gtc
SCOTLAND
GENERAL TEACHING
COUNCIL FOR SCOTLAND

Literature Review on Professional Standards for Teaching

Professor Margery A. McMahon, School of Education, University of Glasgow

University of Glasgow

Contents

Introduction

This short literature review has been prepared in response to a request from the General Teaching Council for Scotland, for a synthesis of relevant literature as part of the current review of the professional standards for teaching in Scotland. Given the terms of the commission a short 'snapshot' review of relevant literature was agreed as the most appropriate means to capture the broad themes and issues emerging or evident from the literature consulted.

Since the professional standards for teaching in Scotland were reviewed and updated in light of the *Teaching Scotland's Future* Report (2011), for which a wide reaching literature review on teacher education had been undertaken, it was agreed that, in the main, for this short literature review, the search would focus on the period from 2012 to 2018.

The structure for the review which follows is:
- outline of review parameters and search terms;
- framing the field and professional standards for teaching;
- definition and purpose of professional standards for teaching;
- design of professional standards for teaching;
- implementation of professional standards for teaching;
- international perspectives; and
- implications for professional standards for teaching in Scotland.

2. Outline of review parameters and search terms

In line with the terms of the commission and, as noted above, a review of the literature was undertaken from 2012 to 2018. From 2012, the 50 recommendations of *Teaching Scotland's Future* (2011) were actioned, of which the review of the professional standards formed an important component. GTC Scotland's set of Professional Standards was subsequently reviewed and, in line with the conditions set at that time, their subsequent review would occur quinquennially.

For the purposes of this review an initial search of educational databases was undertaken, focusing primarily on EBSCO and the British Citation Index. The main search terms used were professional standards for teaching; professional standards for teachers; teaching standards and teacher standards. In identifying items for further analysis selected inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied. Only standards relating to the school sector were included and the following were excluded: professional standards in further education; professional standards relating to TESOL; professional standards in Higher Education; and subject specific standards. This search generated a number of academic articles though there was a preponderance of articles focusing on the Australian context and to a lesser extent, England and Scotland.

For this review, in the main only publications relating to professional standards for teaching / teachers in the English speaking, developed world were selected, though it is important to note that there have been significant developments in relation to professional standards in the developing world, where there is recognition of the context specific nature of professional standards in their development, implementation and adoption.

To ensure as broad a range of capture within the parameters noted above, further searches were conducted using Google Scholar. This generated additional sources including grey literature consisting of commissioned reports and theses.

The literature search showed that there is a growing body of literature that seeks to identify effective models and approaches for the development and implementation of professional standards and which seeks to critique their adoption and the consequences of this for the teaching profession. This is discussed further in the following section.

3. Framing the field

Increasingly professional standards for teaching are being adopted in education systems as a means to improve teacher quality, codify professional practice and regulate the teaching profession and education systems; particularly developing countries, look to systems where professional standards are more well established for guidance on their development and implementation (Gallie and Keevey, 2014: p.1).

Despite their growing importance internationally the research base for professional standards for teaching, particularly relating to their impact, remains relatively small. In 2013 a study of standards in OECD countries, including learning standards, teaching standards and principal standards, conducted by the Centre of Study for Policies and Practices in Education (CEPPE), found that 'the topic of teaching standards and their impact is still quite new in the specialised literature' (CEPPE, 2013: p. 41). The study noted that 'except for learning achievement standards very few independent studies about the implementation of these standards exist. There is even less research as to their consequences and actual impact' (CEPPE, 2013: p. 7).

Taylor (2016) in his thesis *Teachers' experience of professional standards for teachers: A case study of the enactment of teaching standards in a high performing school system* makes reference to the literature review conducted as part of the Teaching Scotland's Future review which reported that ''studies on the impact of [teacher] accreditation are almost non-existent'' (Menter, Hulme, Elliot, & Lewin, 2010, p. 41 in Taylor, 2016: p. 1).

In the 'specialised' literature relating to professional standards for teaching, the focus tends to relate to their construction as mechanisms for improving teaching quality through regulatory and developmental means, a focus on the implementation and the application of professional standards, linked to teacher evaluation and, to a lesser extent, a focus on conceptualisation and design and consideration of impact. Forde et al (2016) identified three constellations in the literature relating to standards: initial preparation and entry into the teaching profession, leadership and management in education and, more recently, advanced teaching practice (Forde et al, 2016: p. 21). Given the importance attributed to and afforded to professional standards as levers for effecting school improvement, the need

for an accessible and coherent body of literature is increasingly emphasised. For Ceulemans (2017) this means opening the 'black box' and she argues that to grasp educational standards and what they do in education it is necessary to know how exactly they come to work (Ceulemans 2017: p. 34; Ceulemans, Simons and Struyf, 2012).

The body of literature relating to professional standards for teaching is emerging but limited, since, as the CEPPE study found, the development of standards for teachers and school principals has occurred within the last two decades (CEPPE, 2013: p.7; Forde et al, 2016: p. 20) and in many cases are a relatively new feature of school systems and are still evolving (CEPPE, 2013:p. 74). The CEPPE review noted that 'OECD English speaking countries have been the frontrunners in this educational trend (CEPPE, 2013: p.74). The report noted that learning standards and systems for monitoring their achievement are features of high performing countries (Barber and Mourshed, 2007; Barber et al, 2010 in CEPPE, 2013: p.7) and that the highest performing and improving educational systems have adopted a coordinated approach to standards (CEPPE, 2013: p. 74). Teaching standards are also seen as part of the strategy to address declining performance in international benchmarking measures such as PISA, as Savage and Lewis (2018) argue in relation to Australia's declining PISA performance (Savage and Lewis, 2018: 136).

More recently standards are being adopted in developing countries, which look to systems where they are more established for guidance on development and implementation. For example, a report commissioned to support the development of professional standards in South Africa (CDE, 2017) sought to draw lessons from the experiences of other countries; to make recommendations for the adoption of best practice in the field; and to identify the priorities for the effective development and implementation of teacher professional standards (CDE, 2017:1). The Centre for Development and Enterprise (CDE) study found a high degree of homogeneity with regard to the content, format, and implementation of standards in the educational systems studied which included USA, England, Australia, Jamaica, Namibia and Chile (CDE, 2017). A consultation report issued by the Commonwealth Secretariat in 2014 was the result of a consultative and participatory process to develop a broad standards framework to guide

commonwealth countries in defining the basic requirements related to knowledge, pedagogical skills and personal attributes that teachers and school leaders must demonstrate in order to achieve the objectives of education (Gallie and Keevey, 2014: p. 3).

The focus in this review is primarily on literature published since 2012. However it is important to situate the development of professional standards for teaching in the wider, politico–historical context of their development within the teaching profession since the 1990s, when their introduction formed part of the neo liberal and new public management agenda. In this respect, professional standards are of 'their time' and are complex ideological texts privileging particular constructions of what it means to be an effective teacher or leader (Forde et al, 2016: p. 25).

The development and wider adoption of professional standards for teaching since the 1990s has generated considerable debate about their purposes and use. Australian academic, Judyth Sachs, was one of the first to provide a critique on the purposes of professional standards with the publication of her article in 2003 on *Teacher Professional Standards: Controlling or developing teaching?* (Sachs, 2003). The underpinning themes were developed further in *The Activist Profession* (Sachs, 2003) and she revisited the issues raised in the 2016 article 'Teacher professionalism: why are we still talking about it?' (Sachs, 2016).

Sachs' 2003 article articulated issues and questions arising from the introduction of professional standards for teaching in Australia in the 2000s. In the article she sets out to discuss three claims relating to the introduction of professional standards: (i) the introduction of standards should improve the performance of teachers; (ii) the introduction of standards will improve the standing of teachers; and (iii) standards contribute to the on–going professional learning of teachers (Sachs, 2003: p. 179–182). The questions she sought to raise were related to whose interests would be served by the standards and what would be the effects of the imposition of the standards on teachers individually and collectively (Sachs, 2003: p.176).

In the article she also provided an important message about the need for flexibility in the codification of teachers' professional knowledge and practice. She argued that 'standards cannot and should not be frozen in time; they must be flexible to the changing conditions of teaching and learning as they occur inside and outside of schools (Sachs, 2003:p.176).

Sachs also sought to articulate the inherent tension in the way standards were conceptualised and used – 'a model of standards versus certification versus control' (Sachs, 2003: p.178). The ability of standards to deliver on the expectations associated with them is also highlighted by Sachs. The emphasis across the literature is that standards remain technical documents (Torrance and Forde, 2017) and their development, enactment and adoption need to be integrated rather than separate processes and as part of wider system reform within education systems. Thus, Sachs argued that the development / existence of professional standards is not sufficient to change public perceptions and media representations of teachers and teaching, nor to elevate the status of the profession (Sachs, 2003: p.181), cautioning against naïve views of the power of standards to immediately reshape or reform practice (Forde, 2018).

In her 2016 article, Sachs asked 'why are we still taking about teacher professionalism?' She identified three key issues: the rise of performance cultures, increased accountability, and the continued imposition of teacher standards; the embedding of performance management and performance cultures in schools and education systems; and the alignment of accountabilities with teachers accountable to the students they teach and the communities in which they work (Sachs, 2016: p. 414ff).

In the evolution of professional standards (which in the Australian context has shifted from state to federal standards), Sachs' analysis offers precision in how standards have come to be defined and used though this is not straightforward. Identifying who standards are for and applicable to, and what standards should contain is seen as a difficult task (Sachs, 2016: p. 416–417). While standards and accountability go 'hand in hand,' Sachs suggests that, in some respects standards have become the tool for managing and overseeing teacher accountability (Sachs, 2016: p. 416; Taylor, 2016).

Referring to earlier binary framings of standards as developmental and regulatory, Sachs argues that the current focus on regulation means that 'the opportunity for teacher professional standards to be a catalyst for authentic professional learning is not being realised' (Sachs, 2016: p. 417). In such circumstances, she argues, the application of standards becomes 'a ritualised form of accountability to meet the needs of government to satisfy the community that its schools and teachers provide a quality education' (Sachs, 2016: p. 417). As part of this evolving trend, Savage and Lewis (2018) detect a shift in the framing of the issue of standards 'squarely around individual teacher quality, rather than the previously more professionally oriented focus on teaching quality' in relation to the Australian teaching standards (Savage and Lewis, 2018: p. 128). Darling–Hammond (2013) notes the distinction between 'teacher quality' and 'teaching quality', arguing that teacher quality might be thought of as 'the bundle of personal traits, skills and understandings an individual brings … including dispositions to behave in certain ways' (p. 11) and 'teaching quality' relates to the 'strong instruction that enables a wide range of students to learn' (p. 12) (Darling–Hammond, 2013 cited in Forde and McMahon, 2018: p.3).

In her 2016 article, Sachs argues that systems where standards transcend purely regulatory and accountability functions, greater equilibrium between development and regulation may indicate the emergence of a more 'mature profession', though a focus on developmental standards is needed to sustain and reposition the profession (Sachs, 2016: p. 422). Where it is weighted more towards accountability the conditions are created for a more controlled or compliant professionalism (Sachs, 2016: p. 423).

Similarly Clarke and Moore (2013) see the potential of promoting compliance rather than development through professional standards. They argue that: neoliberal education policy's fetishisation of standards, measurement, transparency, and accountability has worked to eviscerate the ethical and political core of teaching, reducing it instead to what at times seems little more than an exercise in technical competence and instrumental efficiency. As a consequence, professional standards as currently conceived are more likely to be 'a framework for codifying not levels of development but degrees of compliance' (Clarke and Moore, 2013: p.490)

The tension between regulation and development endures and Sachs acknowledges that both types of standards do 'important professional and transformational work' (Sachs, 2016: p.422; Torrance and Forde, 2017). There is however an attempt to look beyond an 'either – or discussion' where standards are seen as an instrument that enhances educational quality and transparency or criticised for such adverse effects as deprofessionalization, fragmentation and reductionism (Ceulemans, 2017: 34). Ceulemans (2017: p.34) suggests that conceiving standards through a binary lens fails to capture the specific and unintended consequences of different sorts of standards for different groups of actors in distinct social settings and argues for a need to move beyond this dilemma to shift the focus away from what standards are (their content) or what they are for (their goal or intentions) and toward a detailed study of what standards do in particular settings (ibid). This requires greater precision in how standards are defined and how their purposes are understood and articulated, which is considered below.

4. Definition and purposes of professional standards

There is some variation across the literature in how professional standards relating to teachers' work are defined. Sachs (2016) observes that there is reference to teacher standards, teaching standards, and teacher professional standards (p.416–417). She notes that while complementary, there are differences between these (ibid). Teacher standards refer to levels of competence expected of individual teachers, either for entry into the profession or for measuring ongoing performance. The scope and remit of teaching standards is the teaching profession rather than individual teachers (Sachs, 2016: p.417).

There is variance across systems in how standards are defined. Ávalos (2005 in CEPPE, 2013: p.14) found that in the professional domain (standards for teachers and school leaders) and in some European or French speaking countries, the term 'competence' is used more frequently instead of 'standards', but both terms imply very similar meanings (Ávalos, 2005 in CEPPE, 2013: p.14).

How professional standards are conceptualised is closely linked to what their introduction and application is intended to bring about. The purposes of professional standards are therefore multifaceted but which needs to be clearly explicated. For CEPPE (2013) 'a coherent definition of the purposes of standards within the system, without establishing too many expectations, is a critical step to facilitate their adequate use and to prevent them from becoming discredited' (p. 75). Sachs however warns that although the purposes of professional standards may be explicitly stated, this does not imply that they will be understood nor applied equitably (Sachs, 2003).

Broadly, four main purposes are associated with teaching standards:
- to support the improvement of teacher performance;
- to certify teachers who are new to the teaching profession or who have attained a certain status as teachers;
- to assess teacher performance; and
- to evaluate and accredit teacher training institutions (CEPPE, 2013: p. 32).

Sach's (2003) original classification of standards as commonsense, summarising what is broadly understood and agreed about what teachers should be able to do and what they should know; standards as quality assurance; and standards as quality improvement (Sachs, 2004: p.177–178) remains current and relevant. For Ceulemans (2017) a key purpose is for standardising work (p.33–37). Darling-Hammond (1999) in Sachs (2003:175) recognised the potential of standards for 'mobilising reforms of the teaching career' but also cautioned that they are not magic bullets. Darling–Hammond (2012) in CEPPE (2013) warns of the dangers of 'robust standards weakly applied' and so the critical question is 'how the standards will be used, how universally they will be applied, and how they

may leverage stronger learning opportunities and a more common set of knowledge, skills and commitments across the profession' (Darling Hammond, 2012 in CEPPE, 2013:p. 42). A common benefit of standards however is their utility as means to promote professional dialogue. A 2015 evaluation on the implementation of the Australian Professional Teacher Standards (APTS) found that they offer a common national language and framework for self–reflection as well as for offering and receiving constructive feedback on improving teaching practice (Clinton et al, 2015: p. 62; p. 66). Recently, an OECD Working Paper (Révai, 2018) on professional teaching standards and teacher education reinforced their utility in promoting dialogue, arguing that: the main value of standards as policy tools lies in their capacity to create mutual dialogue between different artefacts (standards' requirements, curriculum, course descriptions, accreditation standards, etc.), as well as among stakeholders. Regularly renegotiating the standards as a result of such dialogue and reflections should be a crucial part of the policy process (Révai, 2018: p. 4).

The need for standards to serve several purposes: to demonstrate the required level of competence for entry into the profession; to maintain this required level of competence to ensure continuation of credentials to teach, and to foster increased skill and expertise is also a source of tension in their design and application and raises the question of the application of professional standards across the professional continuum from early career to veteran teacher (McMahon, Forde and Dickson, 2013). There is a tension therefore between their normative intent and orientation and their more generative role in developing and advancing practice (Forde and McMahon, 2019).

In some systems this has been addressed through differentiating standards by career stage or by levels of accomplishment. In Australia for example, the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (AITSL, 2011) have four levels: graduate, proficient, highly accomplished and lead (AITSL, 2011, online). In USA, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) sets out the professional standards for accomplished teachers. (NBPTS, 2016, online).

Such approaches seek to address the tension between standards that specify the level of competence required for entry into the profession and the use of these standards as the definition of competence for serving teachers with considerable experience (Forde and McMahon, 2019). For Forde et al, (2016) this is a means to maintaining a developmental change orientation and a relevance, without depressing or stalling practice' (Forde et al., 2016: p.28). An inherent tension in such approaches is the mandatory versus voluntary / aspirational nature of sets of professional standards where

initial certification and admission to the profession is contingent upon attainment of the benchmark standards but engagement with other developmental standards is elective. The use of incentives (financial, career advancement) may encourage further engagement but cannot mandate for universal adoption. Consequently the leverage afforded by professional standards at entry level can be less effective subsequently.

The purposes for which standards are intended impacts upon their subsequent design and use and so dichotomies emerge, not just in terms of the balance between regulation and development, but in whether they are seen as both normative and generative and whether they should be generic or specific. Standards therefore reflect, implicitly and explicitly, historic, current and projected understandings of the teacher and of the teaching profession and what is seen to be valued and important. The CEPPE study (2013) found that standards set out what someone should know and be able to do to be considered competent in a particular (professional or educational) domain; are used to describe and communicate what is most worthy or desirable to achieve, what counts as quality learning or as good practice and can also be used as measures or benchmarks, and, thus, as a tool for decision-making, indicating the distance between actual performance and the minimum level of performance required to be considered competent (CEPPE, 2013: p.14). Consequently, standards define the dimensions of performance or the domains of learning that are valued and that are worthy of being promoted, but they can also be used to assess if what is valued is actually being achieved or not (CEPPE, 2013: p.14).

The question of whether standards should be generic or specific features in the literature (CEPPE, 2013). Taylor (2016) in his thesis on professional standards for teachers notes that this reflects the shift in the wider adoption of standards, so that national-level professional standards for teachers exist where they did not exist before but which has been a recipe for decontextualised 'reified' standards that are removed from the authentic experiences of teachers (Parr, 2010 in Taylor, 2016: p. 44). Taylor (2016) references Thrupp (2006) who suggests that generic standards are preferred by authorities because they are more technically and politically expedient (Thrupp, 2006 in Taylor, 2016: p.44). Taylor also detects a further shift in that 'the focus has moved from the quality of the subject of interest (teachers), to the quality of the tool used to audit them (professional standards) (Taylor, 2016: p.43–44).

According to CEPPE (2013), 'generic standards describe good teaching practices in general terms without detailing how, in practice, these are to be demonstrated in the different teaching disciplines, distinct student grade levels or stages of professional development' (CEPPE, 2013: p.33). Specific standards on the other hand, can set out expected levels of practice by subject or discipline, grade (nursery, primary, or secondary) or career stage (CEPPE, 2013: p.33). The CEPPE survey in 2013 noted an emerging trend towards more specific standards though standards that integrated all three elements were rare (CEPPE, 2013: p.33). Sachs (2003) was an early

advocate for the need for standards to be flexible, arguing that a 'one size fits all' version of standards which may be attractive to governments, may not be in the best interests of teachers teaching in varied contexts (remote areas, in difficult schools, or in multi-age settings) and where their competence will be judged on the basis of 'some idealized notion of what competent or excellent teaching might be' (Sachs, 2003: p. 185). Sachs references Darling Hammond (1999) who warned that: Standard setting in all professions must be vigilant against the possibilities that practice could become constrained by the codification of knowledge that does not significantly acknowledge legitimate diversity of approaches or advances in the field; that access to practice could become overly restricted on grounds not directly related to competence; or that adequate learning opportunities for candidates to meet standards may not emerge on an equitable basis (Darling Hammond (1999) in Sachs, 2003:p.176).

Ceulemans (2017), as noted above, argues for the need to know more about how standards come to work. She suggests that for standards to have an effect, they need a specific type of user (as otherwise they are just a piece of paper no one cares about). The more a standard allows for versatile use, the more powerful its effect will be. According to Ceulemans, once people identify with a standard in what they say and do, its effect tends to go unnoticed, which, often implies a shift in control between the standard and its user(s). She argues that the capacity to control lies within (those working with) the standard, not in the hands of those behind the standard and that what a standard does depends on what and who it relates to (Ceulemans, 2017: p.47).

Drawing from her research relating to the Flemish Teacher Career Profile (TCP) Ceulemans concludes that educational standards have the capacity to effectuate both trust and control and that what makes educational standards work so as to be more trustworthy than controlling does not depend simply on the way people (mis-)understand or (mis-)use them (Ceulemans, 2017: p.48). Instead she argues it depends on the way these standards relate to implementation methods (e.g., by enacting parliamentary acts or decrees), measuring instruments (e.g., standardized questionnaires, competency matrices, evaluation reports), evaluation procedures (e.g., the quality assurance system discussed in this article), and policy reward and disciplinary systems (e.g., systems for subsidies and accreditation) (Ceulemans, 2017: p.48). The specifications for professional standards as identified by Ceulemans (2017) have important bearings on the ways in which professional standards are designed which is explored in the following section.

5. Design of professional standards for teaching

Standards have been the subject of much debate, including their design and content (Forde et al., 2016) and evaluative studies on professional standards for teaching (CEPPE, 2013; CDE 2017, Gallie and Keevey, 2014) draw attention to important components of the process which includes development, consultation, communication, implementation and evaluation. Given the growing importance that national education systems afford to professional standards for teachers and teaching, comprehensive guidance relating to their development is limited.

A key question in the development of professional standards is who should be involved in their design. This is a potential area of contestation. Sachs (2003: p.178) noted that 'who sets the standards and how they are set becomes one of the sites of struggle between the profession and other stakeholders, and indeed more often than not it is omitted from the discourse' (Sachs, 2003: p.178). Where standards are developed without the involvement of the profession, their adoption and use in a developmental way can be curtailed (Sachs, 2003: p.179) which Sachs suggests was the case when teaching standards were first introduced in Australia, citing Louden (1999) who argues that because of how the standards were developed, who developed them and their political intent, there are a series of weaknesses common to all Australian standards (Loudon, 1999 in Sachs, 2003: p. 179).

Validity and credibility are seen to be important elements in the design and development of professional standards. Credibility comes from direct involvement of the teaching profession and the need to make public the process of standards conceptualisation and design is emphasised. Coughlin (2016) comments on the absence of this in the GTC Scotland Standards published in 2012, citing Kennedy (2016: p.154) who noted that these Standards were not accompanied by a discussion of the writing process or stakeholders (Coughlin, 2016: p. 31).

Evaluative reports included as part of this review (CEPPE, 2013; CDE 2017, Gallie and Keevey, 2014) stress the need for valid standards to be based on evidence or research about teaching practices that have impacted on student learning outcomes (Kleinhenz and Ingvarson 2007 in CEPPE, 2013: p.37; CDE 2017: p.16; Gallie and Keevey, 2014: p.17). However it was found that those involved in developing standards (institutions, agencies, ministries) often do not report the research on which the standards are based (CEPPE, 2013: p.37; CDE, 2014: p.19). Examples of standards where this has been achieved are Mexico, which makes explicit the assumptions and constructs on which they are built, and the US where the InTASC Standards are made available to the public with summaries of the research that underpins the standards (CEPPE, 2013: p. 37).

There is recognition that the process of developing standards is always highly technical (CEPPE, 2013: p.75) and that this requires careful management in terms of pace and implementation. This is particularly acute when standards are linked to teacher evaluation and potentially enhanced remuneration, but even where they are not, their application can impact on the professional and personal lives of teachers significantly, so that standards become 'boss texts' (Talbot, 2016: p. 81; Krantz and Fritzén, 2017: p.1), 'seeking to govern teachers' work from afar, shaping teachers' work and their learning about that work in ways that can be regulated by accrediting agencies (Talbot, 2016: p.81).

Guidance from the literature on the form that professional standards should take is quite limited. Taylor (2016) in his discussion of the design of the 2013 Australian Standards draws from a 2000 discussion paper which sought to address 'the kinds of professional knowledge, understanding, skills and values that ought to characterise accomplished school teaching in Australian schools' and, in identifying these, recommended that they should be seen as 'inter-dependent: not reducible to a lock-step 'tick-a-box' set of reductionist or decontextualised 'competencies'; not comparatively 'weighted' between or among the various characteristics of accomplishment; and not listed in any necessary order of precedence' (Brock, 2000: p.11; Taylor, 2016).

The CDE study (2017) commissioned to support the development of the teacher professional standards (TPS) in South Africa found that the success of the standards in the countries surveyed (USA, England, Australia, Jamaica, Namibia and Chile) was partly related to construction and presentation which was seen to be straightforward, comprising a list of between six and eight generic standards, with sub-points explaining what these mean (CDE, 2017: p. 2). This approach was seen to be important in two ways: first for their overall understanding and commitment and second, so that they are accessible to all teachers required to adhere to them, whatever their career stage or level of seniority (CDE, 2017: p. 2). The study found that teacher professional standards can be applied to individuals, programmes or institutions and while there is variance in how this is enacted, the basic framework and intentions are consistent worldwide (CDE, 2017: p. 2).

The 2013 study of selected OECD countries (CEPPE, 2013) found that in most of these, standards are presented as a short description together with a set of indicators. It is suggested that 'relative conciseness' in some of the standards may reflect a concern about not over defining rules for teaching (CEPPE, 2013: p. 34). Exceptions are identified as the NBPTS Standards (US) and standards for advanced teachers of science in Australia,

which are set out as continuous text (paragraphs) which describe how each standard is to be understood in one to five pages (CEPPE, 2013: p. 34).

In considering the types of standards that have positive impact on the system the CEPPE study emphasises Loudon's criteria (2000) that such standards should be brief, transparent (so that it is clear what is expected of teachers); specific (by discipline, student development level); in context (show in what context the expected performance is to be demonstrated or how evidence is to be collected to show achievement); and with clear focus on teaching and learning (Loudon, 2000 in CEPPE, 2013:). From their analysis of the standards in the study, the CEPPE report found that the 'relative conciseness' of some standards may reflect a concern about not over defining rules for teaching and such standards were presented as a short description together with a set of indicators (CEPPE, 2013: p. 34).

The example of the 2006 National Professional Standards for Teachers (NPST) in Namibia provides a contrast where 30 Key Competences are grouped in four domains and elaborated through competences, scope of performance, values, performance criteria and theoretical underpinnings, covered in detail in 129 pages that outline what every component means and its impact on ITE curricula, programmes and qualifications. (CDE, 2017: p.18).

Research on standards for school principals conducted as part of the CEPPE study found that, of those standards analysed, most were based on key areas or dimensions set out with a general description, ranging from a sentence to a paragraph, that explains the meaning of the dimension followed by a list of practices that define how to put into action the content previously described (CEPPE, 2013: p.52). California and Texas are cited as examples of systems which have adopted this approach (ibid). In other systems principal standards can be more complex and detailed (for example, Chile, New Zealand or the province of British Columbia). The study found that in Chile, every practice or indicator is clarified through a set of descriptors, which are more specific actions regarding the issues addressed by every indicator (CEPPE, 2013: p.53).

The British Columbia model has reflective questions in relation to whether the performance standards (practices) have been fulfilled while the New Zealand standards are accompanied by evidence that illustrates their achievement (CEPPE, 2013: p.53). Models in England, Quebec and Australia are seen as having the highest level of complexity in distinguishing between standards for functional performance and overarching behaviour skills, which may be presented in a parallel way (CEPPE, 2013: p.52).

As noted above, guidance on the development of professional standards is limited in the literature. The recent publication by the British Standards Institution (as part of International Standards Organisation (ISO)) of Educational Organisations – Management systems for Educational Organizations – Requirements with guidance for use (ISO, 2018) offers some broad guidance. The report details the principles for an Educational Organisation Management System which involve:

- focus on learners and other beneficiaries;
- visionary leadership;
- engagement of people;
- process approach;
- improvement;
- evidence–based decisions;
- relationship management;
- social responsibility;
- accessibility and equity;
- ethical conduct in education;
- data security and protection (ISO, 2018: vii).

The pace of development receives special emphasis across the literature. There is appreciation that this is a long process (CEPPE, 2013: p.75). The CEPPE report notes that when this relates to learning standards (for pupils), an approximate timeline is for four years, though for teacher and principal standards there may be shorter time frames (CEPPE, 2013: p.75). While it is recognised that a significant investment of time is made in the technical design of the standards, the CEPPE study found that the processes of validation and consultation, which may be seen as time consuming, are necessary to reinforce their legitimacy (CEPPE, 2013: p.75). Evidence from the CEPPE analysis of the development of standards for principals noted that where they are grounded in high levels of participation and solid theoretical and empirical research, their development is typically time consuming (CEPPE, 2013: p.58). Examples provided are the United States where the review of ISLLC standards took two years, as did the development of standards in New Zealand and Chile (CEPPE, 2013:58). The experience of Australia, which has been revising its school leadership standards in the last few years, is also of interest. Australia has used a process that involves research, external feedback and validation. In the case of Australia, an additional step of including a four–month pilot programme was incorporated into the policy process with the aim of proving the authenticity, utility and added value of the standards before their finalization (CEPPE, 2013: p. 58).

The form that professional standards take is influenced and shaped by the purposes for which they are intended and underpinning conceptions of the teacher and teacher

professionalism. Standards codify knowledge and describe expected levels of performance so they can be content standards (setting out what is valued in learning and teaching); performance standards (which indicate how well someone has to perform to be considered competent in the domain defined by the content standards) or both (Kleinhenz et al. 2007; Robinson, 1998 in CEPPE, 2013: p.14). This duality can be problematic as they can be used in the sense of 'a banner or flag' and also as 'a yardstick or as a measuring rod' (CEPPE, 2013:p.14). From the CEPPE study a concern was identified they should not be overly prescriptive, that they should help create a consensus about good teaching practices and that, to be valid, they should be context free to allow a diversity of possible teaching styles (CEPPE, 2013:33; Torrance and Forde, 2017).

Content standards set out expectations around conceptual knowledge in an expansive way, that includes not only the 'know' but the 'know how to', and also the attitudes and dispositions intrinsic in the "being able to do" (CEPPE, 2013: p.15). In relation to teaching standards, the CEPPE evaluation found that standards explicate the conceptual knowledge that teachers should possess about the subject(s) that they teach; about how pupils learn; and about the curriculum (CEPPE, 2013: p. 15). They also include descriptions of skills that teachers should demonstrate to interact effectively with students to create an appropriate learning climate; to work with other teachers in a team; to master different teaching strategies and assessment methods, and to evaluate their own practice (ibid). Additionally, underpinning values are made explicit, in relation to student learning and development and career-long professional learning (ibid). In terms of how this is set out, in content standards this can be presented with an explanation or explicit description about what is expected, complemented with indicators or comments to explain and specify the meaning of the standards, translating them into 'actions' that show that the standard has been achieved (Cox and Meckes, 2011 in CEPPE, 2013: p. 15).

Performance standards as measurements of performance, identify the point at which the content standard has been achieved; or at what level in relation to content standards, the performance is considered to be 'acceptable', or 'good' (CEPPE, 2013: p. 15). They indicate how well teachers should perform in order to be considered satisfactory in the areas defined by content standards (Maxwell, 2009 in CEPPE, 2013: p.15). Such performance can be measured in 'binary categories' (pass / fail; attainment / non attainment) or levels of mastery (for example, basic, satisfactory, proficient or expert) (ibid). Performance standards can also change over time, for example,

by becoming progressively more demanding if previous standards have already been met, so that standards can act as a motivation for continuous improvement (for example, the Australian Standards, English, Wales) (ibid).

The 2013 CEPPE report analysed the content of professional standards and found that, irrespective of whether they were general or specific, brief or elaborate, it was possible to discern a structure that distinguishes between central domains or dimensions and their component elements (CEPPE, 2013:35). For example, disciplinary knowledge, pedagogic practice and values and professional teaching practice were found to include:

- Knowledge and understanding of the subject (expressed in general terms)
- Knowledge and understanding of the subject (specified for each particular subject and stages of schooling)
- Know, value and teach according to student characteristics (different cultures, past experience, educational needs etc.)
- Understand and use knowledge about how students learn, (theories of learning and development)
- Hold high expectations about all students
- Know how to teach disciplinary content
- Develop higher order critical thinking and skills
- Plan, implement and assess teaching and learning
- Create and sustain an environment that encourages learning
- Value families' role in student learning and development
- Promote social values and ethics among students
- Know how to use ICT for learning
- Incorporate democratic values in classroom teaching practice
- Be committed to students' learning and development
- Reflect on his or her teaching practice
- Know the rationale for and implementation of current educational policies
- Commitment to professional learning (continous learning)
- Contribute and be committed to the school community
- Contribute to the development of the teaching profession
- Know and apply guidelines for ethical behaviour
- Be capable of performing administrative tasks (e.g. registration etc.) (CEPPE, 2013: p.35).

How standards are used to codify and measure teachers' knowledge and practice is debated in the literature. Forde et al (2016) argue that there are a number of issues related to the design of standards including the level of detail necessary for standardisation and about the authenticity and accuracy of these specifications of practice (Forde et al, 2016 p.3). Torrance

and Forde (2017) argue that standards, as concise documents, will make some aspects of practice visible while submerging other aspects (Torrance and Forde, 2017: p. 114). In their analysis of professional standards in relation to continuing teacher education they draw from Gronn (2000) who observed that 'professional standards codify the preferred practice rather than necessarily the best practice for a specific context' (Forde and Torrance, 2017: p.113; Forde et al, 2016: p. 4). In prescribing and codifying knowledge and practice, Kennedy (2014) argues that standards can prevent teachers from building their own construction of teaching and what it means to be a teacher (Kennedy, 2014) and so 'a critical issue is the construction of professional practice underpinning a particular professional standard' (Forde et al, 2016: p. 23). In relation to this Forde et al (2016) suggest that 'a simple distinction might be whether in a particular standard the focus is on setting out the tasks and functions or whether there is a more complex construction of professional practice to include knowledge, understandings, personal dispositions and purposes' (Forde et al, 2016: p. 23).

There is recognition too, that, as noted above (p.6) professional standards are of their time and while they should look to the future, which is often an argument for more generalised standards, the flexibility associated with such future proofing can be problematic. Nevertheless the means for updating and renewing is seen to be an important feature in the operationalisation of professional standards (Sachs, 2003: p.176). Standards need to be regularly updated in order to incorporate the most recent educational research about effective practices and to respond to the new demands posed by the need to prepare students for a changing world (CEPPE, 2013: p.67).

6. Implementation of professional standards for teaching

The adoption and implementation of professional standards for teaching is gaining more attention in the literature and there is a growing interest in how standards come to work and how they gain authority. This is closely related to the process of development and implementation. A key question identified in the CEPPE study is whether these are developed centrally or from practice? (CEPPE, 2013: p. 36). The study draws from Elmore (1996) on how public education policies are developed through processes of forward mapping or backward mapping, which can be applied to the development of teaching standards (CEPPE, 2013: p. 36). In a forward driven process, the policy is centrally driven, where as 'backward mapping' policies are based on the activities of participants who are closer to educational practice than educational policy makers (CEPPE, 2013:p. 36).

Consultation with the teaching profession is seen as a critical element in the development and implementation of professional standards. This is seen as essential to obtain their support and buy in. Such consultation also involves a wide range of stakeholders including academics, teacher education institutions etc. The CEPPE report suggests that the nature and extent of consultation processes serves as a marker of the difference between regarding standards as 'a banner and expression of professional identity or as imposed policy that restricts teaching activities' (CEPPE, 2013: p. 37). As noted above teacher involvement in the design and development of professional standards adds both validity and credibility.

The CEPPE study noted a number of factors that can render the implementation of professional standards problematic. Issues identified included changes and interruptions in the processes of implementation, the lack of clearly delineated institutional responsibilities, inadequate attention to the cultivation of the conditions needed for changes to occur, and, in particular, the active or passive resistance of teachers (CEPPE, 2013: p. 66). As a result of the study, 'good institutional practices' relating to the implementation of professional standards were identified. These include extensive and comprehensive consultation and an appropriate balance between pressure and support, with sufficient pressure to mobilise the system towards improvement, but also sufficient support to generate the conditions and build the capacities that make this change possible (CEPPE, 2013: p.66). A number of elements are necessary for this to be realised including the construction of a

support infrastructure involving several institutions in capacity building; the allocation of adequate resources, including time and the distribution of responsibilities for the generation of these new capacities (ibid).

Teachers' engagement with professional standards is central to the extent to which they can become embedded in practice. In relation to the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) developed by the US National Board for Educational Administration in 2015, Murphy, Seashore Louis and Symile (2018) argue that while the standards might look very promising on paper, they will mean little unless and until people bring them to life in their professional practice (Murphy, Seashore Louis and Symile, 2018:23). They suggest that while previously, standards would have been enacted formally through the design of principal preparation programmes, certification and accreditation requirements, and guidelines for professional development, the new PSEL offer a new way to think about leadership and what it looks like in one's everyday work in schools (Murphy, Seashore Louis and Symile, 2018: p. 23).

In the Australian context, an evaluation of the adoption of the ASPT standards found differential uptake and significant (though not unexpected) differences between how the APST are being understood and enacted between schools and individual educators (Clinton et al. 2015:p. 65; Savage and Lewis, 2018:p. 137). Savage and Lewis (2018) argue that the nature of policy development and enactment means that the APST are only 'made real' when translated and assembled into material practices, and these acts of translation and assemblage depend largely on the context in which the Standards are being enacted (e.g. different jurisdictions, sectors, schools and classrooms) (Savage and Lewis, 2018: p.137). Thus policy development and enactment processes are marked by diverse translations and re/dis/assemblages (Savage and Lewis, 2018: p. 137).

Ceulemans (2017) reports a similar process in the study of Flemish teacher career profile (TCP) and the question of how a standard gains authority (Ceuelmans, 2017: p.35). Her analysis found that the TCP competency lists began circulating in ever more and ever more diverse places, increasing their legitimacy for ever more users (Ceuelmans, 2017: p. 35) and denotes a 'double movement with the mechanisms of circulating and objectifying: the more people start working with the lists,

the more they circulate, and the more they circulate, the more they become stabilized as generally accepted objects' (Ceulemans, 2017: p. 41). The 'lists' gain authority because they are scientifically based as well as politically supported, legally framed, cannot be attributed to a single person or group of people behind the lists (e.g., the government). Rather, she argues, their strength or authority is generated by the multiple concerns from multiple stakeholders they bring together into a self-contained whole (Ceulemans, 2017: p. 41–42).

An important message from the literature is that standards reform should not be an 'isolated strategy' but form part of an integrated professional development system that includes:
- teaching standards that set out in detail what is to be expected of teachers;
- teacher development 'milestones' with recognition and incentives for those that achieve them;
- resources for teachers' professional development linked to the requirements of the standards;
- a legitimate and voluntary professional certification process based on authentic performance evaluations (Dinham, Ingvarson and Kleinhenz, 2008 in CPPE, 2013: p. 41).

The CEPPE study also draws from Ingarvson's (2009) recommendations for a robust system of accreditation of teacher education programmes to complement teaching standards in order to have a complete quality assurance system (CEPPE, 2013: p. 41). This has been identified as a key priority in the Australian Government's report on initial teacher education published in 2014 (Australian Government, 2014: vii).

A recent OECD position paper on the place of professional standards in teacher education sought to investigate what aligning teacher education programmes to standards really means and drew from evidence from three case studies (Australia, Estonia and Singapore) (Révai, 2018). A key question for the study was how are professional standards and teacher education linked? (Révai, 2018: p. 7).

The review found that the alignment was more fluid than fixed and that standards, curriculum and courses can be seen as distinct agents that are assembled in each context and

at each moment of time in unique ways (Révai, 2018: p. 55). Human actors (teacher educators, teacher candidates, schools and mentors, local authorities, etc.) naturally shape these assemblages as they are involved in working with them, and through that shape the professional knowledge and practice of a graduate (or in-service) teacher (Révai, 2018: p. 55). This is a dialogical process which is dynamic, where standards are not static but which can and should shape teacher education programmes and practices but where programmes should also shape the standards (Révai, 2018: p.55).

The tension that might arise from this process and the interaction among different artefacts (standards, curriculum, course descriptions, accreditation standards, etc.) is not seen as something to be eliminated but managed to maintain the constructive dialogue (Révai, 2018: p. 55). Kennedy (2018: p. 649), in her analysis of the development of new teacher education programme in Scotland identifies three distinct cultural spaces in which ITE exists: the political space, the professional space and the university space (Kennedy, 2018: p. 638). These spaces overlap and through her analysis of compliant and disruptive narratives Kennedy argues that it is not completely necessary to present a compliant narrative in order to meet quality assurance requirements (Kennedy, 2018: p. 649). Similarly Révai (2018: p.55) concludes her analysis by recognising that standards are regularly renegotiated as a result of the interplay, dialogue and professional reflections amongst the agents and actors involved so that the processes of development and implementation are iterative rather than concluded.

7. International perspectives

The focus of this review was not directed towards a study of education systems which have adopted professional teaching standards though it did however generate some useful material from multi country studies such as the CEPPE report in 2013 on learning, teaching and principal standards in selected OECD countries (CEPPE, 2013).

Education systems looking to adopt professional teaching standards can look to a number of sites where they have been implemented to identify success factors and features of effective practice relating to standards development. A study by the Centre for Development and Enterprise (CDE) in August 2017 was undertaken to inform the development of professional standards in the South African context and looked at 'what to adopt, what to adapt and what to avoid in the experience of other countries' (CDE, 2017: p.1). Their development in the South African context occurred in the context of an education system in 'crisis' characterised by 'severe inequality, high drop-out rates, very low learner outcomes and ill-equipped teachers' (CDE, 2017). The study examined the development and use of standards in six countries: USA, England, Australia, Jamaica, Namibia and Chile (CDE, 2017) and identified key factors relating to the design and implementation of standards.

The CDE study found that the success of the standards was partly related to their construction and presentation. The study also looked at the factors, identified in a number of studies, that can inhibit or prevent the adoption of professional teaching standards including inclusive processes, research to establish an evidence base, careful formulation, extensive consultation, piloting, refinement, strategic communication, dissemination, training and embedding in the system, as well as monitoring and evaluation (CDE, 2017:35). 'Lessons' identified from the research included:
- An inclusive comprehensive consultation process is critical in developing teacher professional standards.
- There is merit in developing both broad generic standards and more specific knowledge and practice standards for educators in different schooling phases and for different subjects.
- Best practice is to base the standards on the practices shown by research to be associated with student learning, to express them in performance terms and describe what the teacher should know and be able to do to support student learning.

- The necessary policies and legislation must be in place before implementing the standards.
- Well-constructed, research-based, piloted and credible standards can be used as the basis for the whole continuum of student selection, teacher training, registration, evaluation and professional development.
- The dominant international approach to teacher evaluation is the integrated model that aims to appraise teacher performance, strengthen accountability and support professional development.
- The teacher evaluation system must support professional learning, not just accountability.
- High quality support, including mentoring for teachers needing assistance, coaching and opportunities for collaboration and knowledge sharing with their peers, are also essential.
- Resistance to teacher evaluation arises if students' test scores are the only, or dominant, measure used to judge teacher effectiveness.
- A strategic communication and dissemination strategy for the standards is needed so that they are known and fully understood at all levels of the education system, and especially by ordinary teachers.
- Effective implementation of standards to fulfil all their intended purposes is a huge challenge in developed countries, and even more so in developing countries (CDE, 2017: p. 33–35).

The CDE study also advised caution in the pace of development and introduction of professional standards, requiring them to be evidence-based and properly tested in the sector before implementation on scale for the system to be credible (CDE, p. 2017:35).

Within the multi country studies and research articles generated, the phasing of development, roll out and adoption receives attention and the question of the pace of development, adoption and implementation is seen to be finely balanced. In the Australian context, the national standards[1] which includes Australian Professional Teacher standards for example, were seen to be 'weakly applied' with implementation timeframes that were too slow in the 2014 report *Action now: Classroom Ready Teachers* (Australian Government, 2014: viii). The report made a number of recommendations including more explicit alignment between teacher education programmes and the

linking of registration requirements to the Graduate standards (Australian Government, 2014).

An evaluation report published in 2015[2] on the implementation of the Australian Professional Teacher Standards was more encouraging (Clinton et al, 2015). The aim of the 2015 evaluation was to assess the degree, usefulness, effectiveness and impact of their implementation on professional practice (Clinton et al, 2015: p. 8). The focus on implementation recognised that the degree and quality of implementation would impact on the overall goal for the APST which is improving teacher quality (Clinton et al, 2015: p. 8). The evaluation found that progress had been made, with evidence of diverse implementation activities among all key stakeholders (schools, ITE providers, departments of education, Catholic education offices, independent schools associations and principal and professional associations (Clinton et al, 2015: p. 25). A shift was identified from awareness raising of standards to their formalisation through teacher registration and ITE programme accreditation of teacher education providers (ibid). Facilitating factors were identified as supportive leadership; a high level of teacher engagement in implementation and evidence that teaching practice is being informed by the Standards; a positive culture of implementation underpinned by on–going learning and development; a high degree of collaboration and communication about implementation; and system alignment and transferability of implementation (ibid). The evaluation found implementation continued to evolve positively, with the Standards expanding to focus on building a culture of learning (ibid).

It was found that, at a national level, the Standards are not being used predominantly as a compliance tool for monitoring teacher quality but in developmental ways (Clinton et al, 2015: p. 25) and that on the whole the Standards were being operationalised and embedded within the teaching profession and were being used for professional growth, contributing to the further development of professionalism and ownership of the Standards among educators (Clinton et al, 2015: p. 75). Clinton et al (2015) conclude by stating that the evaluation tells a positive story of the implementation of the APTS and how they are being used, with 'a greater likelihood of educators continuing to embrace the Standards, as long as they maintain the momentum of the reform and consider the implementation of the Standards a shared responsibility' (Clinton et al, 2015: p. 75).

[1] In the report the Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education Programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures are also listed as part of the 'national standards' (Australian Government, 2014: Viii).
[2] The 2015 evaluation focused only on implementation. An earlier review of the content of the Standards was undertaken in 2010 (Pegg, McPhan, Mowbray & Lynch, 2010 in Cranston etc).

8. Implications for professional standards for teaching in Scotland

The literature consulted as part of this review suggests that the approach taken to standards development in Scotland aligns broadly with similar approaches internationally and the inclusive and consultative approaches to development and implementation articulate with recommendations and measures of effective practice from international studies. Emphasis is placed on the need for standards to be grounded in research and for this to published as part of the standards documentation. The need for transparency in publicising contributors to standards development is also noted. Attention to the processes of implementation and the need for appropriate pacing relating to this is seen as critical, to ensure not only teachers' engagement with the standards but so that they are adopted and eventually embedded in professional practice. The dual function of standards as means of regulation and development continues to be seen as a potential source of tension but there is recognition in the literature that this can be mitigated where standards are part of an integrated quality assurance system and where standards and their development are seen as an inclusive and iterative process that facilitates dialogue across their multiple stakeholders and users.

References

Australian Government. 2014. Action now: Classroom Ready Teachers. Canberra: Australian Government. Available online at https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/action_now_classroom_r eady_teachers_accessible.pdf (accessed 20/10/18).

Brock, P., (2000) Standards of professional practice for accomplished teaching in Australian classrooms. A national discussion paper. Issued by Australian College of Education; Australian Curriculum Studies Association and Australian Association for Research in Education. Available online at http://www.tesol.org.au/ted/docs/NatStd2K.pdf (accessed 20/10/11).

British Standards Institution., (2018) Educational Organisations – Management systems for Educational Organizations – Requirements with guidance for use. BSI ISO 21001:2018. London: BSI Available online at https://standardsdevelopment.bsigroup.com/projects/2016-00953 (accessed 20/10/11).

Bourke, T., Ryan, M., & Ould, P., (2018). 'How do teacher educators use professional standards in their practice?' Teaching and Teacher Education, 75, 83–92. DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2018.06.005

Call, K. (2018). 'Professional Teaching Standards: A Comparative Analysis of Their History, Implementation and Efficacy.' Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 43(3). http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n3.6.

Centre of Study for Policies and Practices in Education (CEPPE), Chile (2013), Learning Standards, Teaching Standards and Standards for School Principals: A Comparative Study, OECD Education Working Papers, No. 99, OECD Publishing, Paris. Available online at http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k3tsjqtp90v-en (accessed 20/10/11).

Ceulemans, C., (2017) 'How To Move Beyond The Trust—Control Dilemma? What Insight Into The Work Of Educational Standards Might Have To Offer Studia paedagogica vol. 22, n. 2, 2017 www.studiapaedagogica.cz Available online at https://doi.org/10.5817/SP2017-2-3 (accessed 20/10/11).

Ceulemans, C., Simons, M. & Struyf, E. 2012, ''Professional standards for teachers: how do they 'work'? An experiment in tracing standardisation in- the-making in teacher education'', Pedagogy, Culture & Society, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 29–47.

Clarke, M. & Moore, A. 2013, ''Professional standards, teacher identities and an ethics of singularity'', Cambridge Journal of Education, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 487–500.

Clinton, J., Dinham, S., Savage, G.C., Aston, R., Dabrowski, A., Gullikson, A., Calnin, G., and Arbour, G., (2015). Final Report: Evaluation of the Implementation of the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers. Melbourne: Centre for Program Evaluation, the University of Melbourne. Available online at https://www.aitsl.edu.au/tools-resources/resource/final-report-evaluation-of-the-australian-professional-standards-for-teachers (accessed 20/11/18).

Coughlin, D., J. (2016) The development of the Teachers' Standards in England and Professional Standards for Teachers in Scotland: determining the pedagogic discourse and recontextualising principle Doctoral Thesis: Kings College, London. Available online at https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/theses/the-development-of-the-teachers- standards-in-england-and-professional-standards-for-teachers-in-scotland- determining-the-pedagogic-discourse-and-recontextualising- principle(eb87c89d-2460-4c94-adc2-e15ed2d1dbeb).html (accessed 20/10/18).

Darling-Hammond, L. (2013) Getting Teacher Evaluation Right (New York: Teachers College Press.

Donaldson, G. (2011) Teaching Scotland's Future: Report of a review of teacher education in Scotland (Edinburgh: Scottish Government) from http://www.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/337626/0110852.pdf (accessed 20/11/18).

Forde, C., and McMahon, M. (2018) Teacher Quality, Professional Learning and Policy London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Forde, C., McMahon, M., Hamilton, G., and Murray, R., (2016) 'Rethinking professional standards to promote professional learning,' Professional Development in Education, 42:1, 19–35, DOI:10.1080/19415257.2014.999288

Gallie, M., and J Keevy, J., (2014) Standards Framework for Teachers and School Leaders. Commonwealth Secretariat. Available online at https://evaeducation.weebly.com/uploads/1/9/6/9/19692577/[muavia_gallie_and_james_keevy]_standards_framework.pdf (accessed 20/10/18).

Kennedy, A. (2018) 'Developing a new ITE programme: a story of compliant and disruptive narratives across different cultural spaces' European Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 638–653.

Krantz, J., & Fritzén, L. (2017). 'From Expert to Novice? The Influence of Management by Documents on Teachers' Knowledge Base and Norms.' Professions and Professionalism, Available on line at https://doi.org/10.7577/pp.2113 (accessed 20/10/18).

McMahon, M., Forde, C., and Dickson, B., (2013) 'Reshaping teacher education through the professional continuum,' Educational Review, 67(2), 10.1080/00131911.2013.846298

Murphy, J., Seashore Louis, K., and Smylie, M. (2017) 'Positive school leadership: How the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders can be brought to life.' Phi Delta Kappan Vol 99, Issue 1, pp. 21 – 24 https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721717728273 (accessed 20/10/18).

Révai, N., (2018) 'What difference do standards make to educating teachers? A Review with Case Studies on Australia, Estonia and Singapore' OECD Education Working Paper No. 174 Available online at http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=EDU/WKP(2018)10&docLanguage=En (accessed 20/10/18).

Ryan, M., and Bourke, T. (2018) 'Spatialised metaphors of practice: how teacher educators engage with professional standards for teachers.' Critical Studies in Education, 59(2), 167–186. DOI: 10.1080/17508487.2016.1185641

Sachs, J., (2016) 'Teacher professionalism: why are we still talking about it?' Teachers and Teaching, 22:4, 413–425, DOI: 10.1080/13540602.2015.1082732 (accessed 20/10/18).

Sachs, J., (2003) 'Teacher Professional Standards: Controlling or developing teaching?', Teachers and Teaching, 9:2, 175–186, DOI: 10.1080/13540600309373

Sachs, J. 2003. The Activist Teaching Profession. Buckingham: Open University Press

Savage, G.C., and Lewis, S., (2018) 'The phantom national? Assembling national teaching standards in Australia's federal system,' Journal of Education Policy, 33:1,118–142, DOI: 10.1080/02680939.2017.1325518

Smith, K., (2019) 'Standards – promoting or preventing professional development?' INFO–TED Blog. Available online at https://info–ted.eu/standards–promoting–or–preventing–professional–development/ (accessed 17/06/19).

Talbot, D. (2016). 'Evidence for no-one: Standards, accreditation, and transformed teaching work.' Teaching & Teacher Education, 58, 80–89. Available online at http://10.0.3.248/j.tate.2016.05.006 (accessed 20/10/18).

Taylor, A. J. (2016). 'Teachers' experience of professional standards for teachers: A case study of the enactment of teaching standards in a high performing school system.' (Doctoral thesis, Australian Catholic University). Available online at https://doi.org/10.4226/66/5a9cc680b0bc3 (accessed 20/10/18).

Torrance, D. and Forde, C. (2017) 'Redefining what it means to be a teacher through professional standards: implications for continuing teacher education', European Journal of Teacher Education, 40(1), 110–126.

Inspiring world-class
teaching professionalism

gtc
SCOTLAND
GENERAL TEACHING
COUNCIL FOR SCOTLAND

GTC Scotland
Comhairle Choitcheann Teagaisg nah–Alba
Clerwood House, 96 Clermiston Road,
Edinburgh EH12 6UT
Tel: 0131 314 6000
Fax: 0131 314 6001
E–mail: gtcs@gtcs.org.uk

www.gtcs.org.uk
www.in2teaching.org.uk

OSCR
Scottish Charity Regulator
www.oscr.org.uk
Registered Charity
SC006187

Healthy
Working
Lives
Silver Award

LGBT
CHARTER
BRONZE