ifl.ac.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0003/29901/IfLResearchForCAVTL.pdf

drawn between the role of a College member who is on the Board and the role of a College member who is a Trustee.

Some parallels can be drawn between the proposed governance structure of the College of Teaching with the established structure currently in operation at IfL⁴. The main forum through which members are represented is the Advisory Council made up of elected member representatives from the regions and protected equality and diversity characteristics and representatives from key stakeholder organisations. It is from this body that the majority of members of IfL's non-executive board (NEB) are elected and it is their role to provide IfL's strategic direction and ensure business probity. Elected IfL members on the NEB are supported by four co-opted non-executive directors who are appointed for their business expertise.

It is not clear in the College's proposals whether elections to the Board would be from elected Trustees or from a ballot of all members, or vice versa. Coordinating whole membership ballots for both Board members and Trustees could become complicated and confusing for members and could complicate mechanisms that hold respective groups to account.

What would be required of teachers and schools, who should pay, and how much?

Q11: Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200

b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250

IfL is, at this stage, unsure that teachers would be willing to pay the membership fees as proposed.

Primarily this is because the College is brand new and the proposed benefits that come with membership will need several years to establish. The College is right however, as is the practice in most

⁴ <http://www.ifl.ac.uk/about-ifl/ifl-council/ifl-governance-update>

professional organisations, to have different fee levels for different grades of membership due to the additional benefits that come with progression.

Q12: Do you think costs of £250-500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

IfL has made clear already that the level of individual and organisational resource that is attached to accessing the College's membership structures is a decision for the organisation's governance. We do however feel that the process and attached fee of certification, as proposed, is excessive and may detract potential members from joining.

The consultation document describes how teachers will not be paid for the time off that will need to be taken to take part in assessment for certification and that the school would be reimbursed.

IfL would argue that there is a benefit to schools for having their teachers as recognised members of the professional body and so it is right that they make a contribution which, in this case, could be meeting the costs of the certification assessment. This could bring the cost down for individuals who, in their first year as a certified member, under the current proposals could pay up to £640 in fees and possibly lose up to two days pay.

Q13: Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

IfL does not operate a paid process of certification for membership, although our members can take part in a process of professional formation which, if completed successfully, can lead to Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills (QTLS) status. Professional formation is assessed by a team of IfL members and fellows who are holders of QTLS themselves and are appointed – and remunerated – in their role as reviewers.

Q14: Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

Individual teachers and school leaders are best placed to answer this question.

Dr Lawrence Ingvarson, BSc (UWA), MA (Lond.) PhD (Monash)

Prior to his present part-time position, Lawrence Ingvarson was a Research Director at the Australian Council for Educational Research. He began his career as a science and mathematics teacher, teaching in WA, Scotland and England, before undertaking further studies at the University of London. Since then, he has held academic positions at the University of Stirling in Scotland and Monash University in Melbourne. He is a Fellow of the Australian College of Educators, a recipient of a Distinguished Service Award from the Australian Science Teachers Association. He recently co-directed a study for the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement on the preparation of mathematics teachers in seventeen countries (TEDS-M). Other recent projects include the development of standards for teachers and school leaders in Australia, Chile, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. He has also provided consultancy services on teacher quality for the OECD and in Scotland, New Zealand and Chile. Recent books include *Assessing Teachers for Professional Certification: The First Decade of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards*. The book brings together the rigorous research and development work conducted by the NBPTS in the USA since its inception in 1987.

The Prince's Teaching Institute: College of Teaching Consultation
Comments on Discussion Document: *A New Member-Driven College of Teaching: A Blueprint for Discussion*

Lawrence Ingvarson
Australian Council for Educational Research

Q1 Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching?

This is a very exciting, timely initiative that will be observed with great interest internationally. The emphasis on independence is well placed. This feature will provide the stability essential to developing the core functions envisaged for the College, which will take many years to materialise. Australia provides a valuable lesson in the limitations of trying to develop a respected certification system when the body responsible is owned and directed by politicians.

Professions are normally trusted to run their own certification systems. If convinced about its rigor, employing authorities usually encourage members of the profession to seek certification and reward its attainment through access to higher salary scales and eligibility for promotional positions.

Q2 Do you agree with this Vision?

The vision is great.

Q3 Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

Certainly it should provide an authoritative voice in these areas, but ultimately the locus of authority in these matters, as for any profession, must rest with the people and our democratic processes. The public entrusts (or should only entrust) professional bodies with important quality control responsibilities in return for regular and convincing evidence that they are worthy of that trust.

Q4 Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary?

If the College goes down this path, it should certainly be voluntary, however I do not think it realistic to expect that the College will be able to enlist large numbers of teachers and principals and form a member-based body. This is a crowded field, and many, if not most, are already paid up members of a teacher or subject association.

I'm presuming, perhaps wrongly, that there will be another body in England, like the GTC in Scotland, that will continue to be responsible for compulsory registration and its regular renewal; and of course, all teachers should have gained registration. In most professions, such bodies are normally statutory bodies, responsible to the relevant Minister.

I can't see why most teachers would become members of the proposed body. I think it would be wiser to concentrate on developing a rigorous respected voluntary certification system at the higher levels of expertise. As this comes to fruition, it will gradually create a body of nationally certified teachers who will have the confidence to speak "truth to power".

Q5 What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

It will be vital that a College concentrates on providing a few unique services; functions that no one currently provides that meet an important unmet need. Duplication will be death. My advice, perhaps counter-intuitive, is not to get involved as a provider of PD. There are plenty of providers out there already. If the CoT gets the certification right, it will lead teachers to look for the kind of PD that will help them meet the standards. Providers will leap to the opportunity.

In identifying certification at two higher levels beyond registration as its core function, I think the blueprint is on the right path, in that the College will be introducing a much needed professional certification service that no one else can provide on a national basis. (I'm aware that some, like the ASE do this, but I assume it will merge under the umbrella of a CoT).

Certification is the way most professions drive PD and continual improvement in their members' practice, in their own, and in the public interest. Professions provide novices with high performance standards to aim for over several years. They provide a rigorous and independent system for assessing when they have attained those standards. Successful applicants gain a respected certification that employers are willing to pay for, thus creating a strong market for their knowledge and expertise. They gain the esteem of having "made it" in their profession.

Certification systems for teachers aim to build a closer alignment between increasing expertise and career progression. The assumptions underlying such systems - about how to link teacher pay to performance and "incentivize" teachers - stand in stark contrast to those underlying quota-based merit pay schemes, typically limited to annual one-off bonus payments. Reformed career structures based on professional certification aim to enhance student learning by driving higher quality

teaching. A rigorous certification system creates a basis for significantly increasing salaries for accomplished teachers, thereby making teaching a more attractive career option for abler graduates and better able to retain its best practitioners.

Q6 Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

It is important to keep in mind that the core factor on which everything else will depend will be the rigour and credibility of the assessment processes that lead to certification. Everything else flows from that. This will decide whether the CoT will live or die. If the certification provided by a CoT is publicly and professionally credible and if employing authorities see it as worth rewarding substantially, it will lead all teachers to look for the kind of mentoring and professional learning that will help them attain it.

I think it would be a fundamental mistake to conceive of the higher levels as tiers that “only the most exceptional and widely professional would achieve”. I suggest a more productive image is that of a broad staircase to levels of expertise that a school system would want most teachers to reach with reasonable opportunities for professional learning and mentoring. This what a rigorous certification system aims to do – to lift the extent to which successful (standards-based/research-based) practices are used.

Q7 Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers’ professional learning?

I’m afraid the section including Figure 1 and certification needs much more work. There is a need to recognize that people with high levels of expertise in educational measurement and assessment will be needed to build the main components of a valid and reliable certification system. This is not the place for gifted amateurs. My advice would be to learn as much as possible from the educational measurement people who built the NBPTS certification system in the USA. (A book I edited about the R & D that underpins the NBPTS certification system may be worth a look to get some idea of the scale of the work involved.) \$500 will not go anywhere near the real costs of conducting a rigorous certification assessment.

Q8 How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

This is where the standards come in. The main role of standards writers is to synthesize what the research implies for what teachers should know and be able to do. I find it helpful to think of teaching standards providing a bridge between research and practice. This means that standards should go beyond the generic level and answer such questions as “what should a highly accomplished primary

teacher know about the teaching of reading, or how to assess progress in numeracy skills, for example.

Q9 Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

As mentioned, it would be wise for the CoT to stick to providing what is currently not provided initially. With time, especially as the CoT creates a strong cadre of nationally certified teachers at the higher levels, it will inevitably gain more authority and the credibility to speak on such matters. I think it would be unrealistic to expect a new body to have this credibility from the start. Once again, the NBPTS provides an instructive model. After 20 years, the 100,000 National Board certified teachers form a powerful voice in American education and influence policy at all levels, including in the President's office.

Q10 Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

The Board Sub-Committees should provide opportunities to provide widespread involvement of teachers and school leaders. The professional Standards SC should be separate from the SC responsible for the development of the assessments for certification purposes. I think consideration should be given to an assessment and certification SC. A Marketing and Outreach SC to promote applications and employer/union recognition of CoT certified teachers will be needed.

Q11 Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

- a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200
- b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250

As mentioned, I'm not sure that a subscription model will work for the CoT, especially for Associates – why would they pay?

Q12 Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

A sounder, though long-term basis is to charge the full cost of the assessment and certification process – and to work hard with the government, unions and STRB (?) to create a new salary structure that provides a substantial, even irresistible, incentive for teachers to gain certification (~20% increase). This will more than compensate teachers for the certification cost. England already had something like this with the Excellent Teacher and AST, but the assessment lacked credibility (As also led to the demise of the Chartered Teacher scheme in

Scotland). In effect, this should form the basis of a bargain between the profession and government that is serious about promoting and rewarding quality teaching.

Q12 Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

As indicated, I think a lot more work is needed in developing assessment methods that will meet psychometric standards of validity, generalisability, reliability. One that is done, there will be the whole business of setting performance standards, training assessors, etc. This will give a sounder basis on which to estimate certification fees.

You may be creating a rod for your own back if you require teachers to recertify every 5 years – it comes around surprisingly quickly. I suggest 10 years.

As the certification system gains credibility, schools and universities will reorient their professional learning resources to support groups of teachers preparing for certification, whether at the school level, or in local networks.

However, assessors should be highly trained, including bias training, and should be paid for their services. The body of assessors should be as small in number as possible, and they should always work with another assessor. Procedures for checking reliability and constantly monitoring drift and quality control should be in place. This again is an area where NBPTS staff could provide invaluable advice.

Q14 Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

Strange as it might seem, it is not necessary to send assessors to schools. (this also makes the assessment more expensive than it needs to be. Teachers are becoming more adept at producing electronic portfolios containing evidence of their teaching. Assessors do not need to visit schools (in fact, in some ways it is a good idea if they don't as so many sources of bias can creep in). A good idea is to train assessors together at assessment centres and keep them together as they conduct their assessments over several days. This makes it much easier to monitor their judgments and maintain consistency.

None of these comments should be taken as reservations about the importance of what is being proposed in establishing an independent professional body for teachers with responsibility for advanced standards and certification. It is a much needed reform fundamental to any serious effort by governments to ensure quality learning opportunities for all students.

Peter Mattock

Peter Mattock has been teaching Mathematics for 8 years, starting as an NQT in 2006, having completed a PGCE with the University of Leicester. He has served as Second in Mathematics, before being appointed Head of Mathematics in January 2011, adding the oversight of Initial Teacher Training in the role as Professional Tutor in October 2012. Peter completed the inaugural SSAT NQT leadership and development course as an NQT, and has since added to that completion of the MLDP course through the National College of School Leadership. Peter has worked with several Initial Teacher Training institutions, delivering sessions to PGCE students at the University of Leicester and the University of Reading, as well as sitting on both the Oxford University Partnership Committee and the Oxford Brookes University Professional Tutor Steering group. Peter also plays an active role in School Direct in Oxford, sitting on the School Direct Steering group. Peter has been an active respondent to all recent DfES, Ofqual and PTI consultations around curriculum and examinations changes, as well as the formation of the new professional body for teachers.

Response to College of Teaching Discussion Document

I agree that the profession is in need of an independent representative body to retrieve some of the functions that a lack of teacher-led body means that the government has had to replicate. I also agree that this body should have the overview of standards for the performance of the profession and serve as the vehicle to publicise the research and evidence that the profession sorely needs in order to shape its practice and improve its standing as a respected and sought after graduate profession. I would also like to see the body listening to and supporting its members on changes to education policy or practice which are not necessarily based on evidence, where gathering research based evidence may be difficult but are nonetheless well argued and structured – for example it would be difficult to find supporting evidence for qualifications or curriculum reform that is not based on practice in other countries, but may be a wholly new direction. This should not be a barrier to the propagation and support of these ideas if the members of the college believe the ideas have merit. Indeed part of a body such as this may be seen to be generating new ideas rather than simply collating and distributing ideas based on others research. This would mean a change to the vision of the college and its principal activities, to include acting as a voice for the profession in matters of policy and supporting members' ideas for policy change.

As for voluntary membership, given the likely costs involved this is necessary – however in order to set standards it may be necessary to act as a regulatory body. In this case we would require a high proportion (if not 100%) of teachers as some sort of member. Might it be worth exploring the idea of a very reduced or free, compulsory membership – perhaps with some funding from the DfES, in order to take over the regulatory functions with regards setting and maintaining of standards? This would then mean that the paid memberships are for the increased access to mentors, CPD (which could be subsidised for people who have progressed further within the membership structure), research support and influence within the body in terms of eligibility to sit on sub-committees or research teams. This then may allow the body to work as a regulatory body for teachers in addition to just a supportive one. One would assume that the body would have to have some regulatory powers within its structure if only to regulate members with regards its own standards.

Whilst on this subject, given the possibility that the College, either immediately or in the future, may find itself in a position of setting and regulating statutory standards for the profession, the classification of the membership tiers may need to be re-visited. I agree with the terminology associate and fellow as the lowest and highest paid voluntary levels of membership, but not that 'Member' should be the middle one. Given that the College may be required, at some point in the future if not immediately, to hold within its membership all teachers; and the fact that the term 'Member' may be misleading to those institutions without a reasonable knowledge of the structure of the College, it may be better to save the classification as 'member' as a lower grade than Associate, and use it to signify simply members of the teaching profession at such a time when such membership may become compulsory. I would propose something along the lines of 'Practitioner', 'Master' or 'Specialist'.

With regards the evaluation of existing CPD courses, I would like to see the College go further and produce a quality mark that CPD providers can apply for to use when advertising their CPD. Criteria can be set that would allow bodies that organise CPD to apply for use of this mark, which could include the necessity to apply discounts for members, clarity in the advertising as to the suitability of

the course for different groups and allow inspection of the course by members of the College, among others. This may be more beneficial than running courses for key moments itself, as the college will find itself in direct competition with bodies like the SSAT and National College for Teaching and Leadership that run courses for these areas. Many of the private companies that also offer courses for these areas may benefit from greater capital and so may attract better resources and professional expertise than the College may be able to, particularly in the early days.

With regards the proposed organisational structure, I would like to see a greater role for teachers in the areas lower than the board. It is unlikely that many teachers will have the necessary time to sit on the Board of the college, and not being a member of the Board should not mean that teachers cannot participate in sub-committees or input into the direction that the College moves. I would like to see opportunities for teachers to join board sub-committees, or have input into these sub-committees without the need to be members of the board. The reliance on non-partisan experts would potentially limit this to those teachers to whom the experts have regular contact, which may mean they are limited to a certain geographical area of the country for example. Perhaps local 'working groups' could be set up to inform the Board sub-committees, chaired by local Fellows or Members/Practitioners about issues to do with the specific areas highlighted in the discussion document. This might then provide opportunities for local members to address these sub-committees and make 'significant contributions to the profession' – the requirement of becoming a Fellow.

Given these opportunities and activities I can see membership being a truly popular option for teachers and believe that the College could justify payments at the upper end of their proposed ranges. I can see schools being happy to pay for staff to become certified, certainly to the Fellow level (the cost for which should be at the higher end of the certification range, whilst the cost to become a 'Member' should be at the lower); I envisage a situation where many members of the College will want to progress to 'Member' status to the point at which the cost could become prohibitive for schools to pay – for this reason certification costs should be set low enough for 'Member' level that staff will be able to pay for them out of their own pocket (particularly when this means that the fee for their membership of the college will also increase) and so should be set at the lowest end of the range given, if not lower. Due to the increased difficulty in attaining the Fellow grade of membership, for which many teachers will not be eligible for, I believe that schools will be more likely to financially support applications from those teachers who do qualify for Fellowship level – schools would likely consider the benefits in terms of recruitment of students and staff in being able to advertise having a Fellow of the College on their staff, and so this should be set at the higher end of the range.

As for the lack of financial compensation for mentoring, I don't think this is a problem provided schools are willing to support this activity without reducing pay (i.e. that schools are willing to provide paid leave for these activities). For this benefits of having 'Members' and Fellows of the College on the staff of a school should be clear to schools (they aren't necessarily in the current literature in my opinion).

I am willing to be contacted to discuss further any of these ideas and proposal, or any other proposals that the College may be considering in its formation and subsequent work, and would

welcome contact from the Princes Teaching Institute with regards all matters pursuant to the formation and subsequent work of the College.

Yours sincerely

Mr Peter Mattock
Head of Mathematics and Professional Tutor
Oxford Spires Academy
Glanville Road
Oxford
OX4 2AU

Telephone work: 01865428200 extension 257

Telephone mobile: 07796445456

Email: peter.mattock@gmail.com or pmattock@oxfordspiresacademy.org

National Association of Headteachers (NAHT)

NAHT is an independent trade union and professional association established in 1897 and now representing over 28,500 school leaders in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Members hold leadership positions in early years; primary; special and secondary schools; independent schools; sixth form and FE colleges; outdoor education centres; pupil referral units, social services establishments and other educational settings.

As well as supporting their members as a union, they have also gained a reputation as an effective voice in educational policy making across the sector, and work closely with government and other key stakeholders. NAHT also provide an extensive range of training and development programmes for school leaders, as well as outstanding publications, guidance documents and website.

NAHT Responses to Questions on the Blueprint for a College of Teaching

Q1. Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching? Please give reasons for your answer.

NAHT fully support the idea of a College of Teaching. This would enhance the professionalism and status of teachers and protect the profession from the level of political interference to which it is currently subject, and which is detrimental to learning outcomes for children. We believe a College could define and develop professionalism in teaching, based on robust evidence and research rather than transient ideology.

Independence would be key to its success, and it would be important for a College to be led by the profession rather than government in order to retain its integrity. However, we are not sure whether that means that it should be, or could be, based on early recruitment of large numbers of teachers, especially given a mismatch between costs and benefits to the individual. Although wide-scale participation is an aspiration, we outline further in this submission why we have concerns about a business model for the College which assumes such a level of participation from the start without also providing a compelling reason for individual membership.

We should be clear that this is not because we prefer an 'elitist' approach to the College. Rather we suspect, in the absence of different incentives, that the institution will need to make a virtue out of a necessity and should not be solely founded on an expectation that may fail to materialise. If we are happily proved wrong, then nothing is lost. If on the other hand, the College has made claims that cannot be met, or made commitments that cannot be financed, this would have serious consequences.

Q2. Do you agree with this Vision? Please give reasons for your answer.

NAHT agrees with the vision's prime driver for the College to act in the public interest through improving the education of children and young people. This has to be the central objective of a College for the teaching profession and we welcome the importance given to this. We also welcome the emphasis on the use of evidence to inform practice and policy, and believe that this is an important differentiation from many current initiatives that seek to improve the teaching profession.

We support the vision statement and would only question its suggestion that a College's authority will begin with 'widespread membership'. We believe that this may be difficult to achieve initially and that previous similar initiatives have floundered on this point. Whilst we believe that teachers in general would welcome the opportunity for the profession to set, develop and maintain standards, the problem for the college is that teachers could benefit from this without having to join the College. In general, teachers are busy, properly sceptical of central initiatives and often, early in their careers, unable to afford this sort of activity. It will be safest if, in its early days, the authority of the College came from the quality of its work rather than the scale of its membership. We outline below how we think that teachers could be encouraged to participate.

Q3. Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

Yes, we believe that this has to be the College's prime purpose.

Q4. Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary? Please give reasons for your answer.

NAHT agree that membership should be voluntary, as compulsory membership would link the College to regulation and government, from which we believe it must be free. However, a model of voluntary membership would face the challenges in attracting membership that we have outlined above. The case for individual membership as outlined in the blueprint is not sufficient to achieve the scale on which the business case relies.

We believe that a compelling case for even limited membership would need to rely on it being synonymous with excellence in teaching, as evidenced by influential policy-making and guidance combined with rigorous assessment at entry and at progression to 'fellow' status.

We suggest that schools and school leaders have the potential to increase membership by encouraging teachers to be members of the College in order to progress to senior teaching and leadership positions. Schools could support this by agreeing to create time for development and to pay for the assessments for levels of membership in order to make this accessible for all aspiring teachers regardless of income. This would also be a major attraction to working in such schools.

If membership could be linked to development and promotion opportunities in this way, membership would be considered much more valuable and attractive. This is the de facto position of colleges in the medical profession, although we recognise how long this has taken to achieve. Membership being synonymous with excellent teaching would also add weight to the College being the advocate for teaching standards. Such an approach would probably suggest a move away from the concept of Associate membership.

Q5. What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

As outlined above, we believe that the most important activities would be the setting of standards and informing professional practice, standards and policy with real evidence gathered and assessed by the College. We do support the role in enhancing professional development but believe that the other two areas come first. The communication and dissemination of best practice is also critical and is something that has not necessarily worked well in the past. We assume that the College will not be a primary producer of research and evidence, as this is well catered for by other organisations, but will instead focus on bridging the gap between research and practice.

Q6. Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

NAHT are doubtful that this would work as mentoring already has a patchy track record in practice as teachers work long hours and cannot easily be released from their duties without incurring significant costs, both personally and for their school. Matching mentors and mentees can also be challenging. We believe that building the College on a foundation of voluntary activity that is hard to co-ordinate would not provide the stability it would need to develop.

Q7. Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning? Please give reasons for your answer.

As outlined above, we do not believe the Associate membership category would support the College's vision and objectives although provision should be made for non/aspiring members to receive publications and information to inform their practice. We are also concerned that the degree of tiering of competences in the five key areas could become over-complicated and bureaucratic, resulting in relatively arbitrary judgements.

The proposals for the assessment and certification of members, however, seem sensible and would support our own suggestion for developing a membership of excellent teachers. We also agree that the College would be well placed to accredit Continuous Professional Development (CPD) courses, to help teachers navigate provision and to directly provide such courses where there are gaps to support teaching standards.

Q8. How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

We believe that it is a key and defining role for the College to work in partnership with schools and the academy to facilitate and interrogate the relationship between research data and classroom practice. The constraints of the business model for the College mean that it should primarily be involved in evaluation and promotion of research rather than commissioning. It should also focus on assessing the most pertinent and difficult issues to inform standards. As an authoritative voice, the College would have the opportunity to ensure that research is much more widely disseminated and much more influential on policy and practice.

This function will be controversial and it will challenge the profession as often as it challenges policy makers. The quality of the work and of the College's reputation will be essential to help it weather the debates.

Q9 Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

NAHT does think that the College should cover those subjects but the relationship with the issue of school inspection and with Ofsted would necessarily be more complex. Our view is that Ofsted's guidance to its inspectors should take into consideration research evidence on effective teaching practice disseminated by the College and that a school's reference in its self-evaluation to evidence and guidance generated by the College should be authoritative. The College should not be commenting on the methods of inspection nor be too closely associated with the inspectorate.

Q10. Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

Whilst this appears complex, we can broadly understand and support the proposed structure. We would seek a little more clarity as to the role of the trustees, and would also want to see the subject associations more central to the structure. The College could help to support and develop their work and this needs much greater consideration than just to involve them in the partnership forum. The current outline also groups subject associations together with awarding bodies and this fails to recognise their distinct role and the fact that subject associations are currently leading the battle on standards for their subject area. Awarding bodies are much more of an external stakeholder with whom the College could engage through a Partnership Forum.

Q11 Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200

b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250

Please explain your answer

As we have outlined above, reluctantly, we believe that the premise on which these figures are based, of mass membership of 80,000 teachers in 10 years, is unrealistic and we have suggested a refocus on a smaller number of active members. This may make it possible to charge higher fees than these for the significant advantages, status and recognition that membership would represent.

Q12 Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

We believe that this level of fee is a realistic reflection of the costs of delivering accreditation through other members, and the costs of cover for their post whilst out of school. The cost for accreditation to enter a College which offers distinct

advantages would seem reasonable, and it may also be something that schools could consider paying in return for having a number of staff who are members of the College and the advantages and development it can bring to their practice as excellent teachers. It would be easier to justify the accreditation cost if it was associated with a recognised certification.

Q13 Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

We have outlined above our doubts about a model that relies on voluntary mentoring and the challenges this always encounters in the teaching profession. Of perhaps greater concern than the willingness of individuals to participate is the willingness of their employers to release them. We doubt that the extended mentoring proposal could work, but are positive about the more limited voluntary work in accreditation as we believe that to be an assessor would in itself demonstrate a certain level of progression and a high level of teaching expertise and knowledge which could be attractive to potential assessors.

Q14 Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

This might be problematic and it may be that there would need to be more assessors released once a year for an assessment. We could definitely encourage our members to release assessors from their schools.

National Association for Primary Education (NAPE)

The National Association for Primary Education brings together everyone who has a concern for the learning of children from birth to 13 years. Members and affiliated schools work to improve education through the early, primary and middle years.

NAPE strives to raise the profile of primary education and to achieve a higher priority in the nation's consideration of education and the allocation of human and other educational resources. The association is dedicated to the view that the quality of the growth and development of young children is vitally important to the achievement of successful learning and happiness in later life.

The National Association for Primary Education brings together everyone who has a concern for the learning of children from birth to 13 years. Members and affiliated schools work to improve education through the early, primary and middle years.

NAPE strives to raise the profile of primary education and to achieve a higher priority in the nation's consideration of education and the allocation of human and other educational resources. The association is dedicated to the view that the quality of the growth and development of young children is vitally important to the achievement of successful learning and happiness in later life.

Submission from NAPE to the commission concerned with setting up a College of Teaching

NAPE fully supports the idea of a College of Teaching and would want to help establish it as an influential force for improving children's learning and supporting teachers in their vital work in classrooms.

There are two strands of equal importance which NAPE views as imperatives to the establishment and maintenance of a College of Teaching.

The first strand is how a professional person can be described. In other words, professional educators:

- ~ see the needs of pupils/children as their prime concern
- ~ create and maintain correct, high quality working relationships with their pupils
- ~ use their skills and expertise for the benefit of their pupils
- ~ continue to acquire high levels of theoretical knowledge and breadth of experience
- ~ subscribe to a code of conduct which governs their professional behaviour
- ~ can explain with evidence and rigour learning pathways they have chosen for the benefit of their pupils

This should be the cornerstone on which a college is built. It is essential that the profession can describe in what ways it is professional. This helps to give practitioners confidence when describing, with rigour, the learning environment they have provided children in their care.

The second strand is to help ensure that all phases of education are regarded with equal importance, and that there is the recognition and understanding that children are not being prepared for the next phase but are part of a continuous, developmental and formative education.

In this respect it is essential that we establish right from the outset that associations such as NAPE (specialising in children in relation to school subjects) should be regarded by the College as ranking equally to subject associations.

The early and primary years maintained sectors must be well represented in the College of Teaching, and of equal importance to the secondary, further and higher phases in education. Therefore, when education is being nationally debated it is recognised that children's learning begins well before the age of eleven. Currently, the teaching profession suffers from fragmentation and such a college could serve to bind all phases together with the purpose of improving teaching and learning for all ages, ethnicities and backgrounds.

Once these two strands are clearly understood a College of Teaching can begin to establish its central purpose. It is there for the profession of teaching rather than the practice of it in a particular field. This will distinguish the college from subject associations. Teachers will then begin to see that they should seek membership which represents both aspects of their professionalism. This would undoubtedly have an effect on teachers' personal finances, but a strong case for the importance of the college and its association partners can be made.

NAPE views that a College of Teaching should serve several purposes, but not attempt to do too much. It needs to build a strong public profile which is authoritative and well regarded. For example, the present policy of accepting unqualified teachers in schools is an issue a College of Teaching would strongly resist. It should be concerned with ensuring its members are properly qualified, wish to engage in further professional development throughout their careers; and encourage research to inform the profession of new and better ways for children to learn. Evidence should not be limited to research however, but also emphasise a high regard for best practice and experience.

The proposed governance structure is accepted but attention must be drawn to the need for proportional representation of qualified teachers in the five phases of education on all boards and committees. A formal code of conduct which reassures the public should be written and made public. At present there seems to be no thought of re-establishing a General Teaching Council. There need to be rules governing membership, a register, which is publicly available, and a "professional statement" from all those who apply to join.

Over the past thirty years the role of schools has expanded enormously - not only to provide education but also: welfare, health & safety, equal opportunities, child protection and finance, to mention just a few. These are all now publicly understood to be schools' responsibilities. Support from local and central government has long since disappeared. Consequently, NAPE views that the advancement of teaching and children's learning would be greatly enhanced by an independent voice through a College of Teaching. As with medicine, engineering and law, the teaching profession deserves no less.

November 2013

The National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers (NASUWT)

The NASUWT (National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers) is the largest teachers' union in the UK and the only TUC-affiliated teachers' union to represent teachers in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. The Union organises in all sectors from early years to further education and represents teachers in all roles including heads and principals.

The NASUWT is a trade union with a proud history and a tradition of making a difference. Its mission is to create the conditions that enable teachers to secure the best educational opportunities for all children and young people. The NASUWT's mission is imprinted with values - equality, democracy, justice and solidarity; all of these are the hallmarks of an inclusive and progressive society and the key ingredients for quality public education.



**A new member-driven College of Teaching: A blueprint for
discussion
31 July 2013**

1. The NASUWT welcomes the opportunity to respond to the discussion document *A new member-driven College of Teaching: A blueprint for discussion*.
2. The NASUWT is the largest teachers' union representing teachers and school leaders in the UK.

GENERAL COMMENTS

3. The NASUWT has profound concerns about the proposals set out on behalf of the Prince's Teaching Institute to establish a College of Teaching.
4. The discussion document sets out a blueprint for how a College of Teaching might function, including its role in setting standards, enhancing professional development and collecting evidence to inform policy, standards and practice. It also sets out proposals for a governance structure and possible arrangements for membership of a College. This indicates that key decisions about what a College of Teaching would look like have already been made. If the consultation is genuinely about the principle of a College of Teaching, then the only appropriate questions at this stage are: should there be a College of Teaching and, if so, why and what should it do?

5. It is profoundly unhelpful at this stage to propose a specific model for what a College of Teaching might look like. At this time, any decision should be limited to matters of principle rather than specific design until such time that it is clear that there is broad support in principle for the concept.
6. If a College of Teaching is genuinely intended to be teaching-led, then practising teachers need to be actively involved in debates and discussions about the need for the College and its aims and purposes. The current approach does not do this. While teachers and headteachers are able to contribute to online surveys, these are likely to have limited reach. Significantly, the Commission set up to consider the strategic case for a College of Teaching comprises headteachers, academics and senior officials from education bodies but excludes practising teachers. Further, while there is a teachers' panel made up of a small group of teachers, there is no evidence that the Commission is taking active steps to engage with practising teachers more generally.
7. The NASUWT believes that the Commission must consult practising teachers widely and their views must inform decisions about the case for and strategic direction of a College of Teaching. This view is supported by witnesses giving evidence to the Education Select Committee on a College of Teaching.²
8. The NASUWT must restate its profound disappointment that the Prince's Teaching Institute has chosen to ignore the advice of the NASUWT that the Commission should not include any representatives of teacher trade unions and should instead seek to engage with all unions on an equitable basis through the evidence submission process. The presence of a representative of one teaching union on the Commission has unfortunately created circumstances in which the views and perspectives of that union could be unduly privileged over that of others, thereby placing the credibility and integrity of the Commission's work at serious risk.

² House of Commons, Uncorrected Transcript of Oral Evidence, *Great Teachers Follow-Up: College of Teaching*, Wednesday 17 July 2013.

9. The proposed roles and purposes of a College of Teaching remain unclear. The NASUWT is extremely concerned that very different and conflicting notions of the purpose of a College of Teaching have begun to emerge. The idea of a College of Teaching lacks conceptual clarity. The Commission should be clear about what the College should be and what it should do. Again, this concern is supported by evidence given to the Education Select Committee inquiry into a College of Teaching. For example, some of those giving evidence saw a College of Teaching as a refuge from political interference. Others saw a College as providing a career structure for the profession. Some witnesses saw a College of Teaching setting standards for the teaching profession, including regulating the profession, and providing a career structure. Others saw it as playing a central role in bringing teacher representative groups together, for example, subject associations. Some witnesses suggested that those with an interest in teaching, and not just practising teachers, might become members of a College of Teaching. Others saw a College of Teaching as a provider of CPD or providing a CPD quality kite mark.³
10. There is a serious risk of interpreting support for the idea of a College of Teaching as constituting support for the establishment of a particular form of organisation despite different and conflicting assumptions about the role and purpose of a College.
11. The NASUWT is particularly concerned that the development of the idea of a College of Teaching has already been the subject of political interference which will be highly damaging to its prospects for success. There is clear evidence that the Secretary of State sees the creation of a College of Teaching as an opportunity to undermine teacher unions. In a speech at a National College of Teaching and Leadership conference in April 2013, the Secretary of State launched an unprovoked and aggressive attack on teacher unions, suggesting that the College of Teaching would be a better alternative to the teaching unions

³ Ibid.

and 'that the time is right for a new body to act as a voice for the whole teaching profession'.⁴

12. These statements by the Secretary of State raise serious concerns about the independence of the College of Teaching Commission and its draft blueprint. These comments demonstrate that a College of Teaching would not be independent of the present Government and is being positioned as a tool to undermine teacher unions. This is wholly unacceptable and it is also regrettable that neither the Prince's Teaching Institute nor the members of the Commission have raised any public objections to these comments by the Secretary of State.

13. The NASUWT has argued elsewhere that that the establishment of an effective College of Teaching depends on the concept being clear and coherent and for the conditions under which a College of Teaching is established being appropriate and conducive. The Commission must recognise that the current conditions for establishing a College of Teaching are not conducive or appropriate.

14. The OECD has confirmed that there are at least four areas that policy makers must address in order to build a teaching profession that is able to meet the challenges of the 21st century and maintain world class education systems.⁵ These are:

- 'making teaching an attractive profession...not just through pay, but by raising the status of teaching, offering real career prospects, and giving teachers responsibility as professionals and leaders of reform...this requires teacher education that helps teachers to become innovators and researchers in education, not just deliverers of the curriculum...'
- taking steps to ensure that all teachers have an entitlement and access to 'effective development...through longer programs that upgrade... qualifications or that involve collaborative research into improving teaching effectiveness...'

⁴ Speech to National College of Teaching and Leadership, 25 April 2013 downloadable from: www.gov.uk/government/speeches/michael-gove-speech-to-teachers-and-headteachers-at-the-national-college-for-teaching-and-leadership.

⁵ Cited in NASUWT (2013) *Maintaining World Class Schools*, NASUWT, Rednal.

- ensuring that ‘appraisal and feedback is supportive in a way that is welcomed by teachers...lead[ing] to self-improvement and [involving] teachers in improving schools’ with systems of teacher compensation that are ‘fair, based on multiple measures, and transparently applied in ways that involve the teaching profession...’
- engaging ‘teachers in the planning and implementation of reform...moving beyond consultation to involvement [and] transforming schools into learning organisations, with teaching professionals in the lead’.⁶

15. None of these building blocks and conditions are in place.

16. Conditions for enabling high-quality teaching in the 21st century require that:

- teachers must be trusted as qualified professionals;
- teachers need to be free to collaborate as professionals in order to develop and improve teaching and learning outcomes;
- there should be social dialogue between the Government and teachers’ unions;
- teachers should be empowered to design and implement the curriculum;
- teacher preparation should be rooted in knowledge, theory and skills;
- teachers need a meaningful entitlement to ongoing professional development and support;
- teachers need to have time to reflect on their practice as professionals and to work collaboratively with other teachers;
- teachers’ pay and conditions should reflect their professional status; and
- accountability should operate on the basis of trust and support teachers as professionals.

17. Current education policy reforms in England are undermining teacher quality, de-professionalising teachers and removing the fundamental conditions set out above.

⁶ Ibid.

18. The College of Teaching proposals will not fix the problems created by Coalition Government policies and are in danger of being corrupted as a result of these other developments. A College established on the basis set out in the blueprint cannot offer teachers a refuge from the policies that undermine their status and limit their professional agency. Seeking to create a College of Teaching at this point in time risks undermining its effectiveness in the long term. Establishing a College of Teaching that has limited prospects of success could, if it fails, also be highly detrimental to the teaching profession as whole.
19. The Union notes that advocates of a College have sought to draw comparisons between a College of Teaching and the Royal College of Surgeons. While accepting that crude transplantation of the medical Colleges model to teaching would be undesirable, it is clear that many proponents of the College of Teaching are using the medical Colleges as a conceptual starting point.
20. However, there are important distinctions between the regulatory arrangements for teachers and surgeons that serve to highlight the profound difficulties that are at present likely to confront attempts to establish an effective and coherent College of Teaching.
21. In particular, it is important to note that while surgeons are required to register with the General Medical Council (GMC), qualified teachers, since the abolition of the General Teaching Council for England (GTCE), have no statutory regulator. It is therefore the case that that membership of the Royal College of Surgeons is restricted to those who are members of the GMC and comply with its regulatory requirements. Therefore, unless an individual is registered with the GMC as a surgeon and adheres to its national practice standards, he or she cannot be accepted into membership of the Royal College of Surgeons. This provides an important professional underpinning to the College and thereby enhances its status and influence.
22. However, current arrangements in relation to teaching are very different. As a direct result of Coalition Government policy, common qualification and practice standards, backed by effective national regulatory arrangements, are absent.

Teaching posts in state-funded schools can now be undertaken by staff without a professional teaching qualification and there are no national professional standards by which the practice and conduct of all individuals in teaching roles can be regulated on a statutory basis.

23. These considerations serve to emphasise the fact that meaningful work to establish a College of Teaching cannot precede action to place teaching on an appropriately-regulated, professional footing in all sectors, both state-funded and independent. Rather than enhance the status of the profession, attempts to establish a College without an effective framework for the regulation and accreditation of teaching would simply serve to undermine the standing of teaching in comparison with medicine and other professions that operate within coherent national frameworks for regulation and professional standards.

24. It should also be noted that the Royal College of Surgeons operates in a context where the legitimacy and distinctiveness of the trade union functions undertaken by the British Medical Association (BMA) on behalf of surgeons and other medical professionals is recognised and respected. However, as confirmed elsewhere in this response, it is clear that the objective of the current Secretary of State is to use the creation of a College of Teaching to undermine teacher trade unions. It is therefore difficult to envisage how a College of Teaching with a role and status comparable with that of the Royal College of Surgeons might be established in circumstances where Government policy is to attempt to use it as a means of pursuing an unambiguously anti-teacher trade union agenda.

25. The NASUWT therefore takes the view that steps to establish a College of Teaching are, at best, premature given the range of circumstances that prevail currently. The proposal does not and cannot address the fundamental issues critical to the success of a College of Teaching.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

26. The NASUWT believes that it would be most appropriate for the College of Teaching Commission to focus its energies on challenging the Coalition

Government's current national education policy reforms and establishing and promoting an alternative vision of education that is based on trust and teacher professionalism. Attention needs to be paid to establishing a common vision and building alliances to promote that vision.

Is there a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching?

27. The NASUWT does not consider it appropriate to establish a College of Teaching at this point in time. However, the Union would not be opposed in principle to the creation of a College of Teaching in the future as long as specific conditions were met.
28. The role and remit of a College of Teaching would need to be very carefully defined. The body could not and should not undertake functions that are carried out by teacher unions and other organisations. There would be a groundswell of opinion and resistance to a College of Teaching that teachers were expected to join but that sought also to displace the teacher unions. Further, a body that cannot operate and be seen to operate independently of Government would also be resisted by teachers.
29. The NASUWT would need to be actively engaged and consulted on an equal basis with other organisations on the development of a College of Teaching. This is patently not the case with the current proposals, wherein one union has been given a privileged seat on the Commission.
30. The NASUWT believes that there is a debate to be had on the establishment of a College of Teaching rather than on the setting up of a College of *Teachers*. The Union does not recognise the proposition that a College of Teaching would be 'member-driven' and regards this as a veiled attempt to present the College idea as a College of Teachers. A College of Teaching that is focused on the practice of teaching and improving pedagogy could, however, have a role, including in the sharing of practice, commissioning research on pedagogy, the development of programmes of continuing professional development (CPD) and in the signposting of sources of quality CPD

31. A College of Teaching that is focused on supporting high quality pedagogy must put structures in place to ensure that practising classroom teachers are engaged in discussion and decision-making at all levels. They should, for example, be the largest group of members on the College of Teaching board. Regrettably, the composition of the Commission itself has excluded meaningful representation from among practicing teachers who have, instead, been relegated to a side committee.
32. At face value, some education systems appear to have established a college of teaching model that is based on trust and gives teachers control over regulation and professional standards. However, evidence from unions points to a very different picture in practice. For example, the Ontario College of Teachers (OCT) has a remit to regulate the teaching profession in Ontario. This includes developing teacher standards and developing and accrediting qualifications for membership of the College including initial teacher training programmes and teachers' continuing professional development (CPD). However, feedback from the Ontario Teachers' Federation (OTF) indicates that the provincial government is influencing developments at the OCT that undermine teacher professionalism and directly attacks unions. For instance, the teacher standards developed by the OCT have been developed into a detailed set of competencies which are used for more punitive purposes. Also, while there was general opposition to a recent provincial government proposal to increase the length of teacher training from one to two years, the OCT is proceeding and establishing a two-year training programme. Further, legislative changes have been introduced which mean that unions are not able to nominate representatives to sit on the OCT Council and that members of the Council must not have contact with unions.
33. The NASUWT would also like to draw attention to developments in the further education sector and, specifically, the development of the Education and Training Foundation (ETF). The ETF is being established as an employer-led organisation. Decisions about the role and remit of the ETF and about standards for the profession are being made by employers. The proposed standards are based on a managerial concept of professionalism, including, for example, standards on appearance and dress codes. They fit with a high-stakes and

punitive model of accountability and do not recognise the need for teachers and lecturers to take the lead in making decisions about matters that affect them and their professional status. The NASUWT opposes the development of the ETF and believes that the example provides further evidence of the risks involved in attempting to create a College of Teaching: teachers may end up having very little say in defining their professional status and others may control how they can contribute to College decision-making processes.

34. The discussion document sets out proposals to develop a College of Teaching that is *for* teachers. However, as set out above, policy reforms mean that schools are no longer required to employ teachers with QTS. The NASUWT notes with serious concern the suggestion by the Commission that eligibility for membership of a College of Teaching would be relatively unrestricted. This raises questions about whether a College of Teaching would have any currency with teachers and how it would help to raise teachers' professional status.
35. If a College is to focus on supporting high quality teaching then it may be appropriate to consider whether the College should limit membership to teachers. For instance, a College of Teaching might support other staff in schools who deliver or support teaching and learning. In particular, it will be appropriate for debates on the College of Teaching concept to consider wider membership issues in more detail, including whether or not the College should be open to Teaching Assistants, Learning Support Staff and headteachers or principals who do not teach and whether other school support staff might also become members of a College.
36. The NASUWT believes that the principles upon which a College of Teaching would be based should include a clear statement of the moral and intellectual expectations of college members. The moral expectations might be best expressed in the form of values. The Union believes that the statement should refer to the importance of inclusive practice and of being committed to challenging discrimination, addressing inequalities, advancing equality and promoting community and social cohesion. The statement should also make it clear that members of organisations such as the British National Party (BNP), the

English Defence League (EDL) and other organisations that stir up racial and religious hatred should be barred from membership of a College.

Proposed College of Teaching Vision

37. The NASUWT believes that the vision for a College of Teaching as set out in the draft blueprint has engendered confusion and ambiguity. There are now competing visions about what a College of Teaching would be and how it would relate to existing organisations for teachers. This lack of clarity was reflected in oral evidence given in July 2013 to the House of Commons Education Select Committee Inquiry into this issue.⁷

38. This emphasises the stress placed in this submission on the need for more coherent and meaningful consideration to be given to the aims and purposes of a College of Teaching.

Should the College of Teaching aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

39. The NASUWT believes that whilst a College of Teaching could be an authoritative voice on teaching practice, it could not and should not act as a voice for the profession. The NASUWT would oppose any proposal that would allow a College of Teaching to be regarded in this way.

40. The NASUWT believes that the work to develop a College of Teaching on a credible basis would need to give consideration to whether there is a case for establishing more than one College focused on issues of teaching and learning. For example, it might be worthwhile exploring the merits of distinct Colleges to act as authoritative voices for the teaching of reading, mathematics or other subject disciplines.

Should membership of the College of Teaching be voluntary?

⁷ House of Commons Education Select Committee (2013). *op. cit.*

41. The NASUWT believes that membership of a College of Teaching must be voluntary.

42. Forcing teachers to join a College of Teaching would be likely to create significant opposition on their part and would thereby undermine the aims and objectives that proponents of a College believe that its introduction would secure in practice. The College would not be a regulatory body and therefore could not seek to mirror the practice of the former General Teaching Council for England (GTCE).

What should be the most important activities of a College of Teaching?

43. The NASUWT believes that a College of Teaching should focus on:

- providing access to training, professional development;
- identifying, including commissioning, research to promote high quality teaching; and
- sharing professional practice.

44. The NASUWT considers the five professional areas cited in the discussion document to be areas that underpin effective teaching practice. The Union believes that a further area: 'Professional attitudes: commitment to promote equality, diversity and inclusion and challenge discrimination and injustice through teaching and teaching practice' needs to be added. Studies have highlighted this as an area where teachers, especially those new to the profession, would welcome more support (e.g. teaching pupils with special educational needs (SEN) or teaching pupils from 'diverse backgrounds')⁸ There is also an important moral dimension to this sixth area which needs to be reflected through high-quality teaching practice. Further, international evidence shows that high performing education systems have greater levels of equity than other systems.⁹

⁸ For example, Owen, K.; Broadhurst, K. and Keats, G. (2009) *Sink or Swim? Learning Lessons from Newly Qualified and Recently Qualified Teachers*. NASUWT; Birmingham

⁹ OECD (2012), *Equity and Quality in Education: Supporting Disadvantaged Students and Schools*, OECD, Paris.

Is the proposed mentoring structure a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

45. The proposed College of Teaching mentoring model is unworkable and could not be introduced unless and until the underlying conditions of service referenced elsewhere in this submission are addressed, including ensuring that all teachers have a contractual entitlement to CPD. Many teachers encounter substantial difficulties in securing time within the working day to undertake professional development activities. Even teachers whose jobs include providing mentoring and support experience difficulties in securing time to undertake this work. For example, an Ofsted report on the work of Advanced Skills Teachers (ASTs)¹⁰ found that some ASTs, particularly those working in primary schools and in local authorities where there was little support from the local authority encountered difficulties in carrying out their wider support role.

Will the tiered membership and certification process outlined enhance teachers' professional learning?

46. The NASUWT questions the principle of a tiered model of membership of a College of Teaching posited on the basis that eligibility for Associate Status would be provided to persons who are not qualified teachers and who are not enrolled on a programme leading to QTS. The Union does not believe that this will promote or enhance teachers' professional learning. In the context of policy reforms that are de-professionalising teachers, the proposal is likely to exacerbate inequalities and diminish the status of a College.

47. In the absence of provision to ensure that all teachers have a contractual entitlement to time for CPD, the vast majority of teachers would be unlikely to be able to meet the criteria for membership beyond the minimum requirement.

48. It is inappropriate to propose a membership structure that requires teachers to undertake between two and five days of College activities. As indicated above, teachers already encounter significant difficulties in getting time to undertake

¹⁰ Ofsted (2003) *Advanced Skills Teachers: An HMI Survey*, Ofsted, London

training and professional development. Further, the changes that the Coalition Government is seeking to make to the School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document (STPCD), including the removal of teachers' entitlement of 10% time for planning, preparation and assessment (PPA), would, if implemented, almost certainly exacerbate the problem. If a College makes participation in mentoring a requirement of membership, then the College is likely to become the preserve of teachers occupying leadership positions in schools and a select group of teachers working in enlightened schools. A College may also attract a small number of teachers who are willing to participate in College activities in their own time. However, this will almost certainly raise equality concerns as those who, for example, have caring responsibilities are likely to be prevented from becoming involved.

How important is it for the College of Teaching to seek to inform practice with evidence?

49. The NASUWT believes that a College of Teaching should identify, commission and promote the findings of research about high-quality teaching. Therefore, the NASUWT agrees with the reference in the discussion document that an important function of a College of Teaching 'should be to clarify and disseminate the science of education' and 'recognise and celebrate the art and craft of the classroom'.

Should the college seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

50. The NASUWT does not believe that a College of Teaching should advise policy makers on curriculum, assessment or school improvement matters. The remit of the College of Teaching should focus on supporting and developing the practice of teaching.

The proposed organisational and governance structure

51. It is inappropriate to discuss the organisational and governance structure of a College of Teaching when it is unclear whether there is support from teachers for a College. Nevertheless, the NASUWT would observe that the model proposed by the Prince's Teaching Institute is seriously flawed and in the current circumstances, not fit for implementation.

Membership rates, certification costs, mentoring and schools' willingness to release teachers for College functions

52. It is inappropriate to discuss membership rates and certification costs when it is unclear whether there is support for a College of Teaching. If there is support for a College of Teaching then discussion about membership rates, certification costs and mentoring should only take place after extensive consultation with classroom teachers about the purpose and functions of the proposed College. Nevertheless, the NASUWT does not regard the proposed model as fit for implementation.

53. The NASUWT believes that it is right that a College should be financially self-supporting and that revenue should come from charging members a membership fee. However, the costs of establishing the organisation and developing and maintaining support are considerable and membership fees would not cover these costs in the first few years. Therefore, it is difficult to see how a College could be sustainable without obtaining funds from external bodies. The NASUWT would be totally opposed to a College obtaining funds from the Government or other organisations that attach conditions to the use of funds as this would be likely to compromise its independence.

Ms Chris Keates

General Secretary

For further information on the Union's response, contact Sonja Hall, Principal Official (Education).

NASUWT

Hillscourt Education Centre

Rose Hill, Rednal

Birmingham

B45 8RS

0121 453 6150

www.nasuwt.org.uk

nasuwt@mail.nasuwt.org.uk

National Education Trust (NET)

The National Education Trust (NET) is an independent charitable foundation dedicated to leading and sharing excellent practice and innovation in education. We harness our extensive national and international experience to bring about improvements for learners, from early years to university entrance. We assist education leaders and practitioners in sustaining success and tackling underperformance. Our knowledge and expertise enable us to lead and support policy reform, rooted in what works in the classroom.

An on-going priority for NET is closing ‘the achievement gap’, a stubborn feature of our education system. Working with schools, the third sector, local and national government, and other education agencies, we are at the forefront of initiatives to improve educational outcomes for all.



National Education Trust
Response to June 2013 Discussion Document:
A new member-driven College of Teaching.

Q1: Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching?

The time has come; the profession needs to take back the pedagogical and fundamental processes and then to be able to articulate what is happening in schools so that there is no vacuum, next time, for the politicians. There are however concerns that the vision for a College of Teaching, whilst laudable, takes little account of the current context. The Secretary of State has just established the new National College for Teaching and Learning which will provide accreditation, CPD and regulatory powers. Teaching Schools will increasingly have a role for ITT and CPD, and some already offer mentoring/support for NQTs.

Q2: Do you agree with this Vision?

The vision for a College of Teaching is laudable and we agree with the principles behind it. However as noted above, we are concerned that the vision takes little account of the current context.

Q3: Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

There is nothing more important than for the College to do this. It is however difficult to see, in the current context, how a College of Teaching with voluntary membership and no regulatory powers will attract a sufficiently large proportion of teachers to be perceived to be representative.

Q4: Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary?

Membership has to be voluntary, at least in the first years of the College's existence. There will be much to do to win hearts and minds in raising standards, developing innovation and creativity etc.!

Q5: What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

Providing a voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research is important. We would like to see the College play a role closer to that of the BMA - with regulatory powers as well. This might mean developing a 'Hippocratic' oath for teachers committing to sharing professional knowledge and improving collective practice to the benefit of children and young people; all NQTs should be automatically enrolled.

Q6: Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

Yes.

Q7: Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined **will enhance teachers' professional learning?**

In the current context this will not necessarily provide anything new. The Secretary of State has just established the new National College for Teaching and Learning which will provide accreditation,

CPD and regulatory powers. In addition, Teaching Schools will increasingly have a role for ITT and CPD, and some already offer mentoring/support for NQTs.

In addition, there may well be too little emphasis on two further areas: curriculum innovation and creativity and the wider school community - work with governors and parents.

Q8: How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

The profession is not regarded as one that readily uses the best evidence available and is often forced to react to spurious or biased 'evidence' from central government. So it is very important that the College makes this a main platform of its work. No doubt the work at York, the London Institute, Bath Spa etc. in the UK and that of international researchers will inform the College on how best to proceed in partnership with researchers.

Q9: Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Yes, this will be important.

Q10: Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

Agreed.

Q11: Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates a) or b):

This is difficult to assess. We cannot see large numbers of teachers (who may already subscribe to a professional association and a subject association) opting to pay an additional membership fee. What will they get for it? We don't hear a great clamour of demand for a College from teachers in schools. The College of Teaching will need to prove itself so maybe automatic, free membership is needed for the first two or three years.

Q12: Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

As above.

Q13: Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

In many cases, this is the practice that some groups or partnerships of schools are already operating.

Q14: Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

Yes.

The National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)

NFER (National Foundation for Educational Research) is a charity and the UK's largest independent provider of research, assessment and information for education, training and children's services. Founded in 1946, we exist to provide evidence that contributes to excellence in education. We aim for our research to have a positive impact on children and young people by ensuring that it is relevant and useful, both to policymakers and to those practitioners who work directly with them.

Each year, we undertake over 100 projects for approximately 50 clients in the public, voluntary and commercial sectors. Our expert staff provide bespoke research and evaluation designs using a variety of review, qualitative and quantitative methods, and have a wealth of experience engaging and representing the views of young people. We are also experienced in presenting accessible policy and practice messages to help our clients to develop their interventions and programmes further, and support practitioners to further develop their practice.

College of Teaching Consultation

NFER Submission:

Q8 How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

There is a growing movement (Levin, 2013; Goldacre, 2013; Sharples, 2013) to recognise the importance of basing teaching practice upon the most rigorous and comprehensive evidence base possible. The Education Endowment Foundation (Higgins *et al.*, 2013) believes that educational research can equip schools to choose between, and implement, strategies to improve their practice as effectively as possible.

The role of the College in collating and reviewing the weight of evidence, sharing knowledge and providing forums for debate will be very important in directly informing practice with evidence and indirectly shaping practice through informing and challenging policymakers.

The National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) believes in the fundamental importance of providing teachers with the evidence they need, and the skills they need to interpret research, so they can transform teaching into an evidence-based profession. Informing practice with evidence is more than disseminating research findings; it involves knowledge mobilisation (the transfer of research generated knowledge into classroom practice). We believe that knowledge mobilisation (KMb) is critical to the future improvement of teaching practice; and we have developed a 'KMb: theory of change' as a starting point for further discussion. We are currently conducting a rapid review of knowledge mobilisation within the teaching profession. This will cover for example, what factors facilitate/hinder teachers':

- belief in the value of research/evidence
- access and use of research/evidence
- utilisation of research/evidence (including transformation)
- doing of their own research.

The review will also draw out evaluations of the effectiveness of such approaches as they relate to: successful access and use of research/evidence; effective utilisation of research/evidence (including transformation) and positive models of teachers doing their own research.

Sue Rossiter, NFER's Chief Executive highlighted recently in her blog: 'Is 'what works' enough? 'knowing what works is only part of the answer. Knowing why, how and when something works is perhaps more important; and knowing what you need to do to try this out in your own school or service and being motivated and supported to do so are critical'.

NFER have created a new Impact Team in order to act as a catalyst for the transformation of NFER's and others' evidence so that it is useful to practitioners and policy makers for the benefit of learners. We produce syntheses of ours and others' evidence and publish our evidence-based views on current policy and practice through 'NFER Thinks'. (See, for example, 'Key stage 4 policy reform and its potential impact on at-risk young people'

(Maughan, 2013) and 'Improving young people's engagement with science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM)' (Straw and Macleod, 2013).) Furthermore, through our Research Programme we carry out research on educational topics where we consider there are gaps in the evidence base and where we can make a real difference to the lives of learners. We understand the importance of presenting research outputs in ways that are useful to practitioners and increasingly provide guidelines for effective practice and 'top tips' for embedding evidence in practice. We are scoping research currently to identify the characteristics of outputs from research that are best at engaging teachers and promoting the use of outputs to improve classroom practice.

Informing practice with evidence is a two-way process – it connects research and practice so that each informs the other. We take our relationship with schools very seriously and are keen to listen to their concerns and areas of practice where they would like more guidance about what works in the classroom. Research informs practice and practitioners can feed back and highlight key areas in need of further research.

In conclusion, we feel it is very important that the College seeks to inform practice with evidence. We believe that as the College will be run by teachers for teachers, it will be in the ideal position to directly inform teachers and teaching with evidence; teachers must also have their say on what topics they feel are important and they want researched. As the leading provider of independent educational research in the country, we are keen to work with the College in this endeavour.

References

- Goldacre, B. (2013). *Building Evidence into Education* [online]. Available: <http://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/b/ben%20goldacre%20paper.pdf%E2%80%A6> [29 July, 2013].
- Higgins, S., Katsipatakis, M., Kokotsaki, D., Coleman, R., Major, L.E., & Coe, R. (2013). *The Sutton Trust-Education Endowment Foundation Teaching and Learning Toolkit*. London: Education Endowment Foundation [online]. Available: <http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/toolkit/about-the-toolkit/> [29 July, 2013].
- Levin, B. (2013). 'To know is not enough: research knowledge and its use', *Review of Education*, 1, 1, 2–31.
- Maughan, S. (2013). *Key Stage 4 Policy Reform and its Potential Impact on At-Risk Young People* (NFER Thinks: What the Evidence Tells Us). Slough: NFER [online]. Available: <http://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/99925/> [29 July, 2013].
- Sharples, J. (2013). *Evidence for the Frontline: A Report for the Alliance for Useful Evidence*. London: Alliance for Useful Evidence [online]. Available: <http://www.alliance4usefulevidence.org/assets/EVIDENCE-FOR-THE-FRONTLINE-FINAL-5-June-2013.pdf> [29 July, 2013].
- Straw, S. and Macleod, S. (2013). *Improving Young People's Engagement with Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)* (NFER Thinks: What the Evidence Tells Us). Slough: NFER [online]. Available: <http://www.nfer.ac.uk/nfer/publications/99927/99927.pdf> [29 July, 2013].

National Union of Teachers (NUT)

With over 325,000 members, the National Union of Teachers is the largest teachers' organisation in Europe. The NUT recruits into membership only those who are qualifying or have qualified as teachers and has promoted consistently the idea that the educational interests of children and the needs of teachers are synonymous. It has members working in all phases and sectors of education, including in local authority advisory, inspection and support services, who contribute to the development of NUT policy.



THE RESPONSE OF THE NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS TO THE COLLEGE OF TEACHING: A BLUEPRINT FOR DISCUSSION

July 2013

The National Union of Teachers (NUT) recognises the particular importance of the existence of bodies that speak for teachers and for education, at this time when teachers feel so undervalued and morale in the teaching profession is at dangerously low levels. This was reflected starkly in the results of an NUT-commissioned You Gov survey that was published at the turn of 2013. This saw more than half (55%) of teachers describe their morale as low or very low, an increase of 13% since teachers were asked the same question in April 2012. The later survey also found 69% of teachers reporting a decline in their morale since the last general election.

We are proud to speak for teachers, on the basis of reporting views of our members based in schools, colleges and other educational settings. We promote a positive policy view on curriculum issues and the routes to educational improvement in addition to our role of strongly promoting the rights of teachers as employees and professionals.

Together, the teacher organisations represent 97 % of teachers. Whilst the NUT welcomes all debate about how the status of the profession can be improved, and has no surprise that the calls for a College of Teaching have reached their height at this time. It is this Government's determination to denigrate teacher unions and impose its own ideological view of education and teaching, divorced from an evidence base, which has strengthened the desire to look for new ways of asserting the professionalism of teachers.

Q1. Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching?

The NUT therefore believes that if there is a role for another member-driven body, it is as a result of the frustration that teachers feel that their own member-driven bodies are not listened to. We are unsure whether the establishment of a new College of Teaching would have the effect or influence which the authors of the discussion document suggest. The experience of the GTCE may be salutary. Despite the GTCE's research and lobbying on assessment methodologies as an independent body, this did not prevent "*governments stepping into the vacuum to define professional practice*" (page 5).

In addition, it was significant that one of the first educational priorities of the current Government was to dismantle the GTCE on the grounds that "*this organisation does little to*

raise teaching standards or professionalism"¹¹ and to portray it as a bureaucratic quango rather than as an organisation which aimed to engage teachers in raising standards across the education system. This meant that England is now the only country in the UK that has no national independent body for teachers and no unifying code of professional values or practice.

The NUT would argue that this was a prime example of the trend towards disempowering and de-professionalising teachers, which has continued to characterise Government education policy. The College should be prepared to find that, if it adheres to the vision and values outlined in the discussion document, it will be criticised as soon as it takes a position contrary to Government policy and that the presentation of independent evidence to support this alternative view will be ignored or ridiculed, as the teaching unions and many academics have already found.

There is certainly a need for advocacy on several aspects of teacher professionalism, such as access to and career support from professional development; evidence-informed practice; and engagement in research. These are currently left up to the individual teacher or school to pursue if they so choose. This approach sends a clear message that such activities are not seen as valuable or critical to systemic improvement, again reflecting the trend towards de-professionalism.

The discussion document helpfully contains examples of other professional bodies to support its case. It is notable, however, that unlike these examples, the Government would continue to hold responsibility for two key functions, "*standards of performance*" and training requirements for those entering the profession, suggesting that teachers are trusted less than other professions in these respects and that the College, if established, would have less responsibilities or powers than comparable bodies.

It is important also to note the key differences with other professional bodies, one of which is that the professions which have a Royal College do not also tend to have a sector-specific trade union to represent and advocate on their behalf. The specialist trade unions which represent the teaching profession, on the other hand, are long-standing, well-established organisations which have clearly defined roles and considerable professional knowledge and expertise. The NUT would hope that a College of Teaching would respect those roles and work with the trade unions to present a consistent and coherent narrative on teacher professionalism.

Q2. Do you agree with this Vision?

The proposal that the core purpose of the College should be concerned with the quality of education for learners should achieve a wide consensus, as it is the moral imperative that attracts and retains many in the profession. A passion for teaching and the feeling of "making a difference" can sustain teachers throughout their careers.

¹¹ <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2010/jun/02/general-teaching-council-england-abolished>

England needs an antidote to the Government's current presentation of teaching as a "craft" that can be picked up by being in school and observing others. The description of the profession in the discussion document "*that deeply human quality of great teaching deep knowledge and skill which underpins inspiring teaching*" as well as the identification of the complex mixture of skills needed by a teacher "*the breadth of technical, intellectual, professional and personal capacities that we expect from teachers is extraordinary*" (page 5) sets out the College's position clearly and will have resonance with the profession.

However, unfortunately we cannot agree that establishment of the College "*will change the educational orthodoxy to one in which standards are determined by teachers and based in evidence, not determined by political cycle*" (page 6). As discussed above, no political party would transfer these responsibilities currently because they are considered central to their ability to implement their education policies. It seems extremely unlikely that the legislation which would be needed to make this aspect of the Vision a reality would gain widespread support. The College should not mistake the Secretary of State's words of support for its establishment as a genuine endorsement of its Vision. Unfortunately, he has made clear that he sees it as supportive of his own political objectives "*as a voice for the profession in competition with unions*"¹², which he assumes will be uncritical of his initiatives rather than a body which truly reflects the views of the profession.

We also believe that it is somewhat misleading to suggest that the impetus for establishing a College has been driven by the profession generally. A proposal for a Royal College of Teaching appeared as a recommendation by the Education Select Committee in its 2012 report on the recruitment, retention and training of teachers¹³. It has subsequently been widely promoted by one of the members of that Committee. Whilst teachers are frustrated that their views as represented by the NUT and other democratic membership organisations are generally ignored by Government, many would prefer a change in that approach to their views rather than the creation of a new body, in particular one with the costs set out in the document.

The NUT does have concerns about some of the terminology used in the Vision and the ambiguity of several sections within it. It is unclear, for example, what "*advancing teacher standards*" (page 6) actually means. The teaching profession is constantly told that it is not good enough, and this section of the Vision could be interpreted in a similar way, especially as some of the language used in it echoes that used by Government, such as "*embody most rigorous standards*". Whilst it is indeed theoretically possible for a whole new system of 'standards' to be developed, it would be difficult to develop a different clear vision of these as distinct from the new Teacher Standards which are being considered, sometimes in unreasonably bureaucratic detail, in schools across England. The College must be explicit about how its Vision (and its general operation) would be different from the statutory Teacher Standards and how these would in practice relate to appraisal.

Similarly, "*developing and recognising excellent teachers*" could be misinterpreted in a managerial rather than developmental way as the language used is so close to that used by Government to describe new pay policy arrangements. In addition, the NUT would argue

¹² <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2013/apr/25/michael-gove-royal-college-teaching-unions>

¹³ <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmeduc/1515/151502.htm>

that this should also be a central purpose of national and local government as well as individual schools – all of these, in different ways, have such responsibilities towards teachers.

There is ambiguity about whether this would be a College for all teachers or just for some. The discussion document says *“teachers nationally will aspire to become members”* (page 6) (NUT emphasis) but then in the next paragraph it says the Vision is to have *“a college with widespread membership”*. Throughout the discussion document there is a degree of alternation between a “something for everyone” organisation and one which requires time and effort before being eligible for inclusion in it.

Finally, the NUT would suggest that the College should be very clear about what it means by the terms “professional” and “professionalism”, as both of these have been misappropriated by successive governments to support their own reforms and as part of the language of modernising public sector services. This is evidenced by Labour’s “new professionalism” and the Coalition Government’s “effective teaching”, both of which are designed to achieve desired educational inputs and outputs. Part of this misappropriation has been the emerging view that initial teacher education and CPD should be practical as opposed to theoretical and school-based rather than HEI-informed. A key question for teachers would be, where does the College sit in this political landscape? Would its activities reflect this view or take a much broader approach, which could be termed “active professionalism” and which would blend practice with participation in research and theoretical studies?

Q3. Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

The NUT understands that this would be a key aim of the College and sees that the voice of the College could join other authoritative voices. The difficulty for the College will be establishing its view as any more valuable or representative. On the figures put forward in this paper, membership is assumed at 80,000. That is of course less than a quarter of the NUT’s membership and a far smaller proportion of teacher union members.

The College has to consider fully its relationship with the teacher unions, which also offer “an authoritative voice” based on member views and on research evidence. Teachers choose which union will speak for them based on that union’s values and whether its activities and “public face” reflect their own priorities. Will College members be able to say the same or will the College take a “one size fits all” approach and by attempting to please all teachers, fail to reflect the complexity and diversity of the profession’s views? Conversely, will the College only reflect the views of the proportion who are able and willing to join?

Although both groups have distinctively different roles, there are possibilities for collaboration between a college and the unions, where the College could compliment union work or vice versa. For example, in relation to the professional development programmes organised by the NUT and some of the independent research it has

commissioned and championed, such as the EPPI Centre work on CPD provision¹⁴ and the development of school self-evaluation led by John MacBeath¹⁵.

The NUT would suggest that the most important message the profession would wish the College to communicate to the wider public and the focus for its early developmental work should be that it is teachers' professional skills, not structural change and governmental tinkering with education, which improves standards for children.

Q4. Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary?

The NUT believes strongly that membership of the College should be genuinely voluntary and that it must not be seen as the only way to demonstrate "*commitment to personal professional development*" (page 7). A genuine professional should not be required to undertake or limited to one kind of approach to professional development. The NUT's key concern here is that membership of the College could quickly become mandatory *de facto*, for example, if it became required as evidence of meeting the relevant Teacher Standards by individual schools or academy chains. This would actually be counterproductive and lead to a tick box approach to meeting the Standards rather than actual engagement in professional activities negotiated by and useful to the individual teacher.

On a related issue, the College should be clear about who would be eligible to be a member. The footnote on page 7 of the discussion document suggests anyone "teaching" from the Early Years Foundation Stage through to Key Stage 5. This could include unqualified teachers, instructors, overseas trained teachers and Higher Level Teaching Assistants, for example. The College should remember that the removal of the requirement for maintained schools to employ teachers with Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) coincided with the abolition of the GTCE. If the College is serious about its contribution to raising standards and promoting professionalism, it should use QTS as a basic entry requirement.

Q5. What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

The explicit assertion at the start of this section of the document that the College's activities would not include regulatory functions and that it would not have or seek to have a role in disciplinary hearings, professional conduct matters or pay and conditions is a welcome statement of intent by the College about where the limits of its influence would lie. However we feel that it must be noted that there is inevitably overlap between the activities proposed for the College and those which are already carried out by others. Teacher standards are already set in an employment context, professional development is promoted both by employers, unions and other organisations, research is already undertaken and collected. The College must be clear as to how it will interact with those other organisations.

Although the discussion document does not ask any specific questions about this, the NUT believes that a regulatory function deserves at least as much consideration as the other proposals. The NUT does not support the current system of teacher regulation. Professional

¹⁴ <http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/ms/Default.aspx?tabid=53>

¹⁵ Eg <http://www.teachers.org.uk/files/actie/0/schools.pdf>

Conduct Panels are permitted only to make recommendations to the Secretary of State who, though absent from the hearings which take place to consider a teacher's culpability or otherwise, nevertheless acts as the final arbiter in such matters. We believe this removes responsibility from the profession and damages the collective professional status of teachers while simultaneously politicising the process by which standards of professional conduct and allegations of misconduct are assessed. Regulation of teacher conduct by teachers is essential to the principle of accountability and we consider that a College of Teaching could play a role in restoring accountability to the profession.

As noted above, a particular area of concern is that of setting standards. While it is evident from the discussion document that the College does not intend them to be used for disciplinary purposes, there would be nothing to prevent any standards developed by the College being adopted by Government or other bodies, including schools, in the future and used to justify disciplinary action, especially in relation to or capability.

This was what happened during the revision of the GTCE Code of Practice and Values and was particularly concerning as, like the College proposes now, the aims of these were "*high and aspirational*" (page 7) and completely unsuitable as a formal teacher accountability measure. In fact the five "professional areas" proposed in the College discussion document as the basis for setting standards are based on competences rather than broader professional knowledge, values and understanding, and thus would be quite easy to misappropriate. Already, the current Teacher Standards break down the process of teaching in a very similar manner, with very similar sub-headings, but with more exemplification than the College's proposals. This raises the question as to how the two would be distinguished for their different purposes.

In addition, the potential for confusion between the College's standards and the Teacher Standards is increased by the statement that the Teacher Standards should remain the remit of Government "*initially at least*" (page 8). The College should indicate whether it would actively seek this role or not and how this would relate to its earlier statement that it would not seek a role in disciplinary hearings or professional conduct matters, so that the profession had clarity on the College's medium and long term aims.

The College should therefore focus on activity strands 2 and 3, enhancing professionals' development and informing professional practice.

Q6. Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

The NUT has been a long-standing advocate of peer coaching and mentoring. Research suggests that teachers learn most from a combination of support from their peers and specialist support and that peer coaching encourages professional communication and helps teachers to develop a 'shared language' about teaching and learning. The NUT's own CPD programme has coaching and mentoring built in as a central feature and it has been heavily involved in research on this and dissemination of findings to the profession¹⁶.

¹⁶ E.g. http://www.teachers.org.uk/files/A-Z_PEER_COACHING.doc.

Building a relationship between mentor and mentee is critical and must be based on trust, so it is right that the College proposes that there should be medium to long term pairing of teachers, but with the option to review this as the mentee's needs change over the course of their career. The NUT would also agree that more experienced members should take on mentor roles but it is essential that this should not be seen as one-way traffic only: "*juniors*" can also have things to share with "*seniors*", such as new perspectives and ideas gained through their recent initial teacher education. If it is perceived that "*juniors*" should take on a more passive role, this could be seen as patronising and unattractive to recently qualified members of the profession.

Although from a professional practice point of view it would be preferable for mentor and mentee to work in different schools, this proposal ignores the current realities of education in England, where the school system is highly fragmented, schools are in competition with each other and many provide their own CPD offer, including on a commercial basis to other schools. An individual teacher may wish to join the College, but his or her ability to participate fully would be at the discretion of their school, therefore this proposal could deny teachers equality of opportunity.

Q7. Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning?

The proposed three tier membership structure and titles attached to it mirror those of a number of existing professional organisations. The terms "associate", "member" and "fellow" for instance are widely understood and used in academic and professional subject organisations, although it would be important to make clear how the College's usage of these was different from other bodies.

The NUT would agree that all teachers should be able to "*aspire to the highest level*" of membership and that the five professional areas should have equal weighting, so that individual teachers could follow different routes to gain a particular level status, which provides them with a choice to pursue areas which are of particular interest to them, underpinned by a common core which includes all five of the professional areas.

However, as noted above, access to, engagement in and progression through the tiered membership system would be dependent on a teacher's employer and its support. This would make a number of the proposed activities unrealistic for some teachers as they could only be undertaken with the school's consent. In addition, those with commitments outside school, particularly caring responsibilities, could be disadvantaged by activities with any significant time demands beyond the working day or week. Comprehensive equality monitoring systems would be essential and would need to be put in place prior to the launch of this system to make sure that no groups of teachers were disadvantaged.

The information provided in the Potential Membership Tiers box on page 9 is rather confusing due to the use of the term "level" to denote achievement. This is far too close to the terminology of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). A simple explanation is needed of if and how the College's structure relates to that of the NQF, for example,

whether Masters level or postgraduate professional qualifications would be recognised in the College's system.

Certification by and of teachers is a welcome concept but the information provided by the discussion document raises more questions than it answers. Who would be responsible for training those Members and Fellows who would act as assessors, for instance, and how would their assessments be quality assured and moderated for consistency? The discussion document says that teacher assessors would be "*expected to use their judgement when making assessments*" (page 10) but it is unclear whether there would be standard criteria for judgements to be made against and how the College would prevent these leading to a tick box style of assessment rather than the developmental approach suggested elsewhere.

There will be practical issues around the proposed mechanics of the certification process. The mentor would need time to support their mentee in preparing for certification, including the preparation of a portfolio of evidence. The College member acting as assessor would also need time to visit the school and undertake various assessment activities, which include classroom observation, planning reviews, colleague interviews, pupil perception surveys and one to one meetings. In addition to the substantial amount of work involved for those concerned, such activities would be disruptive to the life of the school and would require resourcing to set up and execute.

There are also some areas of overlap between the College's assessment activities and formal teacher appraisal methodology. While the NUT recognises the difference between peer observation and observation for accountability purposes, it believes there could be a significant overlap between the latter and observation as part of the certification process. The NUT has produced guidance which considers the different forms and purposes of classroom observation and provides practical guidance, including a school protocol, on this issue¹⁷. The NUT would urge the College to follow the NUT's approach when finalising its proposals on this issue.

The NUT agrees that the current CPD market is of varied quality. The now-defunct Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) identified the same problems as the College and tried to solve them by establishing a CPD database too. However, due to the difficulties the TDA found when it tried to use teacher review as key criteria for establishing quality of provision, it subsequently had to devise a voluntary Code of Practice which providers had to sign up to, if they were to be included in the database. It is difficult to devise one which is a truly authoritative reference source as teachers have different needs, learning preferences, etc, all of which make reviews a subjective and unreliable form of evidence.

CPD opportunities already exist for most of the "key moments" provision proposed by the College: it is important to note that this does not comprise "*courses*" only, as the College suggests it would do on page 10. The NUT, for example, has a number of types of CPD activity to support newly qualified teachers and those new to leadership positions¹⁸. The College has rightly identified, however, the lack of provision available for those looking to change school sector. All of the previous support that was available, such as "conversion"

¹⁷ <http://www.teachers.org.uk/files/classroom-observation-model-policy-aug-2011.doc>.

¹⁸ <http://www.teachers.org.uk/courses>

courses, has been discontinued, yet anecdotal evidence gained through NUT member queries would suggest that demand for this is increasing.

Q8. How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

The NUT would agree that there is little widespread awareness of research evidence, either national or international, at class teacher or school leader levels but would argue that this is a by-product of the current accountability system. Unless a school is designated as “outstanding” and confident that it can retain this designation, there is a limit to the extent to which schools can make “*fully informed choices*” (page 11), especially if there are concerns about its standards of performance. Despite the Government’s supposed promise of professional freedom and school autonomy, the majority of schools feel pressurised into pedagogical practices either because they have been directed to by Government, for example, systematic synthetic phonics first and fast, or by Ofsted requirements – both perceived and genuine - which are perhaps the most significant driver of changes to professional practice in England currently.

The Government makes much of its use of evidence to inform its education policy development, but very often this has been found to be a partial selection or reading of the evidence to suit its own narrative. Additionally, international research evidence has been put forward to support its arguments which is taken out of context and/ or does not take into account the cultural background of the countries concerned. Any efforts the College made to promote the responsible and appropriate use of research evidence by Government as well as schools would be welcome, therefore, especially if the College drew attention to the limitations inherent in research of all kinds. The proposed dedicated research department could be very helpful in this respect and should also have the ability to commission its own research if any important gaps in the evidence base were identified.

Q9. Do you think the College should seek to advise policy makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

The identification of only three areas of professional interest is perhaps too narrow and does not reflect all that teachers have a legitimate interest in. It would probably be more useful to use the five areas of professional activity as the starting point and make reference to the provision of policy advice on any professional matters relevant to these, rather than try to formulate a definitive list.

Whilst acknowledging that the College has tried in this section of the discussion document to make a clear distinction between its own role and that of the teacher trade unions, it must recognise that that unions routinely provide advice to policy makers on professional matters, so it will be inevitable that there will be overlap on some specific issues. Although there will sometimes be different perspectives, these should be complimentary.

Q 10. Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

It is unclear from the brief outline given in the discussion document how the five different College groups would interact with each other and provide the necessary checks and balances. There are several over-arching points, however, which the NUT would wish to make.

Firstly, a statement is needed about which would have the greater weighting – College members or “others” - who would comprise the Board, Forum, Sub-Committee etc. The GTCE was placed under pressure to increase the number of “others” because of accusations of self-interest, but it should be self-evident that an organisation by and for teachers should be led by them. Connected to this is concern about who these “others” would be and who would propose or nominate them? Terms such as “*independent*” or “*partisan*” are open to question in today’s political climate: for example, the Secretary of State has made sweeping statements about HEI Schools of Education staff and would claim that they had a “*conflict of interest or vested interest in education*”. It would not be appropriate if the College took the same approach to HEI representation in its governance.

The NUT would argue that anyone connected with the College’s organisation and governance structures should have some knowledge or understanding of educational issues in order to make a worthwhile contribution and to have credibility with the membership. Those nominated by the then DfES to sit on the GTCE were not well received by the profession. This kind of “official” representation may also jeopardise any claims of independence.

Q11. Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

- a) Associate £70 – 85, Member £125 – 135, Fellow £175-200**
- b) Associate £85 - 100, Member £135 - 140, Fellow £200 – 250?**

Potentially, if membership of the College is used as a proxy of teacher quality as discussed earlier in this response, teachers may feel compelled to pay these subscription rates if they want to progress in their careers. In this scenario, it is unlikely that many would go on to the higher levels of the College, as it would be the ability to use a College label, rather than engagement in professional activities denoted by it, which would drive subscriptions to the College.

The inclusion of examples of the charges made by other professional bodies to support the College’s proposal is not necessarily helpful. The average salaries of members of the Royal Colleges of Surgeons or Engineers, for instance, are far higher than those of the average school teacher and in some cases are necessary to practice that particular profession in this country.

It should also be recognised that these costs to the individual would be relative and what might appear affordable to one might be seen as prohibitively expensive by another. The difference between the top and bottom of the teachers’ salary scale is considerable, so what might be affordable for a more experienced senior leader, for example, might not be for a newly qualified teacher at the bottom of the pay scale who is trying to repay their

student loan. Similarly, due to consecutive real-term cuts in teacher salaries, a significant number of teachers with families are struggling to make ends meet: for them, membership of the College would be very low on their list of priorities.

The College should be in no doubt that wherever funding comes from, be it from Government or the private sector, it will cease to be able to call itself truly independent, thus damaging its reputation and rationale for existence.

Q12. Do you think costs of £250 – 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

It appears that the only real associated costs for the College would be the provision of guidance on mentoring and certification, so it is hard to see this as anything other than a key income stream for the College. This would mean that the financial burden would fall on individual teachers as well as their schools, which is disproportionate.

Q13. Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

It is extremely likely that teachers would be willing to undertake mentoring and certification activities on behalf of colleagues without expecting financial reward – they do this all the time both as an extremely effective form of professional development for themselves and as a manifestation of the collegiate nature of teaching. The issue is not would they be willing to, but rather would they be allowed to by their schools or have sufficient time to do so, which is considered in the next question.

The NUT would also be concerned if the good will of these teachers was used as a substitute for proper funding and taken for granted. Recognition does not always have to be financial but there would certainly be a need to recognise the contribution made by this group in some way and that anyone undertaking certification responsibilities should be aware that the money raised by it was used to fund College running costs.

Q14. Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

The discussion document says that schools which released an assessor would be reimbursed for cover costs associated with certification but assumes that “*schools would not seek cover costs incurred*” for mentoring (page 13). This ignores the fact that there would be considerable costs for the mentor and mentee’s / assessor and candidate’s schools, because of the range of activities which would be expected to take place during a visit.

NUT head teacher members who have been consulted on this issue had a number of concerns about this aspect of the College proposals, particularly the high cost of supply cover for the mentee or candidate during a visit. It was felt that this would lead to some form of rationing in their school, as they would be unable to fund sufficient cover if the majority of staff wanted to participate. It was also suggested that this might apply to Members and Fellows too, because schools would be unwilling to let teachers out on a

regular basis in this way, even though this would damage the continuity of support provided by an on-going pairing of mentor and mentee.

The College must also be more aware of the realities of school life when formulating its proposals. It should be noted that schools generally are operating with a very limited budget for CPD and that there is no entitlement to it. In addition, successive governments have given precedence to national and school-level CPD priorities rather than those of the individual teacher. Teachers do not currently have equal access to CPD, so membership of the College and participation in its activities could actually be perceived as divisive, within as well as between schools. Furthermore, NUT members teaching in primary schools have stated that the arrangements for release for mentoring appear more secondary than primary friendly. Primary head teachers have shown resistance in the past to initiatives of the kind proposed, not merely on grounds of cost, but on the perceived impact of educational outcomes for pupils and on other members of staff.

Toby Osborne

Toby Osborne read Molecular Genetics at the University of Sussex from 2004-2008, graduating with a first class honours. During the third year of his degree he worked for Pfizer Ltd at their R&D site in Kent, where he was involved in analytical chemistry and biochemistry of novel drug metabolic pathways resulting in published research (Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2009 Apr;67(4):445-54.). He had a second publication as a result of his final year dissertation in the field of oncology (Cell Cycle. 2009 Jan 15;8(2):278-83. Epub 2009 Jan 10). He completed his PGCE in Secondary Science (specialising in Chemistry) with Sussex and went on to Beacon Community College in East Sussex to complete his NQT year. During this time, Toby developed software for Higher Education Institutions to tracking progress of students during teacher training which was implemented as part of postgraduate courses at Sussex University. From 2010-2013 he worked at The Arnewood School Academy in Hampshire, where he became Lead Practitioner for 6th Form G&T as well as Subject Leader in Chemistry. He will begin as Head of Chemistry at St Peter's Catholic Comprehensive School in Bournemouth from September 2013.

Q1 Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching? Please give reasons for your answer.

I think there is a place for such an organisation and creation of such a body will go some way to improving the view of teachers in the eyes of the public whilst giving the profession the tools to drive EVIDENCE based practice to improve standards.

Q2 Do you agree with this Vision? Please give reasons for your answer.

I do agree with this vision. It is important that the profession governs itself and drives itself to further improve. Separation from the political cycle will reduce political intervention by whitehall and ministers when they are driving a political agenda rather than what is based on evidence and in the best interest of young people.

Q3 Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

Yes. These practices and standards are only going to be truly accepted as relevant and purposeful if driven by the teaching profession itself. The body would introduce changes at a pace more suited to the needs of teachers and schools rather than in an ad hoc snappy headline fashion that we see today. After all standards of surgical procedures are determined by surgeons rather than politicians.

Q4 Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary? Please give reasons for your answer.

If the body regulating teaching will do what has been proposed and be as respected as envisaged I feel that membership should be compulsory if you teach in a state funded school in the UK. Maintaining and improving standards should not be left up to individuals. The body would provide a platform to discuss change based on evidence rather than political whims and if a professional is unwilling to be a member, why not? Do they not want to meet the standards or make improvements in the profession? I also think many teachers will not want to join as they were sceptical about the former GTC and will see it doing a similar job.

Q5 What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

Giving the profession a professional rational voice to enact change at a suitable pace, maintain high standards of education for young people and encourage practitioners to want to improve their own practice to help teaching in the UK to become the best in the world.

Q6 Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

Yes.

Q7 Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning? Please give reasons for your answer.

If marketed well and schools are informed of its importance then yes. Recognition within the profession will be respected if everyone is a member. It shows that to become an outstanding teacher requires more than just getting young people to pass exams.

Q8 How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

Vital. When new surgical techniques take place the surgeon it health authority will not allow it to take place without trials. In education we are conducting brain surgery over 20 years of a person's life that will affect the choices they can make in the future.

Q9 Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Yes- based on evidence.

Q10 Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

As part of the structure proposed I think there should also be representatives from each regions based on proportional representation, e.g London should have more representatives as they represent 7 million+ people. These would share views on changes and standards with a regional viewpoint.

Q11 Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200 b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250 Please explain your answer

Only if they feel that the body did what it said it was going to do and was respected by the Government/ Department of Education.

Q12 Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

I doubt many school could afford to pay for this certification. Teachers will only pay it/ aim for it if there seemed to be a genuine advantage for career progression in terms of promotion.

Q13 Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

They may do, but almost certainly they will want time to carry this out/ extra PPAs.

Q14 Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

Some will and some won't as they will not view this as a way of improving grades for league tables and so will not pay for cover. As already stated some may.

Pearson

Pearson is the world's leading learning company working in over 70 countries around the world. With an increasing digital offer, their portfolio includes Penguin, DK, the Financial Times and numerous other educational businesses including the Edexcel awarding organisation. Imprints including Longman and Prentice Hall combine 150 years of experience with online support for every learner.

College of Teachers – Response to Discussion Document

31st July 2013

Prepared by Frances Soul – Director, School Improvement
(Frances.Soul@Pearson.com)

Q1 Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching? Please give reasons for your answer.

In essence, yes. Numerous studies confirm that the quality of teaching and teachers is the most significant factor in improving the quality of education. In 2012, Teaching remains the one profession in this country with no independent body to set standards for the profession, yet the extent of the professional and personal capacity and capability that is expected from teachers is vast.

The Education Select Committee published a report on how to attract, train and retain the best teachers. A key recommendation in this was the establishment of a professional body of teaching, along the lines of many of the Medical Royal Colleges – like the Royal College of Surgeons or Physicians. Medical Royal colleges and other professional bodies have promoted and protected the status of their professions over the years. Teaching deserves the similar protection, greater recognition and higher status that a College of teaching can provide.

Teachers are at the heart of the education system, making a difference to the lives of hundreds of thousands of learners. A college of teaching could provide a single expert voice for the teaching profession where points of concern or interest to the profession, such as suggested changes to the curriculum or changes to the approach to initial teacher training, could be discussed and then communicated.

The lack of an independent body matters, because its absence has resulted in successive governments defining professional practice which has resulted in a lack of coherence for subsequent initiatives. This has also led to the progressive dis-empowerment of the profession, as teachers respond to continuous initiatives and has affected the standing of teaching in society, and its ability to continue to grow as a profession.

The OECD report to the inaugural International Summit on the Teaching Profession, published in 2011, set out a clear responsibility for government to commit to establishing an education system that recognises and develops teachers as professionals. A college of teaching could go a long way to supporting and achieving this.

Q2 Do you agree with this Vision? Please give reasons for your answer.

Yes. In particular one part resonates with our own vision and ethos around "advancing teaching standards, developing and recognising excellent teachers, and promoting the use of evidence to inform practice and policy".

Much of this directly aligns with Pearson's own vision as a global education provider, in taking an evidence-based approach to our work with a clear and direct focus on setting and maintaining standards. Furthermore, Pearson with the RSA commissioned the recent report from the Academies Commission, Unleashing Greatness, which "welcomed proposals to establish a Royal college of Teaching" that "could play a vital role in supporting the alignment of research and practice".

Q3 Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

Yes. There is overwhelming evidence showing that teaching quality is the key element in successful educational outcomes. An independent College of Teaching could build a culture to enhance the quality and professional status of teaching, improve the quality of professional development and to disseminate best practice. Most importantly, it offers a way in which the profession can establish and sustain its professional identity, values and purpose, and lead on securing teaching standards.

Standards can be established most effectively by those with the knowledge, skills and expertise in the relevant subject or discipline – the teachers. The government can only provide limited input and expertise; it is necessary for professional associations to take this work forward for further detailed development and implementation.

The caveat to the above is that without a regulatory and accountability function it is unclear how a College of Teaching could secure standards. Furthermore even without a regulatory role, with a target membership of only 20% of the profession the impact is likely limited at best

Q4 Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary? Please give reasons for your answer.

Previous attempts to establish compulsory membership of professional organisations such as the GTC have failed to gain the necessary level of buy-in and commitment from its members and caused resentment in the profession. There was confusion over the role of the body; was it about regulation and competency or professionalism and recognition? This also led to a degree of bureaucracy, prescription and interference which a self-regulated body could avoid. Furthermore previous evidence would suggest that voluntary membership is the only way that the majority of the profession would embrace a professional organisation and contribute fully with commitment and enthusiasm. However, in the absence of an organisation like the GTC it is not clear who will hold the profession to account, something that is essential if standards are to be maintained or indeed advanced. As a minimum a College of Teaching should have the authority to insist on a period of re-training for individuals who have failed to meet the standards it sets the profession.

Q5 What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

The College should be the "voice" of the profession from ITT to Headship and beyond to influence policy and practice underpinned by research evidence. It should set and secure their own high standards and provide professional development by experts in their field to support this.

Q6 Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

Yes but with the following caveats:

- *There are already a range of opportunities for mentoring open to the profession so this scheme would need to provide added value*
- *Research evidence shows that the most effective approach for professional development involves working collaboratively through a process of sustained enquiry with an external expert to challenge and support*
- *Mentoring through a professional body could provide the rigour necessary to ensure CPD does impact on the learner not simply on teacher practice*
- *Training for mentors would need to be provided with an accompanying level of quality assurance if it is to be successful and achieve its aims*
- *Such a model is likely to be expensive for the profession both in terms of training but also for staff release so the college would need to be able to demonstrate the efficacy in practice.*

Q7 Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning? Please give reasons for your answer.

Tiered membership could, but does not of itself, enhance teachers' professional learning.

It is important that the structure of the College services the needs of children and young people rather than its own internal purposes, which is often a risk with an organisational structure such as this. For the College to achieve rapid and credible recognition at a system level, it must be attained through merit rather than through right of time served or leadership level achieved.

Movement through the tiers needs to be assessed and applied fairly and equitably. Indeed it would be essential for any tiering structure to relate equally to teaching standards, pedagogical knowledge, and professional skill as to leadership level. A college would also need to be robust in its approach to equality and diversity and be a truly representative professional organisation and structure.

Q8 How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

Essential. Evidence should inform best practice and underpin any change in practice in teaching. A college could also clarify the limitations of any evidence. In general teachers do not have the time or expertise to find, evaluate and review the current literature and evidence base so this would be an important function of the College. It would support its members with updates on research evidence. Members of the

College could also become an instrument to build the evidence through and action enquiry related to professional development offered through the College.

Q9 Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Yes. The College should largely be the 'voice' of the teaching profession and policy should be informed by experts in the profession, i.e. its members. As in question nine, the College would have created a robust evidence base on which to credibly inform policy and practice.

Q10 Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

The structure proposed appears to be aligned with the structures of many other well established professional bodies. However it would seem advisable to avoid complex committee structure, at least until the College is fully established. Over-complex committee structures can be seen to serve the interests of committee members rather than the wider organisation membership.

Suggested improvements would be to:

- Agree the proportions of members and fellows on the council or board, the sectors of teaching they are drawn from and ensure that no particular body or entity gains unfair influence*
- Ensure that the executive and boards are fully representative of the members with regards to gender and ethnicity*
- Ensure there is input and representation from higher education and employers as these are the ultimate destination for all young people.*

Q11 Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200

b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250

Please explain your answer

Price range "a" would be the most likely place to start but should include a significant introductory reduction as many unions and professional bodies do so. The price teachers would pay will depend on what they perceive are the benefits and this would need to be demonstrated ahead of joining. The prices quoted fall below current annual union subscriptions but this membership provides additional benefits such as legal counsel. It is not certain from the proposal that there are sufficient added benefits, bearing in mind teachers will also have to pay a certification fee.

Q12 Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

I would expect the only way this could be managed would be for teachers themselves to pay for the accreditation. Consideration would then need to be given to the financial burden that would be placed on a new teacher paying the annual fee plus the accreditation fee in the first few weeks of paid employment as a teacher.

Q13 Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

Yes, if there was a commitment from the teaching profession as a whole to support a College of Teaching, that all members benefited and that an expectation was created that all Fellows contributed or had contributed in order to reach Fellow status. This role should be viewed as demonstration of commitment to the profession as a whole.

Q14 Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

Schools currently release some staff for union representation but this is one or two staff per school. Assuming the majority of teachers are members of the College of Teaching it could mean that there was an unreasonable demand on some schools for staff release, which would not be supported. Schools currently carefully control the amount of staff release and cover. Therefore, it will depend on the demand on each school; there would need to be some monitoring and control on the requests made to an individual school and relevant staff.

The Policy Consortium

The Policy Consortium is a group of experienced consultants, all with strong track records in Further Education and Skills, who work together to provide advice, support and research for education and training. Members include former research managers, journalists, college leaders and experts in curriculum, pedagogy, funding and marketing in the post-compulsory sector. The Consortium provides advice and comment on current policy and undertakes research and development. Its members deliver training and support and write articles, blogs and reports for commercial and public sector organisations. Examples include policy briefings and analysis for sector bodies, articles for the Learning & Skills research magazine Inside Evidence, studies of post-16 participation and GCSE triple science and direct support for colleges on issues such as FE Loans, quality improvement and observation of teaching and learning.

Details available at <http://policyconsortium.co.uk/>

Response to consultation on College of Teaching

Dear colleague

We have seen the proposals for the College of Teaching and applaud the broad intention to raise the status of the teaching profession and encourage high quality, evidence-based professional development. We would like to raise one central concern, however.

Although the focus of the College is intended to be teaching rather than teachers, the definition of whom is to be included, given at the foot of page 7, refers to types of teacher rather than teaching:

“Membership is voluntary and open to all*”

*Where “all” means teachers teaching in academies, maintained, special and independent schools and sixth-form colleges in England, from Early Years to Key Stage 5.

which clearly excludes teachers in colleges and other of post-16 institutions. Our main concern about this exclusion is its effect on learners, parents, employers and others seeking assurances about quality.

The award of fellow or member status will, we hope, enhance the status of schoolteachers who qualify. But this status would not be available to other teacher colleagues who would not be eligible. We envisage two negative consequences of this:

1. In a college such as City and Islington, which includes a sixth form college alongside vocational FE, or any Tertiary College, some teachers could be Fellows/Members, others couldn't. This could easily be read by parents, learners and other professionals as suggesting an inability to achieve the status on grounds of competence, rather than rules of membership.
2. In the context of a divided vocational and academic curriculum, the denial of College of Teaching membership status to the majority of those teaching vocational curricula (i.e. in FE institutions), would exacerbate the existing status problem of vocational curricula.

We believe a strong professional body dedicated to standards and professional development would be a great step forward and commend the College of Teaching initiative in principle. However, the anomalies in the structure of the English (and broadly the UK) education system make the realisation of this a complicated task, largely because institutional arrangements remain deeply divided at 16. Many students are studying academic courses outside schools (“A”-levels in colleges, for example) and the majority of 16–19 year-old young people following vocational or pre-vocational courses are outside the school system. It would be unfortunate to reinforce the negative economic and social consequences of this division through the exclusion from professional recognition by the College.

To illustrate the scale of the problem we offer figures for the number of full-time 16–18 year olds in schools and colleges in 2012 from the DfE First Statistical Release:

State-funded schools	440,700	38%
Independent Schools	86,700	7%
Sixth Form Colleges	152,100	13%
FE and tertiary colleges	485,900	42%

The numbers in FE colleges exceed those in state schools and are a major fraction of the total.

Figures for the number of 16–18 year olds entered for Level 3 qualifications (A level or equivalent) in 2011/2012 also show a major proportion from FE colleges (specifically, almost exactly twice as many as are enrolled in Sixth Form Colleges):

State-funded schools	170,882	43.1%
Independent schools	37,069	9.3%
Sixth Form Colleges	63,741	16.2%
Other FE Sector colleges	125,424	31.5%

We acknowledge that for *post-19* education there are further complications in recognising the professional status of teachers; attempting to include all categories of teaching professional initially may prove too daunting a task. Nevertheless, excluding teachers of 16 –18 year olds in FE at the start creates a particular risk of exacerbating already damaging professional divisions.

Our suggestion would be that a clear statement of intent about the desired scope of teacher membership be set out from the beginning and if different groups are to be included at different stages in the development of the College, that should be made clear. Our hope would be that consideration be given to including all organisations that employ teachers of students up to the age of 18 from the outset.

We also suggest that consideration be given to the use of the word *teaching* in the title. If it is to be retained, we think there would have to be an intention to extend the scope to teaching in a range of contexts, not just school and early years. If not, we suggest the title would need to refer to the more limited scope – e.g. *College of School and Pre-school Teaching*; at least this would allow other complementary Colleges to emerge such as *College of Further and Higher Education Teachers* or a *College of Vocational Education Practitioners* for the other realms of teaching.

Yours sincerely,



Andrew Morris (for correspondence) and
Michael Chandler
Judith Cohen
Mike Cooper
Mick Fletcher
Matilda Gosling
Maggie Greenwood
Maria Hughes
Carolyn Medlin
Ian Nash
Carol Overton
Seb Schmoller

Members of the Policy Consortium 22nd July 2013

<http://policyconsortium.co.uk/>

Royal Geographical Society

The Royal Geographical Society is the Learned Society and Professional Body for geography and geographers and maintains a strong overview of the discipline, its position and its practice in schools, higher education and the workplace, including professional accreditation. We advise on and support its advancement, dissemination and practice in these realms and within wider public engagement and policy. We have 16,000 members and Fellows and our work currently reaches more than three million people per year. Each year the Society works with teachers and pupils from about 50% of English secondary schools and our online educational resources receive c. 1 million 'user sessions' annually. The Society received its Royal Charter in 1859.

College of Teaching Consultation

**Royal
Geographical
Society**
with IBG

Advancing geography
and geographical learning

● Consultation response submitted by the Royal Geographical Society (with IBG)

...

The Royal Geographical Society (with IBG) is the Learned Society and Professional Body for geography and geographers and maintains a strong overview of the discipline, its position and its practice in schools, higher education and the workplace, including professional accreditation. We advise on and support its advancement, dissemination and practice in these realms and within wider public engagement and policy. We have 16,000 members and Fellows and our work currently reaches more than three million people per year. Each year the Society works with teachers and pupils from about 50% of English secondary schools and our online educational resources receive c. 1 million 'user sessions' annually. The Society received its Royal Charter in 1859.

The Society is pleased to respond to the consultation undertaken by The Prince's Teaching Institute into the proposed College of Teaching. The Society has no strong feelings either way on the proposal in general for a College of Teaching **however there are three key areas of detail in the proposals that raise significant concerns for the Society and which we oppose. These are:**

- **The scope and range of activities proposed for the college**

The Society believes that the College of Teaching scope is currently too broadly defined and does not take proper note of existing structures and established areas of subject specialist and professional accreditation support. We feel this is unacceptable.

The discussion about how the College of Teaching might relate to, support or replicate the established work of subject specialist bodies in education - including Learned Societies and Subject Associations - has not been explored in sufficient detail. Our concerns focus on the issue of subject specialism and the proposal that the College provide subject specialist support to teachers and advise policy makers on the curriculum.

The PTI is aware of the widespread support that is provided to teachers through the relevant Learned Societies and Subject Associations. This work connects teachers with up-to-date academic research and subject knowledge; supports the use of subject specialist pedagogy; and provides an ongoing subject community within which a teacher can enhance their professional knowledge and skills. There is nothing to be gained by a College of Teaching seeking to replicate this work, or indeed even attempting to take on this remit.

Further, the Society does not support the suggestion that the College of Teaching create (subject) specialist committees to feed into its proposed training programme; which had been proposed in relation to the concerns of some Subject Associations. (New College of Teaching Workshop Report September 2012). The Society's impression is also that elements of earlier discussions about the proposed college have been informed by the concerns of some (but not all) Subject Associations and the difficulties that they face in terms of their membership levels and support that they provide. The Society does not feel that this accurately reflects the entirety of how teachers engage with their subjects; the bodies that support them in that; and how a teacher's expertise in a subject area can be recognised and accredited. It is vitally important that any proposals relating to subject specialism embrace the breadth of the current Learned Societies and Subject Associations and recognise the well-established and leading work that many bodies do in this area in relation to their disciplines. During evidence

provided to the Education Select Committee (17.06.2013), it was suggested that Subject Associations (and perhaps by implication relevant Learned Societies?) might pay over a proportion of their membership fees, to support the establishment of the College, in return for the College providing subject specialist support to their members. The Society does not support this approach.

- **Subject Specialism: supporting and representing subject specialist teachers**

Within the Standards Setting section of the discussion paper the first priority for this work is identified as 'Subject Content Knowledge'; alongside pedagogical knowledge, professional skills, contributing to the profession and leadership. The Society is at a loss to understand how a general body of teachers can legitimately and effectively 'claim' the area of subject knowledge; when so much of this work is largely provided through the existing work of the respective subject specialist Learned Societies and Subject Associations, many of which have been doing this for decades if not centuries. As the PTI will be aware, Learned Societies and Subject Associations are actively engaged in a wide range of subject specialist support which includes:

- Disseminating new subject specialist academic research to the educational community to connect teachers with up-to-date subject knowledge and approaches.
- Running CPD programmes which support thousands of teachers every year.
- Publishing print and online resource materials for teachers, alongside journals and other publications.
- Providing a range of subject specialist professional accreditations that recognise a teacher's professional practice in relation to their discipline.
- Engaging teachers within and across their professional subject community, connecting teachers with other subject specialists within education, in HE and the wider professions.
- Supporting subject progression from schools to university and into the workplace.
- Providing expert subject specialist advocacy with Government and in the wider policy environment, highlighting the contribution a particular subject makes to young people, university students, in the field of research and the wider professions.
- Providing expert subject specialist advice to Government on curriculum content and assessment.

Indeed, it is unclear whether the proposed College would see a role in the representation of subject specialism to Government. If it does, we are strongly opposed to it, feeling that the role of the proposed College should concern generic matters relating to teaching, not subject specific ones. Many Learned Societies and Subject Associations, drawing on our ongoing relationships with schools, HE and employers, have provided very effective advice and input into DfE's current reviews. In relation to geography the Society would be unwilling to see such positive and effective policy engagement subsumed within, or overshadowed by, the general work of a College of Teaching.

- **Professional accreditation**

The Society is also concerned that the consultation materials have overlooked the existing work of Learned Societies and Subject Associations in relation to their provision of subject specific professional accreditation. The Royal Geographical Society (with IBG) and Association for Science Education raised this issue with the PTI earlier in 2013 and highlighted the contribution of existing subject specialist Chartered accreditations that are suitable for teachers. These schemes provide robust and externally validated professional accreditations which include the following: Chartered English Teacher, Chartered Geography Teacher, Chartered Mathematics Teacher, and Chartered Science Teacher. These all have clear and complementary standards that have been approved by the Privy Council.

.....

The Society was pleased to hear these existing Chartered programmes positively referenced in evidence provided to the Education Select Committee's enquiry into the College of Teaching (17.06.2013) and the recognition that existing subject specialist Chartered Teacher accreditations are robust, have credibility (with teachers and the wider professions) and require an ongoing commitment to professional development. However, during the oral evidence provided to the Select Committee it was also suggested that the proposed College take on a role in the coordination/oversight of these accreditations. The Society does not see the necessity for this given that all the accreditations need to meet the professional standards required by the Privy Council. It is also disappointing that some of the discussion papers that accompany the consultation have significantly misunderstood the current context in relation to Chartered accreditations for teachers. To be candid, it is unhelpful to see Chartered Geographer Teacher and Chartered Science Teacher erroneously described as 'semi-official professional standards' which have 'no central coordination or oversight of these standards'. (Towards a Royal College of Teaching 2013 p29). This does not accurately reflect the current situation; the role of external assessment within these professional accreditations; how Chartered status builds on subject specialist Fellowship/memberships in terms of career progression; or their establishment and regulation by Royal Charter and the Privy Council.

In conclusion, it is for teachers to decide whether they wish to see the creation of a general College of Teaching, and indeed whether they are prepared to support its work financially through their individual subscriptions. However, it is for the established Learned Societies and Subject Associations to lead on subject specialist support and CPD, advice to government, and accreditation in their own areas of subject expertise. For the College to seek to take on these roles would be unnecessary duplication and a waste of resources and would serve potentially to undermine both sets of organisations. We (the subject specialist bodies and the proposed College) should be working together, inclusively, to make the most of our potentially complementary strengths and long-standing reputations and expertise in the case of the Learned Societies.

We understand that our concerns are shared with a number of other leading Learned Societies and Subject Associations. We would like to suggest that a private meeting is convened between the Societies and those leading on the proposals for the College of Teaching. The Royal Geographical Society is willing to convene such a meeting.

Yours sincerely



Dr Rita Gardner CBE
Director
Royal Geographical Society (with IBG)

1 Kensington Gore
London SW7 2AR
T: (0)20 7591 3010
E: director@rgs.org.uk

31 July 2013

Teacher Development Trust

The Teacher Development Trust is a charity that is dedicated to improving the educational outcomes for children by raising the quality of teacher professional development.

We're working with schools, colleges and training providers to ensure that all training and consultancy is carried out in line with international best practice, empowering teachers to lead their own professional development in a way that benefits the young people in their classes.

College of Teaching - Consultation Response

The Teacher Development Trust is the national charity for effective professional development in schools and colleges. In principle, we strongly support the creation of a member-led professional body for the teaching profession. We wish to comment on a few specific parts of the June 2013 blueprint.

1. *Standards and professional development.*

While we feel that a new member-led college should be responsible for a general practitioner career pathway, we believe it should also regulate and delegate the creation of subject- and skill-specific routes to other bodies such as subject associations. For example, routes could be made to train and offer professional development to specialist teachers in mathematics & numeracy, science, assessment, special educational needs, teacher education and school leadership.

In addition, any certification routes will need to have some link to school pay systems. [Ingvarson \(2013\)](#) showed that nowhere in the world have groups successfully encouraged the adoption of certification routes without a link to salary-based rewards – this is a necessary component.

2. *Certification.*

While assessment from peers is an important part of certification, we do not feel that this is sufficient. We strongly believe that a new member-led college should codify the pedagogical knowledge needed in different disciplines and setting examinations in those areas requiring up-to-date knowledge.

By committing to a programme of re-certification every five years, the college would ensure that members' knowledge remained up to date. It would also send a strong signal that teaching professionals cannot just 'walk in off the street' but must formally acquire knowledge on, for example, the best ways to teach reading, how to deal with certain behavioural issues, the key characteristics and needs of learners on the autistic spectrum. Specialist pathways would require their own knowledge, so that certified teacher educators, for example, will be able to describe different coaching models and the characteristics of

effective professional development, while physics teachers would be able to describe two key models for explaining how an electric circuit works.

A second and vital part of certification needs to be evidence from a teacher's own portfolio of how they have progressed their own knowledge and skills through enquiry and research. With each certification and re-certification there should be a requirement for members to submit a portfolio of projects they have completed (with colleagues) with robust evidence showing how they have improved the effectiveness of the learning in their classrooms and how that links to the existing evidence base.

The key to both of these areas is that teachers should not only be judged by what they are doing in the classroom but also on demonstrable attainment and progression in their skill and knowledge about effective pedagogy.

3. *Continuing Professional Development*

We welcome the recognition that teachers need help to evaluate which CPD is most useful but very much regret that the consultation document refers only to 'courses'. All research evidence shows that one-off courses are the *least* effective way to professionally develop teachers.

We would suggest that no one-off CPD is ever accredited by the college unless it can be shown that there has been a collaborative, sustained and rigorously evaluated process back within the school into which this course fits.

4. *Evidence-based practice*

There is no doubt that a new member-led college would be able to strongly encourage teachers' engagement with research evidence to inform pedagogical decisions. However, noticeably absent from the blueprint is any notion of practitioners themselves as researchers, without taking sabbaticals.

Evidence in this area strongly points to the efficacy of practitioners who simultaneously work as researchers, with constant engagement between HEIs and schools. We also know that the "implementation" of research findings needs a collaborative, evaluated micro-enquiry approach in schools if it is to be truly successful.

49-51 East Road, London, N1 6AH | enquiries@teacherdevelopmenttrust.org | 020 7250 8276
<http://www.TeacherDevelopmentTrust.org/> | Registered Charity Number 1147447

We look forward to engaging further with the commission in developing these proposals and we hope to be able to contribute to the development of a member-led college.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'David Weston', with a stylized flourish at the end.

David Weston
Chief Executive, Teacher Development Trust

6th September 2013

Teach First

Teach First is a charity with the vision that no child's educational success is limited by their socio-economic background. They recruit, train and support people with leadership potential to become inspirational teachers in schools in low income communities across the UK.

Each year, a new group of trainees join them and their university partners for six weeks of intensive training before teaching in one of their partner schools for at least two years, where they achieve a Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE). Their training and passion for educational equality means that they are dedicated to raising the aspirations of the young people in their classrooms.

Teach First aims to raise the quality and profile of the teaching profession. Over the last decade they have trained over 4,000 teachers and this year they have recruited 1,261 new teachers into the classroom. They are now the UK's largest, and fastest growing, graduate recruiter - giving teaching children from low-income communities a prestige equal to the pull of brightest lights from the city of London. In 2013, Teach First was ranked 3rd in the coveted league of Times Top 100 Graduate Employers.

A new member-driven College of Teaching

Teach First response to The Prince's Teaching Institute discussion document July 2013

Background

Teach First is a charity with the vision that no child's educational success is limited by their socio-economic background. We recruit, train and support people with leadership potential to become inspirational teachers in schools in low income communities across the UK.

Each year, a new group of trainees join us and our university partners for six weeks of intensive training before teaching in one of our partner schools for at least two years, where they achieve a Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE). Their training and passion for educational equality means that they are dedicated to raising the aspirations of the young people in their classrooms.

Teach First aims to raise the quality and profile of the teaching profession. Over the last decade we have trained over 4,000 teachers and this year we have recruited 1,261 new teachers into the classroom. We are now the UK's largest, and fastest growing, graduate recruiter - giving teaching children from low-income communities a prestige equal to the pull of brightest lights from the city of London. In 2013, Teach First was ranked 3rd in the coveted league of Times Top 100 Graduate Employers.

Teach First currently operates in Wales and nine regions across England: London, West Midlands, East Midlands, Yorkshire the Humber, North West and the North East, South East, South Coast and the South West.

Contact

For further information on the response outlined below please contact:

Jonathan Dando, Senior Public Affairs & Policy Officer
Teach First
4 More London Riverside
London, SE1 2AU
jdando@teachfirst.org.uk
020 3117 1924

Q1 Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching? Please give reasons for your answer.

Teach First believes there is certainly a role for a new, independent member-driven College of Teaching and that this is an extremely exciting and valuable proposal. Clearly, the vision set out for such a body - to improve the education of children and young people - is heartening and resonates soundly with Teach First's own vision that no child's educational success should be limited by their socio-economic background.

It is important that the College is independent and that it is perceived as such by both its members and by the public. If this is achieved, the College can fill a gap in existing provision for the profession and lead the debate on raising standards in teaching. A regulatory inspection framework will always exist, but dialogue between such a College and Ofsted, for example, would help to ensure that the system is supported.

Furthermore, we welcome the idea that the College would encourage teachers to take ownership of the profession, which aligns with some of the principles behind our own training around teachers leading change. We support the notion of the College providing a 'voice' for the profession, one which is united, strong and consistent. Ultimately, such a College - delivered in this way - would help to support public confidence in the teaching profession to provide the best possible education for all children.

Q2 Do you agree with this Vision? Please give reasons for your answer.

Yes - we agree that it should put a commitment to children and young people at the forefront. There is an argument, however, for being even stronger in this respect, referring to '*all* children and young people'. This cannot be a College of Teaching which achieves this vision for some, but should be one that holds it up as an aspiration for all. Furthermore, is 'improving' ambitious enough or should we be talking about 'ensuring an excellent education...' etc? You could then insert, 'In recognising the contribution of teachers/the teaching profession to achieving this...' in front of 'It will build a respected profession...'

Q3 Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

Yes, this a role that the College should play. The College can ensure the values and standards are led by the profession - listening to and incorporating the voice of teachers, unions and academic leaders. Furthermore, the blending of research and practice within teaching is vitally important and, again, the College could provide a strong voice advocating this. Currently, the link between academic writing and the classroom is not strong enough so it is all too easy to be swept along by news about the latest great idea to improve exam results. We need academic research to become practice research and then practice itself. The College could play a critical role in being that bridge, instilling rigour within teaching practice and helping to engender confidence in the profession from the general public through research informed practice.

Q4 Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary? Please give reasons for your answer.

Ultimately, yes. We believe that this is important for a number of reasons. If it is voluntary - and there is a fee attached - then teachers are more likely to engage with the College and its aims. Being co-opted into joining would establish the wrong culture from the outset. It should be straightforward to sign up and dovetail with teachers' professional development. In addition, if teachers are paying a fee the onus is placed on the College to ensure it provides high quality products and services to the profession. This is all vital to ensure buy-in from the profession, which is crucial if such a body is to succeed. In this way, allowing everyone to become a member of the same organisation is more likely to lead to joined-up thinking within the profession - with all the accompanying benefits. This can only lead to better outcomes for pupils - which must remain the most important aspiration to keep in mind.

Q5 What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

Teach First agrees that these break down into the key priorities set out in the consultation document:

1. Setting standards

First and foremost, this should be the most important aim of a College of Teaching and getting this right will enable it to play a leading role within the sector and in positively raising the profile of teaching. Setting these standards, as a professional body, is in-keeping with a

community-led (rather than top-down) approach and would allow teachers to really take collective ownership of them, in line with the proposed vision. If this is achieved, the following priorities should then organically follow.

2. Enhancing professionals' development

Professor Dylan Wiliam has commented that every teacher needs to make a key commitment to be a better practitioner, not because they are necessarily bad teachers but because constantly striving to improve should be every teacher's moral imperative for the good of the pupils.¹ We believe this notion should underpin the approach to professional development within teaching. Good professional development will be felt by the teacher, their pupils and the school in a sustained way and training should be evaluated with this in mind. Professional development should also be measured in terms of how far it supports a teacher to have an impact on the education of the pupils in his or her care. It is about more than simply how the professional development in question is perceived by the teacher and Kirkpatrick's model of evaluation supports this approach.²

3. Informing professional practice, standards and policy through use of evidence

This is, again, reflects previous points but practice and professional development that is informed by research and evidence is critical. Ben Goldacre, and others, have warned about 'bad science' in education - we must acknowledge that children and young people deserve the best from their education and draw on the most credible evidence to support an education system that achieves for all.

Q6 Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

The proposed principle of mentoring is one Teach First agrees with. We are, however, very aware that a mentoring model will only ever be as good as the mentor available. As such, the success of such an approach could rise and fall depending on the quality of the pool available. For example, despite significant investment, experience of Initial Teacher Training has demonstrated this risk of variability. Real thought would therefore need to be given to how best to attract, train and support mentors to ensure they consistently delivered value to their mentees' progression.

Due to the range and breadth of professional areas, there is a risk that an assigned mentor may be expert in one particular area resulting in an overemphasis in one domain, at the detriment of others. If this situation were to arise, a mentee could be left with unbalanced performance.

A potential solution to these concerns is to re-focus the emphasis away from mentoring and towards a coaching relationship. This approach may be useful to illuminate areas of practice, signpost and ensure that the mentee is driving their own learning. By providing a coach, a

¹ Prof Dylan Wiliam, speech at Wellington College, Festival of Education, 21st June 2013

² Kirkpatrick, D. (2006) *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Level 3rd edition*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers

teacher can leverage more specific support available to them, ensuring they can develop across all professional areas and help to mitigate unbalanced emphasis.

Current research suggests³ that the most supportive roles often bridge the gap between coach and mentor. Therefore there may be a solution which enables mentee to opt-in to the type of support that is most appropriate to their current professional development journey - with a range of coaching and mentoring support available.

Q7 Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning? Please give reasons for your answer.

Teach First believes a tiered approach is sensible and aspirational.

The identification of a number of professional areas is also correct. It is vital, however, that the College recognises the need for teachers to demonstrate ability across all of these areas in order to reach the next stage of certification. Teaching success can't be achieved unless all the professional areas are developed and this should be reflected in the certification process.

Whilst the level of rigour needs to be high, we believe there is a real need to ensure that the College contributes to a self-sustaining and high attaining system for all pupils - particularly those facing the biggest barriers. To achieve this we would stress the importance of sharing best practice throughout the profession. This collaboration should be represented and underpin the principle of teachers' professional learning. For example, if work at Level 4 is not shared with colleagues, for the benefit of all children, this may lead towards an unexpected but exclusive practice where teachers who face the greatest challenges in improving outcomes for young people are not provided with the tools and knowledge to deliver this.

The issue of certification is important as it is progressive and aspirational. We believe that the certification process must be open to external scrutiny and that those awarding the certification acknowledge that they are true gatekeepers of the next phase. If the process or judgements are questioned, it could quickly lose its credibility.

One potential challenge of a standard certification system is that it is blind to the context in which the teacher works. This is required to ensure that the rigour is maintained but the College would need to monitor the numbers being certified from a broad section of schools. The College should create an approach to encourage applications from across the spectrum of schools and Academies.

At Teach First we have found that schools that face challenges often require leadership earlier and therefore may wish people to progress through the stages more rapidly. In addition, the local context of a particular school can play an important role - with a need to re-think subject or professional pedagogies based on local demands. There should therefore be a means for this local context to be considered as part of the certification process.

³ Pask, R. & Joy, B. (2007), *Mentoring-Coaching: a guide for education professionals*, Open University Press

In addition, the portfolio approach would need to clearly outline the expectations upon applicants. We would also encourage exploring how the process could be more practice-based, whilst still incorporating the elements suggested.

We support the concept of re-certification to ensure standards remain high and the concept of ever continuing professional development is encouraged.

Q8 How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

Teach First believes this is a critical area and one which the College can provide real added value to the profession. The importance of research informing practice is reflected in Teach First's offer of a Masters in Education Leadership to all our teachers in their second year on the programme. To date, as a whole, translating academic research into significant practice development in schools has often been left to individual teachers who have the resource and desire to do so. There is therefore a real need to facilitate this learning across the profession. The College's sharing of evidence could help teachers better understand the rationale behind new practice and approaches - something which currently holds backs implementation of some of the best new research.

This is further complicated by the wealth of international comparison. We believe that teaching practice should be research-informed, but that research must be used with an understanding of local context.

Q9 Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Teach First believes there is a role for the College to play in advising policy-makers. If the College is to achieve its vision of building a respected profession, advancing teaching standards and promoting the use of evidence, this is an important element which will help create system wide change for both the profession and for students.

In order to remain true to the desire to develop a College that represents a respected profession, it will need to speak with authority whilst representing the views of its associates, members and fellows. It needs to stand above party politics and keep the interest of learners at its heart.

An influential voice with policy-makers will only be achieved if other aspects of the College's work are successful. If the College facilitates the much better adoption of research-informed practice, and the best practices of high attaining fellows is utilised, then its voice will be credible and respected.

Q10 Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

Overall, Teach first believes the proposed structure seems sensible and suitable. Having a governance structure that clearly defines roles and responsibilities and that provides a strict remit will be vital in ensuring the focus of the College remains clear and that it develops as an ever more relevant body. As such, we believe the critical friendship role of the board will be extremely useful.

Whilst the Partnership Forum provides a useful means to hear and utilise a variety of voices, the importance of having a clearly defined remit and role is particularly apparent if the College is to best benefit from the wide range of views that this body will represent.

Q11 Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow

£175-200 b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-

140, Fellow £200-250

Please explain your answer

Teach First feels this is best answered by teachers directly.

Q12 Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

Teach First believes individual teachers should take responsibility for covering the cost of certification.

The College needs to be seen as a respected and vital body within the profession and by individual teachers. The benefits of certification therefore need to be clear and tangible to individuals. We hope that this will be achieved and, as such, individual teachers will be happy to make this commitment to their profession and continued development. The individual taking responsibility for payment would also help mitigate risk of certification being tied to promotion by schools.

Q13 Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

Teach First feels this is best answered by teachers directly.

Q14 Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

If this is to be achieved, the College will need to work hard to demonstrate its relevance and importance to both individual teachers and the wider profession. We are hopeful that this will be the case. To maximum the chances of achieving this, the College should explore how its certification system aligns with other networked initiatives - such as teaching schools.

Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET)

UCET is an independent, professional organisation funded solely by its member institutions, i.e. universities, colleges and others providing accredited HE level teacher education and engaging in education research in the UK, all of which are represented on its Governing Council and its Standing Committees. It acts as a national forum for the discussion of matters relating to the education of teachers and to the study of education and educational research in the university sector. It also provides a network for the exchange of information about the work of its members. UCET promotes high standards in the education and professional development of teachers and supports all appropriate moves to enhance the quality and status of the teaching profession. It contributes to the educational debate from its specialist position within Higher Education and to the formulation of policy through contacts with Government and national bodies. UCET encourages educational enquiry and research and disseminates information and the results of research.

A NEW MEMBER-DRIVEN COLLEGE OF TEACHING

UCET Response to Discussion Document

Preamble

1. UCET welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Discussion Document on the establishment of a College of Teaching in England and warmly commends the Prince's Teaching Institute for mounting this important initiative. We wish to preface our response to the questions posed with a number of general observations.

2. UCET strongly supports the establishment of a College of Teaching, as we have made clear in our evidence to the current Education Select Committee inquiry. In our view, it was regrettable that one of the first acts of the coalition government in 2010 was to discontinue the General Teaching Council for England. Although the Council had not earned the full support of the teaching profession, its shortcomings could have been addressed. It is unfortunate that in England, alone of the four countries in the UK, still has no professional body to articulate and defend the values and standards which teachers espouse or to give expression to the aspirations which shape their approach to their professional work.

3. Secondly, UCET regrets that the Teaching Committee appears to have to some extent pre-empted the discussion by appearing to champion a restricted conception of the role and function of a College of Teaching. The Discussion Document asserts that the College will be "supportive" rather than "regulatory". We think that it is possible to be both. Some organisation will be required to regulate the profession and, in keeping with generally accepted concepts of 'professionalism', it should be the professional body (rather than government) that does so.

4. Another area where discussion is pre-empted concerns the exclusion of any disciplinary function from the duties of the College. It is expressly stated that the College will have "no role in disciplinary hearings or in matters of conduct relating to employment". It is entirely appropriate to exclude the College from any role relating to the pay and conditions of service of teachers for these are the proper responsibility of teaching unions. However, it seems inconsistent for the College to be primarily concerned with setting standards if it has no

responsibility to ensure that teachers comply with expected standards of professional conduct and professional competence.

5. Another example of the Discussion Document's failure in this regard is its stance on standards for entry to the profession, which the document considers to be the responsibility of government and therefore of no concern to the College. If the College's primary role is to be the setting of standards it should not leave responsibility for the standard for QTS to rest with government. Giving responsibility for QTS to the College should not cause any problems for the government, given its stated desire for a sector-led policy approach.

6. Our third general observation concerns the involvement of universities in the work of the College. UCET regrets that, notwithstanding the College's declared aim of setting standards and its promotion of evidence-based policy and practice, there is no reference whatever to the universities and to the ways in which they could support the work of the College. We whole-heartedly endorse the claim that the College should be 'member-driven', but there is no incompatibility between that claim and the involvement of universities. If the College is to have the role of promoting teaching and learning practices that are informed by research and evidence they will surely need to collaborate with universities, which are major centres of research in education. Furthermore, universities have well-established arrangements for determining whether awards are appropriately rigorous. Rather than developing its own programmes of CPD the College could look to universities, in partnership with subject associations where appropriate, to provide master's level and doctoral programmes, whose academic rigour is quality-assured to the highest international standards and whose professional relevance would be endorsed by the College, in exactly the same way as programmes of initial teacher education in other parts of the UK are academically validated by universities and professionally endorsed by the appropriate General Teaching Council.

7. In our view the various tiers of recognition that the College would endorse should be tied to university postgraduate awards. There is strong evidence, from Ofsted and others that programmes leading to such awards enhance teaching and learning and make a strong contribution to the educational effectiveness of schools and of the education service more widely. We therefore urge that the College should find ways of engaging with the universities in its work. Such engagement will strengthen the notion of a teacher-led organisation rather than undermine it.

8. Finally, we trust that the Teaching Committee will have taken account of the work of the General Teaching Councils in other parts of the UK, particularly the General Teaching Council for Scotland, which, as an independent body controlled by teachers, is widely regarded as the prototype of professional bodies in teaching. Account might also be taken of developments overseas such as the Ontario College of Teachers in Canada and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in the USA. The establishment of a College of Teachers is too important to be frustrated by the not-invented-here syndrome.

Response to consultation questions

Q1 Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching?

Yes. The consultation paper sets out very clearly the main arguments for a member-driven College of Teaching. There is no doubt that such a body could provide the “deeply respected voice on professional matters that teaching needs”. The key issue is that there should be a *single* voice, one that commands the support of the whole profession.

Q2 Do you agree with this Vision?

Yes. We acknowledge the weight of the arguments set out in the vision statement. The establishment of the College may not on its own raise the status of teaching but we are sure that that standing will not be raised without the establishment of a College of Teaching.

Q3 Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards practice and research?

Yes, for these are matters that should be determined by professionals and not by politicians. We add one further relevant consideration. If teaching is to attract its share of able graduates it must be perceived by them to be a profession worthy of their commitment. When teaching is demonized, even by ministers, and the work of teachers is denigrated by politicians and irresponsible journalists, it is extremely difficult to envisage teaching as one of the great professions. On the contrary, teachers are frequently portrayed as low-level functionaries whose professional discretion is severely constrained by an excessively prescriptive national curriculum. A College of Teaching is essential to lead the attack against policies that de-professionalise and disempower teachers.

Q4 Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary?

In principle, no. Membership of the College should ideally be a requirement on all of those who teach in English schools. The College will not have the authority or credibility of other professional bodies unless it can speak for the whole profession, and not simply a minority of enthusiasts. We were greatly encouraged by the opening words of the consultation paper, which made reference to ‘an independent professional body with universal membership’. A few pages later the initial ambitious affirmation is modulated to a ‘College with widespread membership’. Would the General Medical Council or the Law Society or any of the other great professional bodies give the slightest consideration to the principle of voluntary membership? We do however recognise the practicalities of ensuring a comprehensive

membership and would hope that, in the absence of compulsion, there should at least be a clear aspiration, supported by a strategy, to secure as close to 100% membership as possible. If membership of the College is not to be a requirement for teachers, it should certainly become an expectation.

Q5 What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

All three of the primary aims proposed for the College are important but the first of these, the setting of professional standards, should carry priority over the other two. Besides, the standards set should be comprehensive and cover *all* the standards of achievement within the profession, not simply a convenient selection of these. Furthermore, it is not sufficient simply to set standards: robust arrangements need to be put in place to ensure that standards are met. In our view, the Discussion Document fails to devote sufficient attention to the regulatory functions that a professional body should undertake as the principal reason for its existence.

Q6 Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

No. The attention devoted to mentoring is to some extent disproportionate and does not represent a wise use of resources. The College would be better advised to take advantage of the programmes of professional development already available and to direct its energies, through an accreditation process, to ensuring that such programmes nurture the professional capabilities valued by the College. There is a further difficulty with regard to the mentoring structure. The measurement and assessment of professional capabilities is an extremely complex matter, which is best undertaken as a collective rather than an individual responsibility, carried out by a single College member or Fellow acting on his or her own. How are those assessed to be protected from the assessor who takes a highly idiosyncratic interpretation of the performance criteria? How will fairness and reliability of assessment be guaranteed? What arrangements will be put in place for the hearing of appeals, or for addressing legal challenges? The proposed mentoring scheme cannot be introduced without much more detailed work on the infrastructure that any large-scale professional assessment scheme will require. It is for this reason that we urge that the tiers of membership should be tied to university awards, which are all underpinned by rigorous quality assurance regimes.

Q7 Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning?

Not as well as they should. While it is reasonable to posit tiered membership, the proposals in this section are too cumbersome. We have three main reservations. Firstly, the five designated areas of professional expertise do not devote sufficient attention to the obligation on professionals to research their practice and to make public the outcome of such research. Secondly, on the assumption that associated status is marked by what currently is known as

QTS – and as we have made clear we maintain that the College, not the government, should determine that standard – there is a need for two further standards. The first of these would denote a significant level of accomplishment as a teacher, similar to the Standard for Chartered Teacher in Scotland or certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in the USA. Both of these are based on a limited number of demanding criteria. In UCET's view, that standard should be tied to the award of a master's degree. Beyond that, there should be the standard for the Fellowship of the College. That ought to denote outstandingly high professional achievement, for example with regard to innovation, institutional or national impact, or excellence in the most challenging classroom or school contexts. That standard ought to be tied to the award of a Doctorate in Education.

Q8 How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

It is extremely important. It is because teaching is a knowledge-based profession, that is, one where practice is informed by evidence, that it can lay claim to professional standing. Of course, as in other professional spheres, teaching includes a repertoire of skills, insights and techniques that are captured by the term *craft*, but the craft dimension of teaching is subsumed within a wider range of professional attributes and responsibilities. That is, in teaching there is continuing interplay between *personal* craft knowledge and a more extensive *public* knowledge base. That *public* knowledge base concerns the evidence relating to effective professional performance and its enhancement. The College must champion that conception of teaching as a form of professional activity informed by evidence.

Q9 Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Yes. As the voice of the teaching profession the College must play a prominent role in shaping educational policy and must enter fully into the debate on the conduct of teaching and learning, matters on which the teaching profession ought to speak with unrivalled authority.

Q10 Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

No. The proposed organizational and governance structure is too complex, resulting in uncertainty and confusion about the location of professional leadership. We maintain that what is required is a broadly representative general council that is the legal entity of the College, which is responsible, not the Executive Director, who is the servant of the council, for the strategic direction of the College, for the appointment of staff, for exercising stewardship of the College's resources, for maintaining close communication with teachers, and for evaluating the College's effectiveness against explicit public criteria.

Q11 Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200

b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250

We seriously doubt it. If teachers in England look across the border they will note that Scottish teachers pay £45 per annum as a registration fee and in return receive the comprehensive range of services that are to be expected from a professional body. We doubt if teachers in England would gladly pay several times that sum for a somewhat restricted professional service.

Q12 Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

No. The College ought not to look upon the certification process as a means of generating income. Again, Scottish teachers pay nothing for this service, although some of the States in the USA meet the costs of certification with the National Board.

Q13 Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

Clearly it will be important to take account of the response to the Discussion Document, but, for our part, involvement in the certification process should be a recognized duty of all members and fellows, an involvement which does not attract additional payment. Such work should be seen as a form of service to the College, an integral part of a teacher's professional responsibilities.

Q14 Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

Again, it will be important to see how heads and others respond, but we maintain that schools should be willing to release teachers for the work of the College as a way of demonstrating their commitment to the teachers' professional body. Engagement in the work of the College needs to be seen as an integral feature of the work of a teacher, not an extra duty that requires a financial inducement.

Gordon Kirk

Academic Secretary.

25 July 2013.

University of Roehampton

The School of Education at Roehampton has a long-established international reputation for high-quality teaching and research, and is positioned as one of the principal providers of Initial Teacher Training (ITT) nationally. Our mission is to develop and apply world-class research, practitioner skills and knowledge to improve outcomes and achievements for all children and young people, both at home and abroad.

We are one of the largest providers of Initial Teacher Training courses in London and the South East and offer our trainee teachers a challenging, vibrant and supportive 'community of practice', with staff and trainees working with partners in over 1000 schools, colleges and education settings to improve education provision.

Our wide range of education courses prepare students for roles in many educational settings - including education management, education policy and education support services - and for entry to teacher training and other forms of postgraduate study. Underpinning the high quality of education provision at Roehampton, our rigorous and internationally recognised research creates impact in our partnership schools, early years and other educational settings.

www.roehampton.ac.uk/education

**Response to The Prince's Teaching Institute discussion document
*A new member-driven College of Teaching: a blueprint for
discussion* (July 2013)**

Executive Summary

This response has been prepared in consultation with staff members across the University of Roehampton's School of Education (UR SoE). It aims to highlight areas of consensus whilst also reflecting the complexity of our staff members' views on the proposal for a College of Teaching.

Overall, RU SoE staff welcome the progression of discussion of an independent, member-driven College of Teaching providing:

a/ significant demand from the profession can be proven, and;

b/ the proposed College would be committed to representing the whole teaching community, including those teaching professionals not based in schools.

In particular, RU SoE staff noted the role of HEIs within the structure of the proposed College needs to be clarified. Staff within Schools of Education - many of whom are former teachers and Head teachers - are at the forefront of training the next generation of teachers and leading educational research communities; as such it is essential the College gives careful thought to how it will represent the broad community of professionals involved in the teaching profession, not just school-based teachers.

Response to Questions 1 to 14

Q1 Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching?

Yes, if a robust evidence base demonstrates demand from the profession. Of course, the response to this consultation itself will form a key part of assessing that demand.

UR SoE staff who responded to the call for views felt strongly that a member-driven College should represent the entirety of the teaching profession – including the broad community of professionals involved in teacher training, education and research who not school-based teachers. They saw a role for a non-political representative of the whole profession, which should act as a stable, consistent institution led by members and able independently to set standards for professional practice. They agreed the focus on independence and a member-driven ethos should be paramount.

However, some staff members highlighted the fact that there are already several 'independent voices' operating within the education landscape. The College would need to distinguish itself through delivering on a specific remit to a very high standard, and not try "to do too much".

Some staff members suggested the structure of the College should reflect distinctions across the profession between Early Years, Primary, Secondary and FE. These are very different audiences and will often require bespoke focus. For example, different medical specialisms, such as surgery, have their own Colleges.

Q2 Do you agree with this Vision?

UR SoE staff broadly agree with the focus of the Vision. In particular staff welcomed the recognition that the overarching focus should be on improving outcomes for children and young people.

Staff felt it was particularly important to stress the Vision's commitment to evidence-based decision-making grounded in rigorous research.

Q3 Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

Yes. The College should be a respected voice of the profession able to articulate authoritative views that reflect the profession's priorities.

In general RU SoE staff felt the above should be the key areas of focus, providing the College recognised they are all relatively contested areas and that consequently a broad representation of views should be actively sought and not diluted in pursuit of neat consensus. However, some expressed concerns that in undertaking to represent the profession on so many complex areas the College would be spreading itself too thinly. Instead the College should look to undertake joint initiatives with university departments and subject associations that already have a wealth of expertise in specific areas.

The College's relationship with the NCTL, OFSTED and other agencies would need to be clarified.

Q4 Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary?

The views of UR SoE staff differed on this point. Roughly half thought no - for the College to be an effective advocate for the profession all should be in it together or not at all, and half thought yes - voluntary membership would allow members to join when they're ready and would necessitate that relevance and quality should dictate the College's direction.

Q5 What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

1. To act as an independent, authoritative advocate for the teaching profession through high-level engagement with policy-makers and opinion-formers. The College should represent the whole profession by upholding, promoting and developing the professional

values which are considered highly by those in the profession, and represent the voices of the teaching community as an independent and non-political organisation.

2. To inform professional practice, standards and policy with evidence grounded in rigorous research.
3. To set member-driven professional standards.

The process for determining and promoting these will need careful thought. Some staff members felt the way the discussion document phrased its wording on this suggested that the existing regulatory minimum standards are not sufficient, leading to concerns that new professional standards might lead to a subjective expectation that becomes unattainable. As one staff member commented, "all good teachers aspire to be better and know there are ways they can improve. However, they do want a work/life balance. They do not want to have to pay for another body producing guidelines telling them that they are not good enough."

- 4 To promote on-going professional development and career enhancement through active use of a professional development evaluation network.
- 5 To celebrate the success of the profession.

Q6 Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

Whilst the principle of teachers supporting teachers was welcomed, staff members were concerned the proposed mentoring structure is too complex and fraught with issues of accessibility and equality.

Q7 Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning?

A few staff members expressed concerns that a strong focus on hierarchy would deflect the value of certification through condensation into a 'tick box exercise'.

It was noted the gathering of evidence every five years might prove too onerous and therefore dis-incentivise members to re-certify, however staff members also felt the rigour of the process would be paramount. A balance must be sought if teachers are to see the value.

A few staff members commented the areas for consideration should be broadened to include an expectation that members engage with outside agencies beyond the school-based focus, such as museums, galleries, PRUs, outdoor centres, STEM initiatives, etc.

Overall, staff members agreed the focus of enhancing teachers' professional learning should be on facilitating and stimulating professional conversations, opportunities for networking and accessing a wide range of research-based materials.

Q8 How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

Extremely important. Evidence is very much embedded into practice at Roehampton and developing practice-based research is a key strategic focus.

The College should seek to facilitate access to a 'broad church' of research approaches which represent the diverse interests of members, with the quality of research taking priority over the kind of research being disseminated.

Staff member suggested the College should consider an expectation that research should form part of the 'Fellow' requirement, if not 'Associate'. Encouraging members to read and engage in research should be core business for the College.

Q9 Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Staff members felt there is already plenty of expertise in universities and subject associations and that the College developing separate advice would simply duplicate what is already out there.

Staff members suggested the College should work with existing sources of expertise in these areas to establish joint initiatives and professional alliances that could reflect opinions of the whole community at a broad level, not just school-based colleagues.

Q10 Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

Staff members highlighted the importance of the Partnership Forum in College decision-making, as the College should seek to represent the whole community and not just school-based colleagues. They felt the Partnership Forum should include a broader representation from early years settings and external settings such as outdoor learning, museums, galleries, etc.

Staff members felt strongly that inclusivity and equality should be paramount in the organisational and governance planning of the College.

One staff member commented the College should be based outside London.

Q11 Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of:

a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200

b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250

Staff members felt teachers would be unlikely to pay subscription fees at the proposed level unless the College was able to provide significant member discounts and benefits.

It was felt allowing an option for spreading payments throughout the year instead of in a lump sum would help boost membership, as would a discounted student membership for trainee teachers.

Ultimately it was felt the College would need to prove its worth and relevance before it could expect a large proportion of the profession to join.

Q12 Do you think costs of £250 - 500 for certification are reasonable? Who would pay them?

Staff members felt certification costs at this level would be prohibitive unless funded by an employer.

Q13 Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

Staff members felt this would be unlikely without compensation to allow for cover, given it would involve time away from members' jobs.

Q14 Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

Staff members felt some schools would if there were demonstrable benefits to them and these were clearly articulated. Other staff members felt it unlikely unless schools were compensated to provide cover.

Other thoughts and questions?

All staff members noted the role of HEIs within the College structure needs to be clarified. Staff within Schools of Education - many of whom are former teachers and Head teachers - are at the forefront of training the next generation of teachers and leading educational research communities; it is essential the College gives careful thought to how it will represent the broad community of professionals involved in the teaching profession, not just school-based teachers.

Staff members also noted the College should formalise how it plans to work with existing sources of expertise to establish joint initiatives and professional alliances.

July 2013

Contact:

Emma Robinson
Strategic Projects Officer
Director's Office, School of Education
University of Roehampton
Emma.robinson@roehampton.ac.uk / 0208 392 3071

Voice: the Union for Education Professionals

Voice: the union for education professionals is pleased to have the opportunity to respond to the discussion document, 'A new member-driven College of Teaching: a blueprint for discussion'. Voice is an independent trade union, founded in 1970 by two Essex teachers, Colin Leicester and Ray Bryant, who gathered together a group of like-minded professional teachers who were prepared to commit themselves to the principle of not striking. The union now has 32,000 members across all sectors of education (early years, primary, secondary and tertiary), including teachers, lecturers, school and college leaders, teaching assistants and other school support staff, nannies, nursery nurses, childcare and early years professionals, centrally employed staff working for Local Authorities in education or children's services, students on teacher training or childcare courses, and self-employed tutors and consultants. Formerly known as The Professional Association of Teachers, the union re-branded in February 2008 as Voice: the union for education professionals. Independent of the Trades Union Congress and not affiliated to any political party, Voice prefers to use the force of argument rather than the argument of force and, as such, relies on the power of effective negotiation rather than resorting to strikes or any other form of industrial action.

COMMENTS

1. Do you think there is a role for a new independent member-driven College of Teaching?

In principle, we are very much in favour of the establishment of a College of Teaching. We believe that morale within the teaching profession is currently at a low point and that this is associated with both a lack of professional esteem within the teaching profession and also a decline in public confidence and respect for teachers. Therefore, we would welcome any attempt to raise the status of teaching as a profession and to restore public confidence and respect.

One of our hopes for the erstwhile General Teaching Council for England was that it would rise to this challenge. Unfortunately, this did not materialise, partly because the GTCE emphasised its regulatory functions over everything else, and also because it was seen by members of the teaching profession as an external imposition, not driven by the profession itself and lacking a genuine interest in the welfare of teachers.

An examination of the failure of the GTCE is, therefore, crucial to ensuring that any potential College of Teaching is correctly founded. At the very least, we believe that such a College should be independent of government and that it should be owned and controlled by teachers themselves. We also believe that such a College should be open to teachers in all phases of education (from nursery to tertiary) and to both public and private sectors (including private tutors as well as teachers from the independent sector).

We foresee there being many potential benefits of such an initiative. It would help to galvanise the profession and raise aspirations, motivation and standards, as well as status. It would provide a vehicle and impetus for promoting continuing professional development in both subject knowledge and generic teaching skills, as well as the development of apposite dispositional and attitudinal aspects of being a professional teacher. It could also act as a very useful umbrella organisation in bringing together subject associations, phase associations, education unions and other professional associations allied to teaching, and in engaging in research.

2. Do you agree with this vision?

Yes, we agree with the commitment to improving the education of children and young people and building respect for the teaching profession by promoting high standards for teaching, developing and recognising excellent teachers and fostering evidence-based policy and practice. We also agree that the College should be motivated by a deep sense of moral and intellectual purpose, driven by members.

It is important that the College of Teaching be politically independent and self-determining. Many other professions have similar bodies to represent and promote their professional interests, and teaching has suffered because of the stranglehold that Government has had on the education system and the lack of a unified member-driven body which can support and steer the profession through the maelstrom of political interference and the concomitant, and seemingly relentless, changes to the education system. This would not usurp the important role played by trade unions in safeguarding and promoting members' employment rights, but would focus on setting, promoting and advancing high standards of teaching alongside complementary initiatives in regard to initial teacher training, continuing professional development and education research.

3. Do you think the College of Teaching should aim to provide an authoritative voice of the profession on matters of teaching values, standards, practice and research?

Yes, we believe this is vitally important, particularly as state education in England is becoming increasingly fragmented and local authorities are declining in influence and impact. Given the essential importance of education to civilisation, democracy and effective citizenship, it is staggering that there is no single cohesive body which can speak authoritatively on behalf of the profession on such matters as values, standards, practice and research in teaching.

4. Do you agree that membership of a new College of Teaching should be voluntary?

Yes, we believe that credibility and respect cannot be gained through compulsion or imposition, and any attempt to do so would meet strong resistance from many teachers and recreate some of the endemic and intractable problems experienced by the GTCE and the Institute for Learning (during the time when membership was compulsory for further education lecturers).

5. What do you think the most important activities of a College of Teaching should be?

We see the following activities as being most important:

- i. Raising the status of the teaching profession among the general public
- ii. Defining teaching standards and good teaching practice
- iii. Promoting continuing professional development
- iv. Curating and disseminating research into teaching
- v. Informing policy-making

6. Do you think that the proposed mentoring structure is a reasonable basis for organising the work of the College?

In principle, we agree that a system of mentoring could very effectively foster a culture of support and professional development. However, training would need to be rigorous and thorough and a system of on-going monitoring and review would need to be in place to ensure consistency between what may be a large number of mentors in meeting service standards and providing a high quality of support.

7. Do you think that the tiered membership and certification process such as that outlined will enhance teachers' professional learning?

In principle, a tiered membership structure should encourage the development of teachers as professionals. However, for this to work in practice, the steps on the ladder need to be sufficient in number and gradation. The current proposal may fail in this regard as most teachers will not be able to access the 'Member' tier until sometime after they have qualified as teachers (because of the need to undergo a period of post-qualification professional formation), which could be demotivating as, in the mean time, they would have to remain in Associate membership, which would fail to recognise that they are no longer trainees – and once they have become Members, there would only be one further rung, which they would be unable to access unless they could show themselves to be exceptionable (thus, putting it out of reach for many teachers). We would prefer the 'Member' tier to be available to all teachers who are no longer trainees, and for another tier (perhaps at 'Licentiate' or 'Chartered' level) to be available to teachers who have established their professional

credibility by maintaining a high standard of teaching and furthering their skills and experience over a period of time. This would still leave the 'Fellow' tier as a final rung for those who prove themselves to be exceptional in terms of the substance and significance of their contributions to teaching.

8. How important do you think it is for the College to seek to inform practice with evidence?

It is very important that the College should seek to advocate and promote evidence-based practice. Currently, much teaching practice is shaped by what is in vogue politically, which is more often informed by rhetoric and ideology rather than evidence. Establishing a more objective and scientific basis for proposals would enable the College to gain credibility and act as an authoritative voice for the profession.

9. Do you think the College should seek to advise policy-makers on curriculum, assessment and school inspection?

Yes. Most policy-makers do not come from an education background, so it is important that a body which is made up of practising teachers, and which speaks on behalf of the whole profession, should take responsibility for shaping the education landscape by not only advising but also using its knowledge and influence to steer developments in such areas as curriculum, assessment, accountability and inspection.

10. Do you agree with the proposed organisational and governance structure? Would you recommend any improvements?

The proposals appear to be eminently sensible and reasonable and should ensure clarity, accountability and sustainability. In order to preclude the structure becoming too costly or unwieldy, consideration should be given to making sure that the size of committees and teams is proportionate to the size of membership but large enough to guarantee resilience to governance being controlled by any special interest group. Care also needs to be taken over the appointments process to ensure that factional interests are not able to dominate. This was a problem for the GTCE, arising from unintended consequences of the election process, and so due diligence needs to be applied to avoid a repetition of this state of affairs.

11. Given the proposed benefits and aims of the College, would teachers be willing to pay subscription rates of: (a) Associate £70-85, Member £125-135, Fellow £175-200; (b) Associate £85-100, Member £135-140, Fellow £200-250?

Funding the College may prove to be its greatest challenge. It is probably unrealistic to expect trainees to be able to afford £70-100, unless they are in receipt of substantial bursaries. Similarly, many practising teachers may struggle to afford £125-140 at a time when imminent changes to School Teachers' Pay and Conditions may depress pay in the schools sector, and when teachers are already having to endure a pay freeze and pay more in pension contributions. If teachers feel torn between paying union fees and College of Teaching subscriptions, it is likely that they will prioritise the former rather than the latter. Therefore, there may need to be an element of 'pump-priming' or a significant increase in teachers' economic position if the College is not to fall at the first hurdle by struggling to attract members. This will only be a problem in the short-term, whilst the College is being launched. Once the College is able to establish itself as an authoritative voice and major

gatekeeper for the profession, teachers will come to regard membership as essential to their professional development.

12. Do you think costs of £250-500 for certification are reasonable? Who should pay them?

It is acknowledged that the process of accreditation has a cost attached to it, but this process needs to be made as accessible as possible by ensuring that most applicants can rely on evidence which is already being used for other purposes, together with robust and effective arrangements for the accreditation of prior learning. This should help to reduce costs. Although the proposed tariff is not excessive, many teachers may still struggle to meet these costs, especially during the earlier years of their professional development, for the reasons already outlined above.

13. Do you think that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation?

It is likely that College Members and Fellows would be willing to mentor and certify other teachers without financial compensation as long as their employers are willing to release them on paid leave to undertake such duties.

14. Do you think schools will release College Members and Fellows 2-5 days per annum on average to certify other teachers?

This may prove to be problematic for some schools, particularly smaller schools, but if teacher release fees can be paid, along similar lines to how the teacher release scheme of examiners is operated by awarding bodies, it is likely that most schools would agree to participate, depending on the number of staff who wish to be released and also, perhaps, the time of the year.

Ian Toone
Senior Professional Officer (Education)
Voice: the union for education professionals
2 St James' Court
Friar Gate
Derby
DE1 1BT

iantoone@voicetheunion.org.uk

31st July 2013

Dr Raphael Wilkins

Dr Raphael Wilkins is Assistant Director (International Consultancy and Knowledge Transfer) at the Institute of Education, University of London (IOE), and Director of International Affairs in the IOE's London Centre for Leadership in Learning. Before joining the IOE in 2006, Raphael worked in teaching, local authority educational administration, and in national organisations, in addition to a period of freelance consultancy with national organisations and universities. At IOE he has personally undertaken over 40 international consultancies in many countries. Since 2011 Raphael has been President of the College of Teachers UK, having previously served as Vice President and Dean. He has published extensively in the fields of education leadership and teacher professionalisation.

Dear Sir or Madam

I am offering the following comments in response to the consultation on a new independent member-driven College of Teaching. I am writing in my personal capacity: I am also President of the current College of Teachers, but there is no difference between any of the official thinking of that organisation and my individual views as expressed here. I have personally been happy to champion the support of the current College of Teachers for the initiative to create a new College of Teaching. The Prince's Teaching Institute is well aware of that support and involvement. Generally what is set out in the consultation accords very well with what I would want to advocate.

In my comments below I want to emphasise that 'teaching' includes the work of headteachers: teaching and school leadership are not two different professions, and in any model of professionalization it is essential that the senior members of the profession play a full and leading role in developing new arrangements for the profession to govern its own evolving standards of good practice.

It is important that teaching should have an independent professional body. One of the reasons that I do not think has been foregrounded sufficiently concerns the growth of institutional autonomy. While that is generally very welcome, institutional autonomy is essentially a managerial construct rather than a professional one. Institutional autonomy has had the effect of reducing the extent to which individual professional practitioners have a sense of belonging to a national profession. A new independent professional body would counterbalance this by providing an infrastructure for the collective exercise of professional autonomy.

The voice of the new College should be authoritative, but to achieve that it must also avoid being partisan. In such a wide profession, at any period there will be hotly debated topics and a range of views, sincerely held and supported by different sources of research. The College should host and enable, even perhaps to encourage, responsible debates within the profession rather than seeking to lay down a 'party line' of a kind that would merely replicate the profession's sense of political interference and intolerance of debate or innovation.

Membership of the College has to be voluntary. Mass registration does not raise standards; it does not promote ownership, pride or agency; it spawns expensive bureaucracy for its own sake. In its early days the College should concentrate on professional development and professional recognitions until it has established itself, then its role will expand through a natural process.

Regarding 'evidence-informed practice', it is clearly important that the College should enable the profession to take a greater role in generating and using high quality evidence that is relevant to practice. At the same time it is important to recognise that the term 'evidence-informed practice' covers some highly contested viewpoints, which at one extreme aim to treat teachers as operatives who must be made to implement the 'proven one right way'. That is the opposite of professionalization, and a misrepresentation of the relationship that is possible between research and practice in a profession such as teaching which is based on human interactions and judgements. The College should be the main forum within which mature, sophisticated and even-handed debate on these matters can take place.

I am not convinced that the proposed governance structure is necessarily the best one: there may be a case for leaving this open until the work of the new College takes more definition.

I remain an enthusiastic supporter of this initiative, and I have set out my views more fully in a number of published articles.

Yours faithfully

Raphael Wilkins (Dr)
Assistant Director (International Consultancy and Knowledge Transfer)
Director of International Affairs
London Centre for Leadership in Learning
Institute of Education, University of London
20 Bedford Way
London WC1H 0AL

Telephone: +44 (0) 20 7612 6428

Mobile: 079 3315 2942

Fax: +44 (0) 20 7612 6618

Website www.ioe.ac.uk/lcl

 http://twitter.com/IOE_London

Raphael Wilkins is President of the College of Teachers

