

|  |
| --- |
| **Consultation Response Form**  **Consultation closing date: 16 October 2015** **Your comments must reach us by that date** |
| Teachers' Professional Development Expert Group call for evidence |

**If you would prefer to respond online to this consultation please use the following link:** [**https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations**](https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations)

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you want all, or any part, of your response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Textbox | **Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.** | |  |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Please specify | Reason for confidentiality: | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | TextBox | Name: | | |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Textbox | Please tick if you are responding on behalf of your organisation. | | X |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | TextBox | Name of Organisation (if applicable): The Historical Association | | |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | TextBox | Address: 59a Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4JH | | |

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Ministerial and Public Communications Division by e-mail: [consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk) or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the Department's ['Contact Us'](file:///C:\help\contactus) page.

What is your gender?

This is a response on behalf of an organisation and as such we represent a broad spectrum of ethnicity, age ranges and both male and female members

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Male | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Female |

What is your age in years?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 0-19 | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 20-29 | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 30-39 |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 40-49 | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 50-59 | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 60-64 |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 65+ |  |  |  |  |

What is your ethnicity?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Asian / Asian British - Bangladeshi | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Asian / Asian British - Indian | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Asian / Asian British - Pakistani |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Asian / Asian British - Other (please state) | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Black / Black British - African | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Black / Black British - Caribbean |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Black / Black British - Other (please state) | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Chinese | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Mixed - Asian and White |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Mixed - Black African and White | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Mixed - Black Caribbean and White | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Mixed - Chinese and White |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Mixed - Other (please state) | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | White - British / Mixed British | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | White - English |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | White - Irish | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | White - Scottish | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | White - Welsh |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | White - Other (please state) | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Other (please state) |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Please Specify: | |

If you are responding as an individual, which of the following options best describes you?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Teacher | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Middle leader (e.g. head of department) | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Senior leader (e.g. head teacher) |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Researcher | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Other (please state) |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Please Specify: | |

If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, which of the following options best describes your organisation?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | School | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Training or professional development provider | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Both school and provider |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | XCheckbox |  | | | Other (please state) |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Please Specify: Subject Association | |

If you work in a school, what phase(s) do you teach? Please select all that apply.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Early years | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Infant | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Junior |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Primary | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Lower | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Middle |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Secondary | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Upper | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Sixth form |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Further education | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 14-19 | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | All-through |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Non-teaching role |  |  |  |  |

If you work in a school, in which type(s) of school are you based? Please select all that apply.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Local authority/community | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Academy/free school | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Independent |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Special school | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Grammar school | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Faith school |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Alternative provision/pupil referral unit | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Other (please state) | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | I do not work in a school |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: | |

If you work in a school, in which county or London Borough is your school based?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: | |

How many years have you worked/did you work in teaching or in schools?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 0-4 | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 5-9 | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 10-14 |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 20-24 | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 25-29 | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | 30+ |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | I have not worked in teaching or in schools. |  |  |  |  |

How did you hear about this call for evidence? Please select all that apply.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Communication from the Department for Education | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Communication from the Teachers' Professional Development Expert Group | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | Social media |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | School | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | XCheckbox |  | | | Other (please state) |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments: Through the Historical Association’s own networks. | |

1 Can you give an example of great professional development practice with which you were involved, which had significant impact on pupil outcomes? If you can, describe what the participants did, what the school did, and what the external expertise was.

In answering question 1, you may wish to address:

* to what extent the professional development activity was typical of your school or group of schools compared to other schools locally;
* any links between professional development and pupil outcomes and/or career development;
* any links between professional development and appraisal/development plans; and
* how the professional development activity was chosen and evaluated.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments:  Both Historical Association and education research points to the most effective CPD being collaborative. This research also highlights the need for subject-specific professional learning, alongside more generic kinds of professional learning addressing whole-school issues. It is clear from the responses to our annual survey of history teachers, that subject-specific CPD, unless offered by an Awarding Organisation, is overlooked in favour of whole school issues. This neglect of the subject means that not only are teachers deprived of opportunities to develop their substantive knowledge and awareness of recent scholarship; it also leads all too often to a lack of attention to the subject-specific dimensions of pedagogy, resulting in the unhelpful and inappropriate application of general techniques that pay no attention to the nature of knowledge in different subjects.  One of the most consistent research findings about the features of CPD that has an impact on pupil learning relates to the need for sustained engagement over at least a term, and ideally longer. Engagement with a particular issue over time makes it possible for teachers to collect systematic evidence of the impact of their learning on pupils’ experience and learning outcomes. An example of such an approach exists in the Historical Association’s Teacher Fellows programme. This programme allows teachers to address a particular area of subject knowledge or a particular theme or issue relating to history education over a sustained period of time. Our recent Agincourt Teacher Fellows Programme for example allows teachers to participate in a 2-day residential course to hear from academic historians about the latest evidence and thinking about the 15th century. This is then followed up by an 8-week online professional development course led by an experienced teacher trainer and expert in the 15th century. By the end of the course, participating teachers will be expected to have produced, trialled and reflected upon an enquiry that they have formulated as a direct result of their learning on the course. These outcomes will then be evaluated by the course leader in terms of the teacher and pupil development that has taken place as a result of the course and the outcomes produced. However, this training model forms part of a fully funded programme. Its high impact is based on an expensive training model and requires a significant commitment from participants. We appreciate that this kind of approach to professional development is not typical; that it is unusual to find courses offering such a strong and long-term subject-specific element. However, unless teachers are given time and well-structured opportunities to focus on issues of concern as well as scope to collaborate as they seek to implement new ideas, those ideas are much less likely to have a significant impact on their practice. Unless issues of time and funding are adequately are addressed, it is unlikely that schools will be able to commit to sustained programmes of CPD, despite the fact that research from BERA, Cordingley, P. (2013) *The Contribution of Research to Teachers' Professional Learning and Development,* BERA/RSA and the Teacher Development Trust, Cordingley, P. Higgins, S. Greeny, T., Buckler, N., Coles-Jordan, D., Crisp, B., Saunders, L. and Coe, R. (2015) *Developing Great Teaching: Lessons from the international reviews into effective professional development,* Teacher Development Trust, both point to this kind of long term collaborative model having the greatest impact on both teachers' learning and pupil progression. | |

2 How could the standard help to promote effective professional development practice which has a positive impact on pupils’ education?

In answering question 2, you may wish to address the following questions.

* What elements of teachers’, school leaders’ and professional development providers’ practice should the standard emphasise?
* How could the standard most effectively balance supportive guidance and constructive challenge for teachers, school leaders and professional development providers?
* How could the standard encourage an evidence-informed approach to professional development?
* Are there any other standards that you have found particularly helpful? What is it about their format and content that we could learn from?
* How could the standard be introduced to schools and the wider system to maximise support and minimise workload? Please consider the process of introduction, the timescale, and the support given.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments:  Any CPD standard that is developed should recognise the importance of subject-specific professional learning. While whole school issues are undoubtedly important, professional development - at both primary and secondary level - neglects this important aspect of teacher development.  While Historical Association survey data from 2015 represents an improving picture, still 60% of primary history coordinators indicate that they have received little or no training for their role. The picture in primary initial teacher education is also patchy, with some BA/BEd courses operating subject specialisms and others not. Even where subject specialisms exist, the trainee is still dependent upon the curriculum programmes of their training school. It remains true that many primary teachers teach little or no history during their teacher training. A standard should recognise the need for subject-specific training for curriculum leaders in primary education and in continuing the development of their subject learning following initial teacher education. This need has been clearly recognised in the recommendations of the recent Carter Review of ITT which stated that schools should include subject knowledge as an essential element of professional development (Recommendation 3, which applies to both primary and secondary education) and that the DfE should make funded in-service subject knowledge enhancement courses available for primary teachers to access as professional development (Recommendation 4).  At secondary level, a standard should encourage the development of subject knowledge (as stipulated by the 3rd recommendation of the Carter Review) and engagement with recent scholarship. The importance of subject-specific professional learning is more important now than ever as teachers respond to significant curriculum change. Within this, a standard should encourage a focus on subject-specific dimensions of effective teaching, such as identifying and addressing common misconceptions, effective curricular planning, and securing appropriate interplay between the development of substantive knowledge and the disciplinary concepts to ensure progression in both. Equally important is the opportunity for teachers to examine whole school issues and generic principles in the context of their subject disciplines.  Research evidence such as the aforementioned Cordingley P. et al (2015), *Developing Great Teaching* report consistently highlights the importance of proactive school leadership in promoting a commitment to professional development. With this in mind, it is vital that standards for school leaders reflect a commitment to their own professional learning and to providing opportunities for and facilitating the learning of others.    In contrast to mathematics, literacy and science, in subjects like history there has been comparatively little funded research into students’ learning and effective teaching strategies. It is therefore important to recognise the role played by small scale teacher research that has built critically and cumulatively on previous work in a collaborative and discursive manner (See Counsell, C. (2011), ‘Disciplinary knowledge for all, the secondary history curriculum and history teachers' achievement’, *The Curriculum Journal*, (22), 2, 201-225; and Fordham, M. (2015), ‘Realising and extending Stenhouse's vision of teacher research: the case of English history teachers’, *British Educational Research Journal*. doi: 10.1002/berj.3192. The standard should recognise the value to teachers both of engaging with research conducted by other teachers – through their reading – and of contributing as professionals to that published body of work. Publication and dissemination of the outcome of teachers’ systematic investigation of key issues in their own practice – including the methods used to evaluate impact – should be encouraged and acknowledged within the standard.  According to large scale research such as the BERA-RSA Inquiry (Cordingley, 2013) and *Developing Great Teaching* (Cordingley et al. 2015) report among others, CPD that has an impact upon pupil learning requires collaboration and sustained engagement. Any standard developed should advocate extended engagement with a particular issue over a period of at least a term- if not longer - as part of a mixed economy of professional development. Subject association membership and the opportunity to attend residential conferences offers teachers the opportunity to engage with a wide variety of sessions and join a community of like-minded individuals, establishing networks of mutual collaboration and support that are so often the continuing outcomes of these courses. Assessment is one such issue that offers plentiful powerful examples of on-going discourse and support. The discourse and planning that had been developing in Alex Ford’s department led to Ford, A. (2013), *Progress, Progression and the New Key Stage 3*, <http://www.andallthat.co.uk/blog/archives/10-2013>. This blog was part of an on-going process and in turn led to a conference session at the Historical Association annual conference and an article in Teaching History journal: Ford A. (2014) *Setting us free? Building meaningful models of progression for a ‘post-levels' world.* Teaching History Journal, Edition 157, P. 28-41.  The implementation of the standard needs careful consideration. If teachers are to be held accountable in relation to the standard then schools' need for funding in order to provide adequate time and access to expert provision need to be addressed. In asking for evidence of the impact of professional development, it should be acknowledged that different subjects operate on different timescales. Teachers of core subjects have far more regular opportunities to gather evidence relating to the implementation of new ideas and to demonstrate pupil progressthan teachers in foundation subjects, for example. Evidence should be collected on an appropriate timescale to allow for the effective implementation and evaluation of new practices. | |

3 How could the standard help shape or improve the provision of professional development (including school-based professional development activities)?

In answering question 3, you may wish to address how this might vary for different types of provision or provider; for example:

* individual, in-school, third-party (other school, higher education institution, private or any other type of provider); and
* programmes, workshops, coaching or mentoring, enquiry or distance / on-line learning support for professional development provision teachers may access.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments:  In line with the evidence of the research reviews cited earlier (Cordingley 2013; Cordingley et al. 2015), the standard might encourage teachers to commit to collaborative learning approaches either online or face to face and place value upon collaborative planning as a valuable professional development activity in order to prompt schools to allocate sufficient time to it. There should also be some encouragement for programmes of professional development that include multiple sessions and re-visiting as part of a mixed economy of teacher development that fits schools’ budgetary restrictions.  Research evidence has also consistently demonstrated the value of peer support and collaborative learning in helping to embed new ideas in practice. The standard might encourage teachers’ commitment to collaborative professional learning by asking for evidence of engagement with others – which might take the form of peer observation and feedback, but could also involve various forms of online collaboration.  The standard should provide encouragement for programmes of professional development (in-school and offered by external providers) that include multiple sessions or at least some clearly identified form of follow-up so that participants are encouraged and supported in implementing new ideas and in continuing to work on them.  Collaborative planning provides a very significant opportunity for teachers’ professional learning because it promotes focused discussion of learning objectives, and of the sequence or structure of learning as well as of detailed teaching and learning strategies. Schools should therefore be encouraged to allocate sufficient time in school to collaborative planning within departments and to the subsequent evaluation of shared schemes of work.  Recent changes in the organisational structures of education have led to a greater emphasis on in-house training provided by academy chains, federations or teaching school alliances. While this is an important aspect of ongoing professional development, there is a danger of such groups each developing a somewhat insular approach. A standard should recognise the value both in collaboration with institutional colleagues, but also in working with teachers in other contexts and upon the expertise that can be provided by outside agencies who often have access to large pools of expertise. Residential courses in particular often offer a wide variety of expertise and the opportunity to explore issues in breadth and depth, drawing on the latest academic research.  While the standard needs to recognise the importance of teachers' sustained engagement with an issue, if that CPD is to have an impact on pupil outcomes, it is also important to make that provision available in flexible formats, through a variety of approaches and platforms. It will also be important for the quality of CPD to be assured. Our members tell us that the professional development they receive both in school and from *some* commercial providers is of variable quality. They also tell us that our name attached to professional development as a subject association provides them with confidence in the quality of the training in which they are participating. Schools need to have this confidence in the quality of the CPD they are offered from all providers. Collaboration with subject associations (as well as other providers) in developing quality assurance procedures and standards can play a vital role here.  Teachers also tell us that they lack the opportunity in their schools to take part in subject-specific training. Some of the comments we have received in our surveys of the history teaching community highlight this need:  *“In-house CPD is never subject-specific here”…”Most of our CPD is in house and generalised rather than history specific”…”CPD is generic at my school. Repetitive, nothing innovative and not history specific.”*  This issue is not isolated to history teachers, nor to the secondary phase. Subject-specific training is an overlooked developmental need in many subject areas. In a recent survey carried out by DATA, 80% of secondary design and technology teachers indicated that they were not being given the opportunity to develop within their subject area. In primary schools, while the Historical Association survey evidence of 2015 shows that the new curriculum may have provided some impetus for renewed engagement with subject-specific training, all too often, training does not extend beyond the confines of literacy and mathematics. Only 47% of respondents indicated that they had undertaken history related CPD and of those, a further 13% indicated that this training had not been in the last 3 years.  The lack of subject-specific training engagement is not for want of a plentiful supply of quality opportunities, often through subject associations, and through a variety of platforms, but has more to do with the emphasis, value and priority placed upon it by schools in terms of allocating training funds. A standard that promotes and recognises the need for, and value of, subject-specific teacher development in line with the recommendations of the Carter Review (2015) will encourage schools to support and engage with such developmental opportunities as well as those aimed at addressing whole school issues. | |

4 What short-, medium- and long-term approaches might help to remove barriers to professional development and could be reflected in the standard?

In answering question 4, you may wish to address:

* time and structures, including timetabling and impact on workload;
* costs and prioritisation; and
* sourcing, accessing and engaging with knowledge and external expertise.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments:  Dedicated teachers welcome opportunities for professional learning; however cost is often a barrier, particularly to training that does not represent part of an identified whole-school developmental need. In the longer term, this barrier needs to be removed. Comments such as *“Training is frowned upon in my school. We are constantly being told how expensive it is to cover us for a day. If it isn’t led by an exam board, there seems little point in applying to go on it.”…*and *“My school isn’t allowing us to go on external CPD courses this year due to budgets”* made by teachers from the PGCE programme at Oxford University who qualified 3 and 4 years agoare broadly reflective of what teachers tell us about CPD in their schools on a regular basis. Teachers often fund professional development from their own pockets.  Teachers engage with professional development because they want to learn, collaborate and improve their practice. However, workload is another long term issue that needs to be tackled in order to allow teachers time to get the training that they need. The Workload Challenge report earlier this year fully indicated the frustrations and restrictions that teachers face due to workload pressures. This does not just relate to the professional development that teachers receive, but also to the time limits and scope for them to act upon that training, or to become the authors of their own development. Development is not just about the wholesale and uncritical adoption of ideas or models framed by experts, but should instead be part of a more creative and collaborative process. All too often, where they are taken up, ideas and training are implemented uncritically because teachers simply do not have the time to make the work their own. An additional training and research time allocation for every teacher each year may help to alleviate these tendencies, however this too comes with huge cost implications.  In the shorter term therefore, the first priority must be to encourage changes and allowances that are practicable. One such consideration might be encouraging schools to provide regular timetabled opportunities for departments to engage together in collaborative planning or on an agreed professional development need/focus. This need not be an additional INSET activity but might offer the impetus for schools to provide and protect regular after school departmental meetings within any meeting calendar for the year. In primary schools, this may mean scheduled whole school meetings at least twice per year.  The need to set up and tap into localised school-to-school subject networks and university-to-school networks for both primary and secondary teachers should be supported and encouraged as a setting for sustained and collaborative subject-specific professional learning.  A second priority might be encouraging cultures within schools and in departments that encourage informal as well as formal collaborative learning. Relationships that are trusting and inclusive can set the tone for collaborative planning and discussion either formally or informally. Ensuring opportunities for uncontrived, spontaneous collaboration between teachers can be achieved by safeguarding non-teaching time and providing shared spaces for people to get together. A standard should encourage and support the development of departmental and school cultures that mobilise social capital and therefore encourage and enable informal collaborative CPD to take place.  A third priority might be ensuring that when whole-school issues are addressed, time is set aside to ensure opportunities for working with colleagues within the same subject area as well as across different subject areas. This encouragement to address subject-specific issues and to consider pedagogical issues from a subject-specific perspective is essential to effective development as a history teacher.  A final short term priority might be greater consideration of the relationship between any standard developed and initial teacher education, to ensure a smooth transition and on-going training that builds effectively upon initial teacher education.  The recent and significant curriculum reform at a national level requires targeted professional development which should be supported by government funding. Subject associations and their affiliate networks are best placed to provide this support. | |

5 Is there anything else you would like to contribute to help us shape the standard so that it is useful in different types and phases of school?

In answering question 5, you may wish to include:

* any other issues that you would like the standards to address, and
* any specific, innovative ideas you would like us to consider.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | DfE | Comments:  The following comments do not directly address the question above, but should act as some important observations and questions about this call for evidence that should be considered.   * Firstly, it is a matter of concern that consultation is being conducted in relation to CPD that bears no obvious relationship to consideration of initial teacher education. Attention needs to be given to the process by which CPD builds on and relates to teachers' prior learning (particularly given the diversity of routes into teaching and the variable amounts of time and attention focused on subject-specific pedagogy with them). * Secondly, it is notable that this call for evidence seems to be directly addressed to teachers, both in terms of the panel appointed to oversee the development of the standard and in the questions posed in this document. However, in order for an effective standard to be formulated, it seems pertinent to talk with all parties concerned with teacher education, including universities, training alliances and representatives of the large number of commercial training providers that exist. * The concept of a standard for professional development and calls for evidence related to teacher CPD are not new and there is already in existence a historic body of evidence which should be consulted in identifying the key features of successful CPD known to have an impact on pupils' learning. Consideration also needs to be given to the role of teacher research and professional enquiry as one dimension of CPD and the subject associations, through their roles in supporting and publishing this work, have useful expertise to share. * The nature of the CPD standard is currently ambiguous and it is not clear whether the standard will be designed to act as guidance, or become mandatory, which of course will mean huge time and cost implications for schools. * It is unclear whether if such a standard were to become mandatory, what kind of impact this might have upon current CPD providers. If quality assurance measures are to be developed, this needs to be done in consultation with those providers, including the subject associations. | |

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Textbox | **Please acknowledge this reply.** | | X |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | TextBox | E-mail address for acknowledgement: melaniej@history.org.uk | | |

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, please confirm below if you would be willing to be contacted again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | XCheckbox |  | | | Yes | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Checkbox |  | | | No |

All DfE public consultations are required to meet the Cabinet Office [Principles on Consultation](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/255180/Consultation-Principles-Oct-2013.pdf)

The key Consultation Principles are:

* departments will follow a range of timescales rather than defaulting to a 12-week period, particularly where extensive engagement has occurred before
* departments will need to give more thought to how they engage with and use real discussion with affected parties and experts as well as the expertise of civil service learning to make well informed decisions
* departments should explain what responses they have received and how these have been used in formulating policy
* consultation should be ‘digital by default’, but other forms should be used where these are needed to reach the groups affected by a policy
* the principles of the Compact between government and the voluntary and community sector will continue to be respected.

If you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please email: [consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk)

**Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.**

Completed responses should be sent to the address shown below by 16 October 2015

Send by post to: Henry Clarke, Department for Education, Sanctuary Buildings, L2 Teacher Quality Division, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BT

Send by e-mail to: [pd.expertgroup@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:pd.expertgroup@education.gsi.gov.uk)