

FIRST REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF TEACHERS' STANDARDS

**QTS AND CORE STANDARDS
Presented to
The Secretary of State
for Education**

14 July 2011

Contents

Foreword by Sally Coates	3
Membership of the Review	5
Executive Summary and Recommendations	6
Proposed Standards for Teachers	9
1. Introduction: Background and Scope of the Review	13
2. The Review Process	17
3. Recommendations and Rationale	19
4. Additional Observations	25
5. Next Steps	28
Annex A: Terms of Reference of the Review	29
Annex B: Summary of Evidence Reviewed	31
Annex C: Respondents to Call for Evidence	33
Annex D: Summary of Responses to Call for Evidence	35
Annex E: List of Wider Engagement Activities	42
Annex F: Summary of Feedback from Wider Engagement	43
Glossary of Abbreviations & Acronyms	48

FOREWORD BY SALLY COATES, CHAIR OF THE REVIEW OF TEACHERS' STANDARDS



The conclusion of Sir Michael Barber's seminal study of the world's best performing school systems has fast become a guiding principle for developing education policy: "the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers".

A relentless focus on high-quality teachers and teaching requires a clear and universal understanding of the basic elements of good teaching. The standards which define our expectations for teachers' professional practice should therefore set the benchmark for excellent teaching and exemplary personal conduct. They should set a standard to which all trainees aspire, and which all qualified teachers adhere to and improve upon throughout the various stages of their career.


Earlier this year the Secretary of State asked me to conduct a review of the existing standards for teachers, with a view to establishing new standards that are clearly expressed and that can be used effectively to underpin teacher training, support performance management and guide teachers' ongoing professional development. Ultimately, the standards which define teachers' professional practice and personal conduct should contribute to raising public confidence in the teaching profession.

In undertaking my task I have had the privilege of being able to draw on the support and advice of an outstanding group of individuals who bring a rich variety of experience and expertise to the Review.

The members of my Review team have been extraordinarily generous with their time and commitment, and have shown themselves to be passionate about tackling the challenge of producing a set of standards that can have a real and positive impact on the trainees and teachers we work with, and on the children we teach.

In the process of the Review we have been fortunate enough to engage with a significant number of those who are using the current standards, and upon whom our recommendations, if accepted, would have the greatest impact. The views of providers of initial teacher training, induction co-ordinators, teachers' professional associations and serving teachers and headteachers – as well as a number of other educational experts – have been enormously helpful in shaping our thinking throughout the course of the past four months, and I am extremely grateful to all those who have taken the time to make such valuable contributions to our work.

The standards that we are now proposing to replace the existing Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) and Core standards have been designed to set a clear national benchmark of what is expected of teachers. We are confident that they bring clarity and rigour to setting out the basic elements of teaching that all teachers need to demonstrate consistently in order to have the best possible impact on the children they teach. The standards also establish a clear framework within which teachers can identify the areas of their practice that they want to improve even further. Ultimately, we have aimed not to produce an exhaustive and prescriptive list of skills, knowledge and understanding, but a clear and powerful expression of the key elements of great teaching, which I am confident that all schools will recognise and will want to adopt as a part of their commitment to giving pupils the best quality education.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "S. A. Coates." The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'S'.

Sally Coates
Principal, Burlington Danes Academy

MEMBERSHIP OF THE REVIEW

Sally Coates	Chair	Principal of Burlington Danes Academy, Hammersmith and Fulham
Roy Blatchford	Deputy Chair/Chair of Drafting Group	Director of the National Education Trust
Richard Aird	Review member	Headteacher of Barrs Court Special School, Hereford
Joan Deslandes	Review/Drafting Group member	Headteacher of Kingsford Community School, Newnham, London
Judith Fenn	Review member	Head of School Services at the Independent Schools Council
John McIntosh OBE	Review/Drafting Group member	Former Headteacher of the London Oratory School
Dr Dan Moynihan	Review member	Chief Executive of Harris Academies
Professor Anthony O'Hear	Review/Drafting Group member	Professor of Philosophy and former Head of Education Department, Buckingham University
Leanne Simmonds	Review/Drafting Group member	Subject Leader of Modern Foreign Languages, Evelyn Grace Academy
Patricia Sowter CBE	Review member	Principal of Cuckoo Hall Academy
Ava Sturridge-Packer CBE	Review/Drafting Group member	Headteacher of St Mary's C of E Primary School, Birmingham
Greg Wallace	Review member	Executive Principal of the Best Start Federation, Hackney
Brett Wigdortz	Review member	Chief Executive of Teach First
Lizzie Williams	Review member	Lead Teacher at King Solomon Academy, London
Patrick Leeson	Observer	Director of Development, Education and Care, Ofsted

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The independent Review of Teachers' Standards, chaired by Sally Coates, was launched by the Secretary of State for Education in March 2011. The Review brings together leading teachers, headteachers and other experts to review the existing framework of professional standards for teachers. The Review is tasked with establishing standards that set out clearly what is expected of teachers in both their professional practice and personal conduct, and which can be used effectively in managing and improving teachers' performance. Ultimately, the new standards should make a positive contribution to raising the status of the teaching profession.
2. The Review is being conducted in two phases of work; the first has looked at the existing standards for QTS and the Core professional standards. This phase of the Review is now complete, and this report presents the Review's first recommendations to the Secretary of State. A second phase of work will look at the "upper" tiers of the existing standards framework (Post-Threshold, Excellent Teacher and Advanced Skills Teacher), and is due to report later this year.
3. The Review has considered a range of evidence and feedback from a wide variety of sources, including domestic and international research, as well as inputs from users of the current standards. Before beginning its drafting work, the Review conducted a call for evidence through which it gathered views from users of the current standards and from a number of educational experts.
4. The Review has also tested its draft proposals with those who will be the main users of the new standards: providers of initial teacher training (ITT), induction co-ordinators, and teachers and headteachers in schools. Their feedback has been vital in shaping the further development of the draft and the formulation of the Review's recommendations.
5. The Review is recommending that a single set of standards should replace the existing QTS and Core standards. The new standards should also incorporate key elements relating to conduct, referring to the current *Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers*, developed by the General Teaching Council for England (GTCE).
6. The new standards are intended to set out a clear baseline of expectations for the practice of all teachers, from the point of qualification onwards. As such, they will be used by ITT providers to assess when a trainee can be recommended for QTS. The same standards will also be used, albeit in a different context, to assess the extent to which Newly-Qualified Teachers (NQTs) have consolidated their training and confirmed their competence at the end of the induction period.

7. The Review has been clear that it is not the task of standards to prescribe in detail what “good” or “outstanding” teaching should look like; that decision is best made by ITT providers, teachers and headteachers themselves. The standards should provide a clear framework within which those users can exercise their professional judgement as relevant to context, roles and responsibilities.

8. The standards document is presented in three parts: a preamble, Part 1 and Part 2. The preamble provides an overarching statement of the practices and attitudes that are expected of all teachers. Part 1 contains the standards for teaching; Part 2 contains the standards for personal and professional conduct. Taken together, the preamble, Part 1 and Part 2 constitute the proposed new standards.

9. In Part 1, each of the eight standards is underpinned by supporting bullet points which are intended to illustrate the scope of the overarching statement. Those assessing trainees and teachers should focus on the overarching substantive statements which may involve more than the sum of the bullet points. The bullet points should be used in tracking progress against the standards during the course of an assessment cycle, so as to help determine particular areas where additional development might be needed, or indeed to observe where a trainee or teacher is already making excellent progress. To meet the standard, a trainee or teacher will be expected to demonstrate an appropriate range of practice described by the bullet points underneath each statement.

10. The standards in Parts 1 and 2 are different in nature; those in Part 2 set non-negotiable expectations in terms of a teacher’s behaviour and conduct. These standards are not designed to be assessed in the same way as the standards for teaching in Part 1. The standards in Part 1 will clearly be demonstrated in a variety of ways by teachers at different points in their career, as appropriate to the setting in which they are working and the duties they perform. The standards in Part 1 will also form the basis for the assessment of both trainees and serving teachers.

11. The Review concluded that it is not helpful for the standards to attempt to specify gradual increments in the expectations for how a teacher should be performing year on year. By defining clearly the framework within which all teachers operate, the standards should provide the parameters within which teachers can identify and address their professional development needs, as appropriate to the role and setting in which they are working.

12. As part of the second phase of its work, the Review will be looking at the remaining tiers of the existing standards framework (Post-Threshold, Excellent Teacher and Advanced Skills Teacher standards).

13. A second and final report will be made by the Review to the Secretary of State in the autumn of this year.

Recommendations

R1: The draft standards proposed by this report should be adopted to replace the existing Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) standards and the Core professional standards.

R2: The single set of standards proposed by this report incorporates standards for behaviour and conduct, and as such these standards should replace the current Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers from September 2012.

R3: Successful assessment against these standards should be the determining factor in a recommendation for the award of QTS and successful completion of statutory induction.

R4. The new standards should be introduced for use from 1 September 2012. All trainee teachers beginning their training on or after that date should be assessed exclusively against the new standards.

R5: The new standards continue to define the “baseline” level of practice expected of all teachers.

R6. The Department for Education should make clear arrangements to manage the introduction of the new standards for those trainees already in training on 1 September 2012, and for teachers who are in service on that date.

PROPOSED STANDARDS

STANDARDS FOR TEACHERS

PREAMBLE

Teachers make the education of their pupils their first concern, and are accountable for achieving the highest possible standards in work and conduct. Teachers act with honesty and integrity; have strong subject knowledge, keep their knowledge and skills as teachers up-to-date and are self-critical; forge positive professional relationships; and work with parents in the best interests of their pupils.

PART ONE: TEACHING

A teacher must:

1 Set high expectations which inspire, motivate and challenge pupils

- establish a safe and stimulating environment for pupils, rooted in mutual respect
- set goals that stretch and challenge pupils of all backgrounds, abilities and dispositions
- demonstrate consistently the positive attitudes, values and behaviour which are expected of pupils.

2 Promote good progress and outcomes by pupils

- be accountable for pupils' attainment, progress and outcomes
- plan teaching to build on pupils' capabilities and prior knowledge
- guide pupils to reflect on the progress they have made and their emerging needs
- demonstrate knowledge and understanding of how pupils learn and how this impacts on teaching
- encourage pupils to take a responsible and conscientious attitude to their own work and study.

3 Demonstrate good subject and curriculum knowledge

- have a secure knowledge of the relevant subject(s) and curriculum areas, foster and maintain pupils' interest in the subject, and address misunderstandings
- demonstrate a critical understanding of developments in the subject and curriculum areas, and promote the value of scholarship
- demonstrate an understanding of and take responsibility for promoting high standards of literacy, articulacy and the correct use of standard English, whatever the teacher's specialist subject
- if teaching early reading, demonstrate a clear understanding of systematic synthetic phonics

- if teaching early mathematics, demonstrate a clear understanding of appropriate teaching strategies.

4 Plan and teach well structured lessons

- impart knowledge and develop understanding through effective use of lesson time
- promote a love of learning and children's intellectual curiosity
- set homework and plan other out-of-class activities to consolidate and extend the knowledge and understanding pupils have acquired
- reflect systematically on the effectiveness of lessons and approaches to teaching
- contribute to the design and provision of an engaging curriculum within the relevant subject area(s).

5 Adapt teaching to respond to the strengths and needs of all pupils

- know when and how to differentiate appropriately, using approaches which enable pupils to be taught effectively
- have a secure understanding of how a range of factors can inhibit pupils' ability to learn, and how best to overcome these
- demonstrate an awareness of the physical, social and intellectual development of children, and know how to adapt teaching to support pupils' education at different stages of development
- have a clear understanding of the needs of all pupils, including those with special educational needs; those of high ability; those with English as an additional language; those with disabilities; and be able to use and evaluate distinctive teaching approaches to engage and support them.

6 Make accurate and productive use of assessment

- know and understand how to assess the relevant subject and curriculum areas, including statutory assessment requirements
- make use of formative and summative assessment to secure pupils' progress
- use relevant data to monitor progress, set targets, and plan subsequent lessons
- give pupils regular feedback, both orally and through accurate marking, and encourage pupils to respond to the feedback.

7 Manage behaviour effectively to ensure a good and safe learning environment

- have clear rules and routines for behaviour in classrooms, and take responsibility for promoting good and courteous behaviour both in classrooms and around the school, in accordance with the school's behaviour policy
- have high expectations of behaviour, and establish a framework for discipline with a range of strategies, using praise, sanctions and rewards consistently and fairly
- manage classes effectively, using approaches which are appropriate to pupils' needs in order to involve and motivate them
- maintain good relationships with pupils, exercise appropriate authority, and act decisively when necessary.

8 Fulfil wider professional responsibilities

- make a positive contribution to the wider life and ethos of the school
- develop effective professional relationships with colleagues, knowing how and when to draw on advice and specialist support
- deploy support staff effectively
- take responsibility for improving teaching through appropriate professional development, responding to advice and feedback from colleagues
- communicate effectively with parents with regard to pupils' achievements and well-being.

PART TWO: PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

A teacher is expected to demonstrate consistently high standards of personal and professional conduct. The following statements define the behaviour and attitudes which set the required standard for conduct throughout a teacher's career.

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
 - ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability or might lead them to break the law.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND AND SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

- 1.1. The Schools White Paper, *The Importance of Teaching*, published in November 2010, set out the Government's intention to carry out a review of the framework of professional standards for teachers in England.¹
- 1.2. The White Paper argued that "The proliferation of existing teacher standards means that our expectations of teachers are unclear, and makes it hard to assess teacher performance and steer professional development" (2.34), and announced "a review of existing measures of teacher performance and conduct, including the current professional standards for teachers and the General Teaching Council for England's (GTCE) code of conduct and practice, to establish clear and unequivocal standards" (2.34).
- 1.3. On 11 March 2011, the Secretary of State for Education announced the launch of the independent Review of Teachers' Standards, and the appointment of Sally Coates, principal of Burlington Danes Academy in West London, to chair the Review.² The Review Group comprises teachers, head teachers and other experts including representatives of the ITT sector.
- 1.4. The Review's terms of reference (reproduced in **Annex A**) task it with establishing a set of standards which:
 - are unequivocal, clear and easy to understand;
 - provide a tool to assess teachers' performance and steer professional development;
 - are designed to inspire confidence in the profession;
 - focus primarily on the key elements of teaching (including approaches to early reading and early mathematics), how to address poor behaviour and how to support children with additional needs, including Special Educational Needs; and
 - encompass standards of ethics and behaviour, both within and outside the school, including, for example, having tolerance and respect for the rights and views of others and not undermining UK democratic values.

¹ <https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/CM-7980.pdf>

² <http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/inthenews/a0075465/major-overhaul-of-qualifications-to-raise-the-standard-of-teaching>

- 1.5. The Review has been asked to look at the full framework of professional standards for teachers developed by the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA). The scope of the review does not include professional standards for Early Years Professional Status (EYPS), or the national standards for headship, developed by the National College for School Leadership (NCSL). Other professional and occupational standards used by members of the schools workforce (professional standards for Higher Level Teaching Assistant status, and National Occupational Standards for Supporting Teaching and Learning in Schools, both developed by the TDA) are also outside the scope of this Review.
- 1.6. The Review has also looked at the *Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers* (“the Code”), developed by the General Teaching Council for England (GTCE), with a view to incorporating key elements relating to conduct into the new standards.³ All registered teachers are currently required to abide by the Code, and any disciplinary proceedings undertaken by the GTCE will have regard to it.
- 1.7. The current framework of professional standards for teachers comprises five tiers:
- Qualified Teacher Status (QTS)
 - Core
 - Post-Threshold
 - Excellent Teacher
 - Advanced Skills Teacher (AST)
- 1.8. The Review is being conducted in two phases, and will report to the Secretary of State at the conclusion of each phase. The first phase, to which this report relates, has looked at the existing standards for QTS and Core.⁴ Further recommendations relating to the remaining tiers of the current standards framework will be made to the Secretary of State later this year.
- 1.9. Trainee teachers are required to demonstrate that they have satisfied all 33 of the current QTS standards before they can be recommended to the GTCE for the award of QTS.⁵ QTS defines the benchmark for entering the teaching profession in the maintained sector in England.

³ http://www.gtce.org.uk/documents/publicationpdfs/code_of_conduct_1009.pdf

⁴ For details of the existing framework of professional standards, produced by the TDA and introduced in September 2007, see www.tda.gov.uk/standards.

⁵ The Government confirmed in the Schools White Paper that it intends to abolish the GTCE. Subject to the passage of the Education Bill, some of the GTCE’s current functions will be transferred to a new Executive Agency of the DfE with effect from April 2012.

- 1.10. Those teachers who subsequently take up a Newly-Qualified Teacher (NQT) role in a maintained school or non-maintained special school are required by law to complete a period of induction.⁶ The induction period, which lasts three full terms, represents a period of sustained additional support for NQTs, building a “bridge” between the training phase and full employment. At the end of the induction period, an NQT is assessed (by the headteacher of the school in which they are working) against the 41 Core standards (which are substantially the same as the QTS standards, with a small number of additional requirements). On 28 April 2011, the Secretary of State announced that the Department for Education (DfE) would be considering the existing arrangements for induction to see how these might be updated and simplified better to serve the interests of schools, NQTs and pupils. The DfE will consult on new regulations for statutory induction in the autumn term of 2011.
- 1.11. Following induction, the Core standards continue to define the “baseline” level of practice expected of all teachers. Once a teacher reaches the top of the main pay scale (which comprises six incremental points), they become eligible to “cross the Threshold” and move onto the upper pay scale, which comprises a further three performance-related pay points. In order to move onto the upper pay scale, a teacher must be assessed as having met the ten Post-Threshold standards.⁷
- 1.12. Excellent Teacher and Advanced Skills Teacher statuses exist to designate outstanding and established classroom practitioners who have a role in supporting the leadership of their own school, or working with other schools in an “outreach” capacity to share best practice.⁸ Applicants are assessed against the corresponding standards as part of the designation process.
- 1.13. The Core standards are used to support the performance management of teachers once they have successfully completed their induction period.⁹ Those who have “crossed the Threshold”, or attained either Excellent Teacher or Advanced Skills Teacher status are also assessed against the relevant standards for those statuses.

⁶ As defined by The Education (Induction Arrangements for School Teachers) (England) Regulations 2008.

⁷ Details of the pay scales for classroom teachers, and the association with professional standards, is found in the [School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document 2010](#).

⁸ It is not necessary to have “crossed the Threshold” to attain AST status; it is, however, necessary to have done so in order to be designated an “Excellent Teacher”.

⁹ NQTs are not subject to the statutory performance management arrangements, as defined by [The Education \(School Teacher Performance Management\) \(England\) Regulations 2006](#).

At present, the standards are formally described as providing the “backdrop” to performance management discussions.¹⁰ The DfE has recently launched a consultation on proposed amendments to the performance management system which would include the introduction of a more direct relationship between the standards and the appraisal of teachers.¹¹ The consultation is currently underway, and is due to close on 16 August 2011.¹²

- 1.14. It should also be noted that the work of the Review to date has taken place in parallel with a Government review of the current infrastructure and mechanisms for the delivery of Initial Teacher Training in England, published on 27 June 2011.¹³ The strategy document published by the DfE as part of that review notes that the professional standards for qualified teachers “should set out the knowledge and skills that all teachers should develop through ITT” (para 17), with a view to ensuring that “the content of ITT meets the needs of schools”.

¹⁰ Introduction to the Professional Standards for Teachers, paragraph 9.

¹¹ See <http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/inthenews/a0077469/schools-to-get-more-power-to-manage-teachers> for further detail.

¹² The online consultation is accessible via the DfE website:
<http://www.education.gov.uk/consultations/index.cfm?action=consultationDetails&consultationId=1743&external=no&menu=1>

¹³ [Training our next generation of outstanding teachers: An improvement strategy for discussion](#)

2. THE REVIEW PROCESS

- 2.1. Supported by a Secretariat provided by the DfE, the Review Group met on 7 occasions between 14 March and 4 July 2011. The full committee designated a sub-group of its membership to act as a Drafting Group, charged with the main work of developing the draft standards. This Drafting Group convened on a number of additional occasions outside the meetings of the main Review.
- 2.2. The Review Group began by defining what it understood to be the purpose of teachers' standards, and agreed that standards should broadly provide:
 - one or more nationally consistent benchmarks for quality of teachers' practice and conduct to improve pupils' achievement;
 - a suitable standard of demonstrable competence and conduct for entry to the profession, raising the quality, and also to be required by the end of induction;
 - a clear basis for helping teachers to develop professionally; and
 - a clear basis for schools to tackle underperformance and misconduct through performance management.
- 2.3. The Review considered evidence from domestic and international sources to explore the use of teachers' standards in different education systems, and to identify the ways in which standards have been used effectively to support teachers' professional development and manage performance. The Review also looked at evidence from other high-status professions in order to understand how professional standards are used to benchmark and develop performance. This included consideration of the relationship between codes of conduct and standards for professional practice. A summary of the evidence considered by the Review before the drafting process began is presented in **Annex B**.
- 2.4. Having considered the available evidence, the Review wished to carry out a further call for evidence, targeted at a number of key stakeholders. These included 54 ITT providers rated "Outstanding" (Grade 1) by Ofsted, bodies representing the ITT sector (UCET and NASBTT), and a number of educational experts whose views the Review wished to invite. Teacher and headteacher unions were also invited to make written representations at this stage. A full list of those responded to the initial call for evidence is provided in **Annex C**.

- 2.5. Based on the evidence reviewed and further responses received, a summary of which is provided in **Annex D**, the Review proceeded to develop a set of draft standards. The drafting process included a mapping exercise and gap analysis conducted against the existing framework of professional standards and the GTCE Code. This identified the areas which the Review agreed should be retained in the new standards, and also flagged up those areas where the existing standards and Code were thought by the Review to be insufficient in their coverage, or where duplication could be identified.
- 2.6. The Review took the view that, in the interests of streamlining and removing duplication, it would be desirable to explore the feasibility of establishing a single set of standards to replace the existing QTS and Core standards. The Review noted that there is significant duplication between the two sets of existing standards, with evidence from users suggesting that it is not always clear how the difference between QTS and Core is meaningful or measurable in practice.
- 2.7. Having agreed to a set of draft standards, the Review wished to carry out a period of testing and engagement during which key users of the standards would be invited to comment on the proposed draft. Between 16 May and 10 June 2011, the Secretariat organised and facilitated discussions with a number of key users of teacher standards, including ITT providers and their representative bodies (through the national ITT provider network meetings), NQT induction co-ordinators, and teachers and headteachers. The Chair also met representatives of the main teacher and headteacher unions during this period to listen to their comments on the draft standards. A full list of the events at which the draft standards were tested is provided in **Annex E**. Members of the Review were also invited to carry out additional testing of the draft standards with relevant local stakeholders.
- 2.8. Feedback from the discussions on the draft standards held in May and June was presented to the Review at its meeting on 24 June. A summary of this feedback is provided in **Annex F**. Where the Review agreed that revisions to the draft standards should be made as a result of this feedback, these were incorporated into a final draft of the proposed standards recommended in this report.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS AND RATIONALE

- 3.1. The Review has been guided by its Terms of Reference in establishing a set of standards which, in its view, are more streamlined and more clearly expressed than the current standards, and which are appropriate for supporting the performance management of teachers as well as steering their professional development.
- 3.2. The Review Group is confident that the proposed standards will have the effect of increasing public confidence in the teaching profession, as the standards clearly define the key characteristics of teaching, and are designed to make that the benchmark for the practice expected of all teachers.
- 3.3. The Review wishes to make the following recommendations to the Secretary of State:

R1. The draft standards proposed by this report should be adopted to replace the existing Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) standards and the Core professional standards

- 3.4. In recommending a single set of standards to replace the existing separate sets of QTS and Core standards, the Review Group has taken the view that the duplication between the two existing sets of standards is such that the differences between them are not meaningful in practice. The Group believes that the first year of employment as a qualified teacher should focus on demonstrating consistency of practice and consolidation of the skills and knowledge acquired through ITT (whether delivered through an HEI or employment-based route). The Review Group has concluded that a single set of standards should be established to provide the framework for assessment at the end of ITT (i.e., for the recommendation of QTS), for NQTs at the end of their induction period, and then for teachers as part of the annual appraisal process.
- 3.5. In arriving at this recommendation, the Review has been mindful, from the earliest stage of discussions, that replacing two existing sets of standards, used for assessment of trainees and teachers at different career stages, with a single set of new standards could present a practical challenge to end users. Since 2007, users of the standards have been accustomed to referring to the standards that correspond to a particular assessment point or career stage (QTS, end of induction, Threshold, etc.).

However, the Review has taken the view that a single set of standards defining the key elements of teaching should be applied, as appropriate, to different contexts and career points. Thus it is possible to make a judgement on a trainee teacher's performance against the standards in the context of their being in training (whether that training is school- or HEI-led), in the same way that it is possible to make a judgement on an NQT's performance against those standards at the end of their period of induction, with that assessment being based on the context in which they are employed.

- 3.6. The Review has sought to ensure that the standards set a reasonable level of expectation for the practice that could be demonstrated in a training context, whether that is mainstream (HEI-based) or employment-based training. It will be necessary for ITT providers to make an assessment of trainees against the standards in a way that is commensurate with the context. So, for example, the Review is clear that all trainees should be "accountable for pupils' attainment, progress and outcomes". The way in which ITT providers make an assessment of this accountability in the context of a training placement will necessarily be different from the way in which an NQT's accountability is assessed at the end of a full year of practice. The key point is that the standard is interpreted in a way that is consistent with, and commensurate with, the context in which the trainee or teacher is operating.
- 3.7. The induction period for NQTs, the Review agreed, should be seen as an opportunity to consolidate on the training period and to demonstrate consistency of practice; this does not necessitate additional or different standards, but a confirmation of the teacher's ability to put their training into practice in the classroom.
- 3.8. The Review concluded that the overriding concern in developing new standards was to define a clear framework that would be easily understood and universally identifiable, and that would define the "line in the sand" for the expectations of every qualified teacher. The proposed draft standards are intended to set a baseline of expected practice for all teachers. Not only do they define the level of competence at which a teacher should be judged to be qualified, they also define the minimum level at which all teachers must maintain their professional practice throughout their career.
- 3.9. Although the standards, if accepted, may only be required for teachers in maintained schools, non-maintained special schools and a majority of Academies (subject to their funding arrangements), the Review hopes that the clarity and rigour which the new standards will bring to defining the key elements of teaching will mean that they are adopted in practice by teachers working in all settings, as a nationally recognisable and respected

- 3.10. The Review also believes that introducing a single set of “floor” standards is consistent with the aim of giving greater autonomy to schools, and placing trust in the professional judgement of those who are using the standards in practice. If these standards are adopted, it will be for headteachers and appraisers to make a judgement about the level of practice that a teacher should be demonstrating within the framework provided by the standards, based on consideration of the individual’s role and experience, and the specific demands of the setting in which they are working.
- 3.11. So, for instance, a headteacher using the standards to appraise the performance of teachers in a small rural primary school, and to plan appropriate professional development opportunities for those teachers, will need to take account of a different range of factors from the headteacher of a large inner-city secondary school who is making the same judgements. It is right that, in each case, the headteacher should have the freedom to apply the standards in a way that is consistent with the needs and circumstances of his or her school. Both assessments, however, will be made in the context of a nationally recognised framework of standards which define the baseline expectations for every teacher’s performance.
- 3.12. In drafting the standards, the Review has opted for a model of overarching statements, supported by bullet points. The intention is that, taken together, the bullet points constitute essential elements of each standard: within the context of the standard as a whole they should be seen as focusing on the type of practice that those assessing trainees, NQTs and teachers might observe in determining whether they have met the standard. Rather than being read as separate standards, the bullet points are intended to illustrate the scope and extent of each standard, assisting assessors to develop a narrative of how successfully the trainee or teacher is meeting the standard, including areas in which they are already demonstrating an advanced level of practice as well as those in which they might require further development.
- 3.13. The Review’s principal concern has been to define a clear and coherent benchmark for professional practice which can apply universally to all teachers at different career stages. As such, the Review is confident that the proposed standards will provide a useful framework to support trainees and teachers in identifying areas in which they could further build on and improve their practice, knowledge and understanding.

- 3.14. Within that framework, the breadth and depth of practice that a trainee or teacher exhibits will of course vary depending on the context in which they are working, and the amount of experience they have. The standards are clear that teachers have a responsibility to develop their own practice through effective professional development, including through reflection on the effectiveness of lessons and approaches to teaching (both their own and those of colleagues). Being open and responding to advice and feedback from colleagues is a critical aspect of every teacher's professional development, and the proposed standards clearly reinforce that message.

R2. The single set of standards proposed by this report incorporates standards for behaviour and conduct, and as such these standards should replace the current Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers from September 2012

- 3.15. The Review has been clear that, in order to meet its remit of establishing standards that inspire public confidence in the teaching profession, standards for the personal and professional conduct of teachers should be brought together with standards for professional practice.
- 3.16. The Review agreed that, for the sake of coherence and clarity, it would be preferable to locate standards for practice and conduct together in a single document. In doing so, the Review determined that the document should be presented in two parts; the first dealing with standards for teaching, the second with standards for personal and professional conduct.
- 3.17. Adopting this approach, the Review has been clear that the two parts of the standards document are significantly different in nature, and consequently will necessitate a different approach to their assessment. Whereas Part 1 (Teaching) sets out standards that can be assessed, and against which practice would be expected to develop in breadth and depth as a teacher's career progresses, Part 2 (Personal and Professional Conduct) sets out standards that are immutable and that apply equally and consistently, in "absolute measure", to trainees and teachers at all stages of their career.
- 3.18. The Review recommends that the standards for personal and professional conduct contained in Part 2 of the present document should replace the GTCE's *Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers* from September 2012.

R3. Successful assessment against these standards should be the determining factor in a recommendation for the award of Qualified Teacher Status and successful completion of statutory induction

- 3.19. The mechanism and timing for the award of QTS is outside the scope of the current Review. However, the Review has designed and tested the proposed standards to ensure that they set an appropriately challenging but realistic benchmark for the point at which a teacher should be deemed to be qualified.
- 3.20. In doing so, the Review has been particularly mindful of the need for the standards to be fully “assessable”. Feedback from users of the standards during the period of wider engagement proved extremely helpful in guiding the Review to refine the wording of the proposed standards in a way that makes them consistent with the assessment procedures of both ITT providers and schools, which will also use the standards in the context of statutory induction, and after that in performance management discussions.
- 3.21. The Review Group recognises that ITT providers will require support in introducing and using the new standards effectively, and recommends that the Department and its Agencies should work closely with representatives of the ITT sector in order to develop a strategy for implementation.

R4. The new standards should be introduced for use from 1 September 2012. All trainee teachers beginning their training on or after that date should be assessed exclusively against the new standards

- 3.22. The Review Group has been acutely conscious of the need to give users of the standards adequate notice of any changes to the current framework which will affect their day to day business. This is particularly true in the case of ITT providers, who will need time to give careful consideration to how their programmes are designed and delivered in accordance with the new standards.
- 3.23. Although the Review Group will be proceeding to consider the “upper levels” of the current standards framework in the next phase of its work, the Group advises that this definitive set of Teachers’ Standards replacing the QTS and Core standards should – subject to the Secretary of State’s approval – be made available to users at the earliest opportunity, leaving sufficient opportunity for ITT providers to review and revise their programmes in time for those trainees who begin their ITT in or after September 2012.

R5. The new standards continue to define the “baseline” level of practice expected of all teachers

- 3.24. At present, the existing Core standards define the “baseline” level of competence for all teachers following successful completion of the statutory induction period. They underpin all of the additional, incremental standards at the higher levels of the existing framework.
- 3.25. The Review recommends that the proposed new standards should form the baseline of practice expected of all qualified teachers, regardless of the point they have reached in their career, the setting they are working in, or the specific role they fulfil. This is consistent with the Review’s aim of establishing a set of standards that are clearly understood and that define the basic characteristics of high-quality teaching that all those in the profession should be able to demonstrate consistently throughout their careers.
- 3.26. The Review has been careful to draft the standards in such a way as not to place unreasonable new expectations or burdens on those teachers who may have been qualified for a significant period of time. As far as possible, the Review has attempted to make the standards reflect the “timeless” values of teaching. The terms of reference within which the Review has operated also identified a number of key areas which are of particular importance for current education policy, and those have been accommodated within the draft standards in a way that the Review believes is appropriate.

R6. The Department for Education should make clear arrangements to manage the introduction of the new standards for those trainees already in training on 1 September 2012, and for teachers who are in service on that date

- 3.27. It is of paramount importance that ITT providers – and trainees themselves – have absolute clarity about the standards against which they will be assessed in order for a recommendation for QTS to be made.
- 3.28. The DfE should work with ITT providers and their representative bodies to clarify, at the earliest opportunity, how the introduction of new standards will affect those trainees who are already in training, but who have not yet been awarded QTS on 1 September 2012. These arrangements should ensure that no existing trainees are unfairly disadvantaged by the introduction of the new standards.

- 3.29. The Review Group agrees that it is appropriate for the new standards to apply universally to all serving teachers, as their purpose is to set out an enduring set of competences which define the basic expectations for all teaching that is of good quality. The DfE must also consider the implications of the new standards for teachers who are already in service in September 2012. Proposed revisions to the existing performance management arrangements for teachers will clarify the relationship between the standards and any new appraisal system.

ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS

- 3.30. In addition to its formal recommendations set out in the previous section, the Review also wishes to make some observations on matters which fall outside its Terms of Reference. These do not constitute a part of the Review's formal recommendations to the Secretary of State, but might be considered as pertinent issues arising out of those formal recommendations.

Award of Qualified Teacher Status

- 3.31. The Review suggests that the point at which a teacher is deemed to be "fully qualified" should be the end of the first full year of employment following the completion of ITT. In practice, this would mean that QTS is "provisionally" awarded at the end of ITT, and then confirmed or revoked following the end of a first year of employment. The Review Group noted, in particular, the current anomaly whereby an NQT who fails the statutory induction period does not lose their QTS. The Review is not proposing this change to the Secretary of State as part of its formal recommendations.
- 3.32. The Review is persuaded that this approach would be consistent with the introduction of a single set of standards to cover the periods of training and induction. Thus a trainee would be expected to meet the standards at the end of their training in order to be granted provisional QTS; they would then be required to demonstrate their ability to maintain a consistent level of practice within the framework of the standards throughout their induction period, at the end of which QTS would be confirmed. The Review Group understands that this issue falls outside its terms of reference, but suggests that the Department for Education might consider whether the arrangements for awarding QTS could be reviewed following the introduction of the new standards, and in light of any changes to the current Induction arrangements that arise out of the Department's review.

Alignment with Ofsted Criteria

- 3.33. Although not explicitly covered in the Review's Terms of Reference, the letter of appointment from the Secretary of State to the Review Chair requested that the Review "consider how the standards align with Ofsted's school inspection criteria".¹⁴
- 3.34. Throughout its deliberations, the Review has given careful consideration to the way in which the existing professional standards are, in practice, aligned with Ofsted grading criteria, particularly the descriptors for the quality of teaching, by both ITT providers and schools.¹⁵ The Review has noted the widespread currency that the Ofsted grade descriptors enjoy in both the ITT and schools sectors, with both trainees and teachers often being "graded" on the four point scale used by Ofsted.¹⁶
- 3.35. The Review welcomed input to its discussions from the observer representing Ofsted, which included discussion of the current consultation on revisions to the inspection framework for schools.
- 3.36. The Review gave detailed consideration to whether it would be appropriate to develop descriptors setting out what different levels of achievement look like against the draft standards. So, for instance, separate descriptors could define what "outstanding", "good" and "satisfactory" achievement of the standards might look like. However, the Review concluded that doing so would not be consistent with the principle of streamlining and simplifying the standards; nor would such prescription be consistent with the spirit of investing greater confidence in the professional judgement of teachers.
- 3.37. The Review sees obvious advantages to users of the standards in being able to discern different levels of performance and achievement for trainees and teachers.

14

<http://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/g/guidance%20and%20publications/letter%20to%20sally%20coates.pdf>

¹⁵ The framework for the inspection of ITT providers by Ofsted can be found at: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/content/download/5977/54263/file/Framework%20for%20the%20inspection%20of%20initial%20teacher%20education%202008-11.pdf>. The evaluation schedule for the inspection of schools under Section 5 of the Education Act 2005 can be found at <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/content/download/9632/106774/file/The%20evaluation%20schedule%20for%20schools%20April%202011.pdf>.

¹⁶ The four-point scale is graded as follows: 1 (Outstanding), 2 (Good), 3 (Satisfactory) and 4 (Inadequate).

However, the purpose of standards should be to define a benchmark of practice expected, and provide a framework within which judgements about performance can be made, based on appropriate factors such as an individual's level of experience, and the specific role and setting within which they are practising. A full description of those determining factors cannot, and should not, be provided by the standards themselves.

- 3.38. The Review therefore invites Ofsted to consider how its grade descriptors for the evaluation of teaching might be framed in such a way as to make clear connections with the teacher standards. Doing so would help users of the standards to “read across” more consistently to level descriptors within the Ofsted framework.

Subject Specialism for Primary Education

- 3.39. The Review noted early on in its deliberations that the current professional standards may be having a detrimental effect in discouraging subject specialists from training to teach in the primary phase. This arises from the requirement that those teaching in the primary phase be trained to teach all subjects within the primary curriculum. The Review was of the opinion that there should be greater opportunity for teachers to focus on their specific subject specialism within the primary phase, and agreed to flag that issue with Ministers through this report.

4. NEXT STEPS

- 4.1. Following the submission of this report, and pending the Secretary of State's consideration of its recommendations, the Review will embark on the second stage of work. This will consider the existing Post-Threshold, Excellent Teacher, and Advanced Skills Teacher standards.
- 4.2. The Review will evaluate the process it has followed thus far, and will apply any lessons learned to the conduct of its second stage of work. The Review will again consider appropriate evidence relating to the current standards in use in England, as well as international comparators, and may wish to seek further evidence from relevant users of the standards.
- 4.3. The final report of the Review will be made to the Secretary of State in the autumn of 2011.

Annex A – Terms of Reference for the Review of Teachers' Standards

Context

The Coalition Government is committed to raising the prestige and esteem of the teaching profession. As set out in the Schools White Paper, The Importance of Teaching, the proliferation of existing teacher standards means that expectations of teachers may appear unclear, and it can be hard to assess teacher performance and steer professional development. It is therefore necessary to establish rigorous standards of competence, ethics and behaviour that reflect the trust and professionalism society should be able to expect from its teachers.

Aim

The aim of the Review is to establish a set of standards that:

- are unequivocal, clear and easy to understand;
- provide a tool to assess teachers' performance and steer professional development;
- are designed to inspire confidence in the profession;
- focus primarily on the key elements of excellent teaching (including approaches to early reading and early mathematics), how to address poor behaviour and how to support children with additional needs, including special educational needs; and
- encompass standards of ethics and behaviour, both within and outside the school, including, for example, having tolerance and respect for the rights and views of others and not undermining UK democratic values.

The scope of the Review is the standards for classroom teachers. The Review will focus on the existing standards for teachers for Qualified Teacher Status (QTS), Core, Threshold, Excellent Teachers (ETs) and Advanced Skills Teachers (ASTs). It will not include headship standards (although the National Professional Qualification for Headship is being reviewed separately) nor the pay consequences of any standards.

Output of the Review

The Review will present a short interim report to the Secretary of State in July 2011 including draft standards designed to replace the current QTS and Core standards, and a final report in the autumn term with a draft set of standards, including the higher levels.

Conduct of the Review

The Review Chair will be supported by a small group of excellent practitioners – including headteachers, teachers and initial teacher training providers. The Review will consider best practice internationally. The Chair will be able to call for expert advice and evidence as appropriate and should provide

opportunities for the teaching profession and its representatives to engage with the Review.

Officials' support and secretariat will be led by DfE working with interested parties as appropriate.

The review is expected to start by focusing on QTS and Core standards, as the foundation for the system. The second stage of the review, examining the higher-level standards (Threshold, ET and AST), would begin only after recommendations had been made for the QTS and Core standards. The Review will take account of work to align designations for leading practitioners and reforms to initial teacher training.

Annex B – Summary of Evidence Considered Prior to Drafting

Evidence supplied to the Review of Teachers' Standards focused particularly on those countries that performed significantly higher than England in the outcomes of PISA 2009.¹⁷

A review of literature indicates that teacher quality and especially the issue of standards for teachers have been of particular concern in high-performing countries in recent years. For example, in the last few years, New Zealand has published revised professional standards,¹⁸ Australia has recently published new national standards,¹⁹ and Singapore has produced new graduate standards that form the basis of teacher registration.²⁰ More generally, Korea is reviewing its performance management of teachers. The Review considered the structure and content of a number of high-performing countries' standards as part of its drafting process.

The 2007 McKinsey study by Sir Michael Barber on *How the World's Best Performing School Systems Come Out on Top* is recognised as a recent catalyst for igniting further interest in teacher quality and has been frequently quoted in high performing countries' literature relating to their teacher reforms.²¹ Barber concluded that the main driver in variation in student learning at school is the quality of teachers and that the quality of the school system cannot exceed the quality of the people who teach in it, which means there must be a thorough and ongoing commitment to teachers; development throughout their careers.

Nationally, the 2010 General Teaching Council for England (GTCE) survey provided an opportunity to explore teachers' views on the professional standards framework, and how and whether the standards influenced their approaches to improving their teaching practice.²² Respondents were asked the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements relating to their understanding and use of the standards. For example, relating to the direct statement: 'In practice, the professional standards do not make any difference to the way that I teach', more teachers agreed (41 per cent) than disagreed (24 per cent), and almost one in three neither agreed nor disagreed (29 per cent). Further evidence on use and awareness of the standards was provided by the NFER work on professionalism in the teaching profession.²³

Key messages were considered from NFER research on behalf for the Office of

¹⁷ [PISA 2009 Results: What Students Know and Can Do – Student Performance in Reading, Mathematics and Science, OECD \(2009\)](#)

¹⁸ [Graduating teacher standards, New Zealand Teachers' Council \(2007\)](#)

¹⁹ [National Professional Standards for Teachers, Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership \(2011\)](#)

²⁰ [The Teachers' Pledge, Singapore Ministry of Education \(undated\)](#)

²¹ [Barber & Mourshed, How the World's Best Performing School Systems Come Out On Top, McKinsey and Company \(2007\)](#)

²² [Poet, H., et al., Survey of Teachers 2010, Support to Improve Teaching Practice, NFER/GTCE \(2010\)](#)

²³ [Walker, M., et al. Making the links between teachers' professional standards, induction, performance management and continuing professional development, Research Report for the Department for Education, NFER \(2011\)](#)

the Children's Commissioner looking at children and young people's views on aspects of education policy²⁴. The research included asking children and young people for their views on their teachers and what they thought makes a good teacher.

Consideration was given to existing national standards documents including the *Framework of Professional Standards for Teachers* developed by the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA)²⁵ and the *GTCE Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers*. The Review saw the consultation documents for Ofsted's consultation on inspection of maintained schools and relayed feedback to Ofsted through the independent observer. Consideration was given to the practices and standards of other professions in the UK, and in particular the standards of good medical practice set out by the General Medical Council.²⁶

International and national evidence was supported by qualitative evidence held by the TDA and DfE about the existing teachers' standards. In summer 2009, TDA began work to scope a possible future Review of professional and occupational standards for the schools workforce, and to understand how effectively standards were being used in schools. This work included a formally commissioned research project and evidence on perceptions and use of the standards through large-scale surveys aimed at teachers and head teachers. The scoping work included further informal engagement with a range of stakeholders, including ITT provider networks, and intelligence gathered through the TDA's Regional Leads in their dialogues with schools, LAs and other partners. These various strands of data and intelligence gathering resulted in an evidence base, which helped the Review to understand how stakeholders view and use the current standards, and where they feel that standards could be improved to have greater impact on raising the quality of teaching. Overall findings from this work were that awareness of the current standards is good, but there was general agreement that the standards could be sharpened and simplified in order to help schools use them more effectively as a document for everyday reference and practice. There was also agreement that standards need to be closely and effectively linked with procedures such as performance management and the planning of professional development in order to ensure that they deliver maximum impact.

²⁴ [Children and Young People's Views of Education, Research Report for the Office of the Children's Commissioner, NFER \(2011\)](#)

²⁵ [Professional Standards for Teachers: Why Sit Still in Your Career?, TDA \(2007\)](#)

²⁶ [Good Medical Practice, General Medical Council \(2006\)](#)

Annex C – Initial Call for Evidence

Questions asked:

1. In your experience, how far do the current set of standards and other expectations of teachers, such as the General Teaching Council for England's Code of Conduct and Practice, meet [the criteria for standards defined by the Review's terms of reference]?
2. What changes do you think could be made to achieve these?

List of respondents:

Associations/Individuals:

Professor Robin Alexander, Cambridge Primary Review
Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL)
Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)
Council for Subject Associations (CfSA)
Field Studies Council
General Teaching Council for England (GTCE)
Sue Hackman, Chief Adviser for School Standards, DfE
Independent Schools Council (ISC)
National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT)
National Association of School-Based Teacher Trainers (NASBTT)
National Teacher Research Panel (NTRP)
National Association of Schoolmasters and Union of Women Teachers (NASUWT)
National Union of Teachers (NUT)
Professor Rhona Stainthorp, Psychology Department, University of Reading
Professor Morag Stuart, Psychology Department, University of Reading
Charlie Taylor, Head Teacher of The Willows Special School and Government Adviser on Behaviour
Tim Turvey, former headmaster, Hulme Grammar School, Oldham
Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET)
Voice

Providers of Initial Teacher Training:

Birmingham City University
Bishop Grosseteste University College, Lincoln
Devon Secondary Teacher Training Group
Essex Teacher Training
The Havering Teacher Training Partnership
Institute of Education, University of London
Leeds Metropolitan University
Manchester Metropolitan University
The Pilgrim Partnership
Suffolk & Norfolk Primary SCITT
University of Brighton

University of Chichester
University of Derby
University of East Anglia
University of Exeter
University of Manchester
University of Nottingham
University of Plymouth
University of Reading
University of Worcester
University of York

Annex D – Summary of Call for Evidence Responses

The following summary of responses has been grouped into seven areas:

- Content
- Quality and Clarity
- Scope, Structure and Streamlining
- Performance Management and CPD
- Ofsted
- Conduct
- The Review Process

Content

A headteacher union was able to provide a list of their preferred content headings, stating that there should be relatively few standards focusing on teaching, achievement, safeguarding, behaviour and wider contribution and leadership. They also felt that the current standards are process driven and unrelated to outcomes, vague, and open to subjective interpretation. An HEI also provided a list, split into ‘first and second order elements of excellent teaching’, with first order elements including knowledge for teaching, personal skills and attributes, and dispositions, and second order elements of teaching including *knowledge of assessment methods, skills in explaining and questioning, behaviour management and working with parents and carers*.

HEIs supported a focus on the key areas of teaching, identifying pedagogy and subject and curriculum knowledge as essentials, and also warning against revised standards providing a narrow definition of the role of a teacher, arguing that elements such as the use of technology and interaction with support staff must be included. A teacher union agreed that the standards should focus on the key elements of teaching, and commented that the volume and repetitive nature of the current standards makes it hard to focus on what is important, noting that the various uses of the current standards has led to processes which accompany them becoming overly mechanistic, a reservation echoed by SCITTs and EBITTs. They also expressed concern regarding how ‘excellence’ is to be defined, and whether this would lead to the standards establishing unreasonable expectations of early career teachers.

Almost all ITT providers which responded were very strongly of the view that a key strength of the current standards is the way in which they embed the principle of teachers reflecting on their own practice, agreeing it is imperative that this is retained. For example, an HEI observed that it is crucial that trainee teachers can understand, deliver and intellectually reflect upon a range of teaching and learning pedagogies.

Several ITT providers noted that coaching and mentoring of and by teachers is a clear priority for Ministers given its inclusion in schools White Paper. One HEI suggested that coaching and mentoring might have an enhanced status in the revised standards; another observed that it relates directly to the attributes

required of those entering the profession.

A number of respondents suggested that the focus of the standards on the key elements of teaching should not be compromised by an attempt to encompass current initiatives or political priorities. Similarly, a headteacher union observed the importance of taking account of other major reviews which are currently taking place. HEIs echoed this observation, and also noted that revised standards which reflect the professional autonomy of teachers would be consistent with current Ministerial thinking. They further remarked that the current model of outcome standards, written at high level with accompanying guidance, has enabled the HEI-led ITT sector to respond to newly emerging priorities without the need for frequent revisions of the standards. An individual HEI regarded the reference in the call for evidence to 'poor behaviour' as unhelpful, stating that there is an inextricable link between good teaching and engagement of all learners.

Two early reading experts were approached. The first of these submitted two responses, on reading and writing and language and cognition. The reading and writing response stated that all primary teachers should show that they: understand the Simple View of Reading (SVR) which proposes that reading is the product of accurate, fluent word reading, and language comprehension processes; have a working knowledge of the research evidence that supports this view; are able to teach pupils to read words accurately and fluently, and to understand the texts that they read; are able to teach pupils to become confident readers who want to read both for enjoyment and to support their studies across all curriculum subjects; have an understanding of the Simple View of Writing (SVW), and; are able to use the SVW as a framework for monitoring progress and assessing performance of writing. The language and cognition response made two specific recommendations: that the standards should include a requirement for teachers to show that they are aware that their teaching should be informed by their understanding of cognitive functioning so that they can make provision for efficient learning and meet the needs of individual learner, and; that teachers must have high levels of personal communication skills, advanced knowledge about language including both structural and descriptive linguistics, knowledge about typical language development, and the ability to use their knowledge in this domain to plan effectively across the whole curriculum.

The second early reading expert also submitted two responses, on reading and writing and on behaviour. The reading and writing response argued that to teach reading and writing effectively, teachers need to understand the cognitive processes involved in reading and writing and the ways in which these typically develop in children, so that they know why they are teaching what they are teaching and why they are teaching in those particular ways. It went on to provide a comprehensive list what primary school teachers should be able to know and understand, including the basic propositions of the SVR and SVW and some of the relevant research bases, and should be able to do, which included references to phonics, reading, spelling and writing, including handwriting. The behaviour response, which referenced the expert's own research, identified the importance for teachers of: knowing about attachment theory and knowing and understanding the influence of attachment on

emotional and social development; understanding the emotional and social development of children and the ways in which families and schools influence this; being able to help children construct realistic and coherent narratives about their lives and experiences, and; being introduced during teacher training to the implementation of restorative approaches.

An organisation representing subject associations submitted an unsolicited response which addressed the position of subject knowledge within the standards and commented that the current standards give little prominence to the importance of subject teaching. They also argued that it is not solely the quality of subject knowledge that trainees have acquired through degree study that is important, but also their understanding of subject pedagogy. They went on to recommend that the revised QTS standards require that new teachers: know how to apply their subject knowledge to teaching; are able to evaluate the effectiveness of their own subject teaching in order to adjust their teaching strategies for maximum pupil learning; have a sound grasp of subject pedagogy in order to fulfil the expectations of teachers set out in the schools White Paper, and; are equipped with a secure understanding of curriculum planning and have the ability to construct a broad, deep and enriching teaching curriculum in their subject.

A teacher union was clear that an awareness of equality, inclusion and diversity should be reflected at all stages. One HEI pointed out that difficulties related to areas such as SEN and behaviour are often to do with the complexity of these issues, rather than failure on the part of teachers and ITT providers, and that CPD is important in addressing this. Another HEI expressed concern about the term 'UK democratic values' (included in the review group's Terms of Reference) suggesting that it is open to various interpretations.

One HEI reported that the nature, timing and current arrangements for the skills tests should be reviewed so that their impact on admissions procedures is minimal as is the negative distraction they can cause to trainees, while another suggested that the review group should identify the vital skills and knowledge required for entry to ITT and decide whether additional skills tests are necessary. HEIs also suggested that the Review should consider whether the Skills Tests are an appropriate measure of Literacy, Numeracy and ICT skills.

Quality and Clarity

One HEI advocated a greater emphasis on measurability, arguing that this would help to drive improvement. Similarly, another HEI observed that some of the current standards are suitable for quantifiable assessment, others qualitative. They went on to advocate standards which support a holistic approach, with progress and attainment considered under the key headings rather than focusing too prescriptively on individual standards or details of complex standards. A third HEI agreed that a holistic approach should be taken, arguing that good teaching is more than simply the sum of a set of standards. A fourth favoured an approach to developing the standards which focuses on their effectiveness in supporting assessment of teacher performance.

A headteacher union favoured an ambitious approach which focuses on both competence and excellence, with standards that should be simple, concrete and concise, referring only to recognisable behaviours against which differentiation can demonstrably occur. They also commented that there is very strong evidence that skills and knowledge do not differentiate those whose performance is outstanding; this is almost always demonstrated through behaviours, attitudes, values and characteristics. An HEI identified the danger of an oversimplified set of standards resulting in key attributes being neglected, and becoming nothing more than a list of unrefined skills. They also observed that the current standards support the link between good learning and good behaviour, and that the current 'Professional Attributes' should be retained as they encourage self-awareness and criticality among teachers.

An HEI suggested there is tension between developing a set of standards which are clear and easy to understand and the necessity for sufficient detail which unequivocal standards will require, also noting that the current standards are significantly better in this regard than previous versions. Similarly, a teacher union noted the importance of balancing clear identification of explicit progression with standards which against which assessment can easily take place, while another felt that there should be a greater focus on quality of practice in contrast with the current emphasis on collecting large quantities of evidence. A further HEI commented that some essential skills are not covered by the current standards, but also noted the danger of new standards placing unrealistic expectations on classroom teachers.

HEIs, SCITTs and EBITTs noted the distinctive usage of the QTS standards and their role in securing accountability of ITT providers. Their submissions also discussed the relationship between the QTS standards and the ITT requirements, with HEIs commenting that the review should not blur the distinction between that which trainee teachers must achieve and what is required of ITT providers, and SCITTs and EBITTs by contrast commenting on areas of overlap, in particular with regard to entry criteria.

Scope, Structure and Streamlining

A teacher union response stated that a teacher's private beliefs should be beyond the scope of the standards, which should be restricted to quality of performance in school; however they were clear that this should not be limited to what happens in the classroom. In contrast, a headteacher union were of the view that standards related to conduct should include reference to teachers' status as a role model outside of school.

A teacher union, along with SCITTs and EBITTs, commented that developing a framework which applies to all age ranges is problematic; the same teacher union also identified a tension between this and the notion of clear and unequivocal standards. Similarly, another teacher union felt that universal application of the standards is challenging, as is the provision of evidence for some of them. On a related point, a third teacher union and an HEI felt that extending the scope of the standards to apply to those working in colleges would be feasible given their current breadth of coverage.

A teacher union reported that the current structure which clearly suggests how career progression is achieved is highly valued; a headteacher union concurred, noting the value of a coherent and progressive framework, while an HEI suggested that the framework is meaningful for all teachers, and not just something with which trainees or NQTs engage.

However a different teacher union felt that some of the current standards don't allow for progression, and also commented that the Post-Threshold standards are weak and not closely related to the criteria for crossing the threshold. Conversely, another teacher union identified an overlap between some standards and the TLR criteria in STPCD.

By contrast, the professional body for teaching in England recommended a significant change to the structure of the framework, beginning with the decoupling of the standards from pay, progression, and specific roles. Trainee teachers would be required to meet a foundation set of standards and would also need to demonstrate that they can meet the requirements of the Code of Conduct. Chartered and Expert standards would follow, the application for assessment against which would be at a time of the individual teacher's choosing. Evidence for the Chartered standards would be drawn from Performance Management; these standards would focus on mature and deeper practice, and would also include coaching and mentoring. Expert standards would allow for specialisation in one of five areas: pedagogical; local context; subject or specialism; learning leadership beyond the school/locality; inter- and intra-professional working.

HEIs, reflecting on successive reviews, commented that the current streamlined standards have been proved to be fit for purpose and that the revised model should retain the streamlining principle. An organisation representing schools in the independent sector agreed that the Core standards provide appropriate coverage of the key elements identified in the Review's aims, but argued that this could still be achieved with significantly fewer standards, and in particular through eliminating instances of duplication. They also suggested that the scope of the Core standards should address CPD of teachers, and that standards which address the requirement for qualifying as a teacher should not feature at this stage.

Performance Management and CPD

A number of respondents questioned the value the current standards have in supporting Performance Management processes. A teacher union felt that distinctions between necessary and desirable are unclear, and the current standards do not provide objective measures for the purposes of Performance Management; they also noted the importance of consideration of local context when using standards to address underperformance. One headteacher union was of the view that use of the current standards is limited to addressing underperformance, though they also noted that the majority of the standards are not relevant in this context, while another observed that the impact of standards is only as powerful as the CPD and PM processes which sit alongside them. An HEI was of the view that the tension between assessing performance and steering professional development should be acknowledged

by a suite of standards which leave scope for local contexts to be addressed as part of CPD.

One teacher union was clear that the standards should provide a backdrop to CPD and PM, and that schools should not need to refer to them regularly. Another noted that the inclusion of a notion of equal access to CPD for all teachers would be a desirable feature. SCITTs and EBITTs were of the view that the current standards fail to recognise the importance of early-career CPD, and suggested that the early-career standards might include a greater emphasis on reflective practice.

Ofsted

Almost all responses from ITT providers included a reference to the relationship between the standards and the grading of trainee teachers drawing on the Ofsted frameworks. One HEI felt that there needs to be greater articulation between the standards and Ofsted characteristics for the assessment of individual trainees, and suggested that one way to achieve this could be to formulate profile statements in order to indicate what trainee teachers should aim to demonstrate within the context of their school practice and training period as a whole. A second HEI argued for a closer link between the standards and relevant Ofsted criteria, noting that alongside the overlap between the standards and the GTCE Code of Conduct is the common practice of measuring teacher performance using Ofsted materials. A third observed that it is imperative that the standards are not redefined in practice by Ofsted.

SCITTs and EBITTs suggested that, given the procedures for ITT inspection, the standards should be developed with grading of trainee teachers in mind. Several responses highlighted the need for ITT providers to develop their own materials to support the grading of trainee teachers.

Conduct

One teacher union was unequivocal in their view that the notion of incorporating the GTCE Code of Conduct into the standards is misguided, would undermine regulation of the profession, and would impact on the ability of standards to provide a framework for the development of practice. Another agreed, noting that combining the standards and the Code is problematic due to their differing natures. The professional body for teaching in England themselves felt that the standards complemented by the Code collectively provide the benchmark for fitness to practise.

Other responses, including from SCITTs and EBITTs, and two HEIs took a different view, welcoming the prospect of the standards and the Code being combined. A third HEI agreed, suggesting that the standards and the Code could be brought together as key performance standards underpinned by a non-negotiable set of values and ethical considerations, with professional attributes combined with the Code forming a set of underpinning principles which are enforceable from the outset for all trainees and which would apply to all teachers. Another HEI commented that this might result in a set of standards which do more to describe the teaching profession, and noted that this would

remove the anomalous position of trainee teachers being subject to a Code which is intended for professionals.

One HEI felt that the current standards align well with the Code, encompassing its eight key points.

The Review Process

Almost all of those who responded expressed an interest in submitting further representations at a later date, with the teacher and headteacher unions in particular indicating a wish to submit oral evidence to the review group. The majority of responses welcomed the review and were broadly supportive of its stated objectives. A number of responses from ITT providers queried the rationale for a review at this time, given the relatively short period which has elapsed since implementation of the current standards. Other responses queried the timescale for achieving the objectives of the review. One HEI suggested that there is a contradiction between the notion of freeing teachers from constraint, and the identification by Ministers of specific elements for inclusion.

A significant number of responses highlighted the importance of drawing on available research, with some suggesting that it should be possible to identify a link between each standard and the evidence which underpins it. Some responses also noted the apparent contrast between research findings and priorities identified by Ministers.

HEIs made two specific recommendations with regard to implementation of the revised QTS Standards; that ITT providers need to be engaged as early as possible, with opportunities to test drafting for unintended consequences, and; that for the revised suite of teachers' standards to be valid and credible the review group should devise a strategy to minimise the risk of reviewing them in a sequential manner rather than concurrently.

Annex E – List of discussions held with key users of standards (10 May – 10 June 2011)

- 15 Initial Teacher Training Provider network meetings, covering all mainstream (HEI) and employment-based providers, facilitated by the TDA.
- 2 national Induction Co-Ordinator conferences, covering Induction Co-Ordinators from all Local Authorities in England, facilitated by the TDA.
- TeachFirst Ambassadors' focus group, and meeting of TeachFirst regional HEI providers.
- Feedback from UCET, NASBTT, ISA, ISC, the Catholic Education Service and GTCE.
- Discussions with teachers and headteachers held in 9 Training and/or National Teaching Schools, facilitated by the TDA:
 - Ashton-on-Mersey School, Trafford;
 - City of Portsmouth Girls School;
 - Framwellgate School, Durham;
 - Huntington School, City of York;
 - Ivybridge Community College, Devon;
 - Sawtry Community College, Cambridgeshire;
 - Southfields Community College, Wandsworth;
 - Swanhurst School, Birmingham;
 - Tuxford School, Nottinghamshire.
- Members of the Review Group were also invited to discuss the draft standards with stakeholders in their own localities.
- The Review Chair held individual feedback meetings with representatives of the following teacher and headteacher unions:
 - ASCL
 - ATL
 - NAHT
 - NASUWT
 - NUT
 - Voice

Annex F – Summary of Feedback from Wider Engagement

Stakeholders participating in the period of wider engagement on the draft standards issued on 16 May were asked for their views in response to a series of eight questions. Respondents were also invited to provide any additional comments.

- 1 Are the draft standards unequivocal, clear and easy to understand?
- 2 Are the draft standards suitable for use when assessing performance?
- 3 Are the draft standards suitable for helping to plan professional development?
- 4 Will the draft standards inspire confidence in the profession?
- 5 Do the draft standards identify the key elements of teaching?
- 6 Do the draft standards set appropriate expectations for what a trainee teacher should achieve in order to be awarded Qualified Teacher Status?
- 7 Are you confident that the draft standards will be adequate in underpinning the design and delivery of programmes of ITT?
- 8 Do the draft standards define appropriate expectations for the level at which a newly-qualified teacher should be practising at the end of their induction year?

Summary of Responses

Q1: Are the draft standards unequivocal, clear and easy to understand?

The number of comments in response to this question was very high, and the answer to the question was generally negative, universally so from ITT providers. Many comments focused on specific wording used in individual standards; a significant proportion of these comments singled out the use of the word “good”, and also commented on terminology which it is felt renders the standards hard to assess.

Training School discussion groups were comfortable with the tone of the draft standards, reporting that the language and especially the headings were clear. They also commented very favourably on the removal of repetition evident in the current standards, though some endorsed the point made by a number of ITT providers that the terminology used reflects an outmoded view of education. More generally, stakeholders were unclear regarding the status of the bullet points, and whether meeting each of these was a condition of meeting each standard.

Training School discussion groups and ITT providers were overwhelmingly of

the view that the reference to “good teachers” in the preamble should be changed, and that the word “good” should not feature anywhere in the document. A significant number of ITT providers interpreted the use of this language as an attempt to align the draft standards with the Ofsted grade descriptors for good teaching, or the Ofsted groups of characteristics for individual trainee teachers (the responses failed to identify to which they were referring).

The term ‘UK democratic values’ was the subject of frequent comment from Training School discussion groups, most of which were unsure of its definition for the purpose of the standard.

Q2: Are the draft standards suitable for use when assessing performance?

The number of comments in response to this question was again very high; the answer to the question was again generally negative; again this was universal from ITT providers. There was particular disquiet about whether assessment against a number of the bullets would be possible, in particular where terms such as “foster a love of learning”, “promote the values of scholarship”, and “uphold public trust in the profession” have been used. Similarly a number of Training School discussion groups and ITT providers felt that tracking progression and grading trainees (as required by Ofsted) would prove difficult.

It was suggested that a single set of standards covering ITT and Induction fails to identify how teachers progress during the NQT year. ITT providers in particular had not recognised the intention that progression would be defined by the application of the standards in an alternative context.

There was also concern about the extent to which the draft standards could be applied in all contexts. Suitability for Early Years settings emerged as a particular concern where terms such as “set homework” and “promote the values of scholarship” were felt to be unsuitable.

Q3: Are the draft standards suitable for helping to plan professional development?

Training School discussion groups were broadly positive when responding to this question, indicating that the areas covered would provide a good basis for identifying CPD activities. Other responses to this question were relatively limited; in part this is likely to be because the responses reflected in this report are largely from those involved in initial or early-career training. In particular, the ITT provider networks had few comments here.

Q4: Will the draft standards inspire confidence in the profession?

Stakeholders found this question difficult to respond to; in particular they were unclear about for which audience(s) the standards are intended to do this. There was a broad sense, particularly among Training School discussion groups, that teacher standards cannot by themselves inspire confidence in the

teaching profession.

Q5: Do the draft standards identify the key elements of teaching?

The perceived lack of emphasis on learning and pupil progress was widely viewed as an omission, and was noted in responses to many of the questions. It was frequently observed that the draft standards characterise learning as a passive activity and do not do enough to require teachers to engage pupils. It was also felt that a reference to pupils taking responsibility for their own learning would be valuable.

In addition to the general preference, most evident among ITT providers, for a separate Code of Conduct, Training School discussion groups suggested that many of the more specific behaviours identified in draft Standard 9 would be covered by school or statutory policies or employment terms and conditions, and are therefore superfluous to the standard.

Most responses indicated areas which were felt to be missing or given limited emphasis in the draft standards. The following list gives those areas which were noted most frequently:

- Critical reflection and self-evaluation
- Pupil learning and progress
- Working with parents/carers
- Pastoral care
- An understanding of pedagogy
- Progression within subjects across age phases
- Collaborative working, including with support staff
- English as an Additional Language (EAL)
- Understanding of how pupils learn and develop
- Promoting equality/equal opportunities

The first three areas listed were viewed as being particularly significant. Critical reflection and self-evaluation was reported by ITT providers as being a key element of provision, with many noting that its raised profile within ITT programmes in recent years has made an important contribution to improving the quality of training. Training School discussion groups were similarly of the view that this area makes a vital contribution to the development of practice.

A focus on of pupil learning and progress was seen as important in ensuring the currency of the standards. Working with parents and carers was described as central to practice and there was some confusion about its absence from the draft standards given its inclusion in the preamble.

Q6: Do the draft standards set appropriate expectations for what a trainee teacher should achieve in order to be awarded Qualified Teacher Status?

Direct responses to this question were minimal, with the majority of

stakeholders addressing expectations during training as part of broader responses to other questions, in particular those on the assessment of performance, key elements of teaching, and design and delivery of ITT programmes. Some Training School discussion groups indicated that the award of QTS following completion of the Induction period would be more appropriate under these standards.

Q7: Are you confident that the draft standards will be adequate in underpinning the design and delivery of programmes of ITT?

This question was clearly of most interest to ITT providers. In general the focus of comments was on how the standards could be used to track trainee progress and underpin assessments for QTS and have therefore been included elsewhere in this report. Comments specifically addressing programme design and delivery were far less frequent, though Training School discussion groups did suggest that some elements of the draft standards may be difficult to evidence during ITT placements (e.g. "contribute to the wider life and well-being of the school").

Standard 3 did attract a number of comments however, in particular with regard to the reference to systematic synthetic phonics. In addition to the comment above, a number of responses noted that the requirement for an understanding of systematic synthetic phonics is not limited to those teaching primary-age pupils (e.g. those teaching in Special Schools may need to be covered by this). Furthermore, it was observed that the absence of a requirement for an understanding of systematic synthetic phonics among secondary trainees contrasts with how practice in this area has developed in the ITT sector in recent years.

Q8: Do the draft standards define appropriate expectations for the level at which a newly-qualified teacher should be practising at the end of their Induction year?

Similar to Question 6, direct responses to this question were minimal, with views on the implications of the draft standards for the Induction reflected in comments provided against other questions.

Additional Comments

- Further exemplification and guidance to support the use of the standards would be helpful in assisting users with implementation.
- It's difficult to respond in full without knowing what the later stages of the framework (i.e., any standards that might be recommended by Phase 2 of the Review) might look like.
- Reference to specific policy areas (particularly systematic synthetic phonics) means that these standards may not be adequately future-proofed.
- The rationale for revising the standards is unclear in light of positive recent Ofsted findings on the quality of new teachers.

Glossary of Abbreviations & Acronyms

ASCL	Association of Schools and College Leaders
AST	Advanced Skills Teacher
ATL	Association of Teachers and Lecturers
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
DfE	Department for Education
EBITT	Employment-Based Initial Teacher Training
EYPS	Early Years Professional Status
GTCE	General Teaching Council for England
HEI	Higher Education Institution
ISA	Independent Schools' Association
ISC	Independent Schools' Council
ITT	Initial Teacher Training
NAHT	National Association of Headteachers
NASBTT	National Association of School-Based Teacher Trainers
NASUWT	National Association of Schoolmasters/Union of Women Teachers
NCSL	National College for School Leadership
NOS	National Occupational Standards
NQT	Newly-Qualified Teacher
NUT	National Union of Teachers
QTS	Qualified Teacher Status
SCITT	School-Centred Initial Teacher Training
STPCD	School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document
TDA	Training and Development Agency for Schools
UCET	Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers

© Crown copyright 2011

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is also available for download at www.education.gov.uk