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Glossary and abbreviations

ASN – Additional Support Needs

BME – Black and Minority Ethnic

CLPL – Career-long professional learning

CPD – Continuous professional development

Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) – the national curriculum for children aged 3 to 18 years in schools in Scotland. It offers a broad general education for children up to S3 followed by a senior phase from S4 onwards and completion of National qualifications.

Distributed leadership –the concept that all teachers are leaders and involves leadership roles being devolved to staff that do not have a formal leadership remit within their role.

Experiences and Outcomes – experiences and outcomes recognise the importance of the quality and nature of the learning experience in developing attributes and capabilities and in achieving active engagement, motivation and depth of learning. An outcome represents what is to be achieved. Taken as a whole, the experiences and outcomes embody the attributes and capabilities of the four capacities.

ESOL – English for Speakers of Other Languages

Probationer scheme - flexible route – a way to complete probationary service for teachers who have decided to opt out of the Teacher Induction Scheme; are not eligible to join the Teacher Induction Scheme; can't commit to a full-time post; want to complete their probationary period somewhere other than a Scottish state school; are registered in more than one subject; and are looking to gain full registration in their second subject.

GTCS – General Teaching Council for Scotland

Getting it right for every child (GIRFEC) – the national approach to improving outcomes through public services that support the wellbeing of children and young people.

How Good is Our School 4 – a framework of quality indicators to promote effective self-evaluation as the first important stage in a process of achieving self-improvement in schools.

ITE – Initial Teacher Education

Joint assessment –this means the assessment of student teachers during school placement by the school, the university and the local authority.

National Implementation Board (NIB) – the group of stakeholders that were tasked with implementing the recommendations from Teaching Scotland’s Future.

NQT – Newly qualified teachers.
Professional review and development (PRD) – a process in which teachers review their professional learning and reflect on teaching practice with their reviewer.

Raising attainment for all (RAFA) – Raising Attainment is a national policy programme to improve attainment and achievement of young people through a collaborative learning system and improvement methodology. The aim of this policy programme is to reduce inequalities in education and ensure that every child can succeed in school.

PGDE – Post Graduate Diploma in Education

Professional Update (PU) – a requirement of General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) registration for fully registered teachers. The key purpose of Professional Update is to: maintain and improve the quality of our teachers as outlined in the relevant Professional Standards and to enhance the impact that they have on pupils' learning; support, maintain and enhance teachers’ continued professionalism and the reputation of the teaching profession in Scotland.

SCEL – Scottish College for Educational Leadership

SQA – Scottish Qualifications Authority

SCQF – Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework

SCQF level 11 learning – refers to accredited CLPL available to teachers (also known as master-level learning).

Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivations (SIMD) – a tool that identifies areas of multiple deprivation in a consistent way using a number of key measures such as education, housing and employment.

Stages of Early Arithmetic Learning (SEAL) – Stages of Early Arithmetic Learning is a strategy for maths learning used in Primary schools.

Standard for Provisional Registration – standard for what is expected of a student teacher at the end of Initial Teacher Education who is seeking provisional registration with the GTCS.

Standard for Full Registration – the standard required of every qualified teacher to formally enter the profession and is a benchmark of competence in teaching.

Standard for Career-long Professional Learning – standard for teachers to continue to develop their expertise and experience across all areas of their professional practice through appropriate and sustained career-long professional learning.

Standard for Leadership and Management (Middle Leaders) – the standard specifying the responsibility of middle leaders to lead and collaborate with team(s) to establish, enhance and ensure high quality learning experiences and outcomes for all learners.
Standard for Leadership and Management (Head Teachers) – the standard specifying the role of Head Teachers as leaders of the whole school community and within the wider children's services network.

Teacher Induction Scheme – The Teacher Induction Scheme (TIS) provides a guaranteed one-year training post in a local authority to every eligible student graduating with a teaching qualification from one of Scotland's universities.

TSF – Teaching Scotland’s Future is a review of teacher education conducted by Graham Donaldson in 2010 which has led to a number of changes to teacher education and career long professional learning.
1 Executive summary

Background

1.1 In 2010, Professor Graham Donaldson undertook a review of teacher education on behalf of the Scottish Government. The resulting report ‘Teaching Scotland’s Future – Report of a review of teacher education in Scotland’, published early in 2011, concluded that the two most important and achievable ways in which school education can realise the high aspirations Scotland has for its young people are through supporting and strengthening, firstly, the quality of teaching, and secondly, the quality of leadership.

1.2 The report also set out 50 recommendations for how improvements could be made to teacher education. The Scottish Government accepted, in full or in part, all of these recommendations and established a National Partnership Group to consider them in more detail. Ultimately, this resulted in 20 substantial projects being taken forward by the National Implementation Board for Teacher Education.

1.3 Ipsos MORI Scotland was commissioned by the Scottish Government in July 2015 to evaluate the early impact of Teaching Scotland’s Future (TSF) on teacher education and professional learning. This report sets out the findings of that evaluation.

Purpose and scope of the evaluation

1.4 The purpose of the evaluation was to guide and inform future improvements in teacher education and professional learning and, ultimately, to help build the capacity of teachers and improve the learning of young people.

1.5 Some evaluations are designed to measure the impact of a specific initiative or programme of work, in order to assess whether it ‘works’, and whether it should be continued or rolled out. However, TSF was not a single programme of work, it was a wide-ranging review resulting in 50 recommendations some of which set out a vision for 21st century teacher professionalism while others specified particular actions. Moreover, TSF did not emerge in isolation from other policy developments or existing work that was already in progress.

1.6 This evaluation does not assess progress on each of the 50 recommendations, and, although some of the drivers and facilitators of change are discussed, it does not attempt to measure the precise contribution of TSF to areas where there has been progress. Rather, this report offers an overview of the current landscape of teacher education, highlighting what progress has been made in key areas since TSF was published and where further progress and improvements are still needed.
Methods

1.7 The evaluation used a mixed-method approach. An online survey was carried out between 14 September and 9 October 2015 among a representative sample of teachers in primary, secondary, special schools across Scotland (including both the state and independent sectors) who were randomly sampled from the General Teaching Council for Scotland’s (GTCS’s) database. The achieved sample was 6,346 and the response rate was 21%.

1.8 Focus groups and in-depth interviews were conducted with teachers across Scotland at all career stages and from all sectors. In total, 80 teachers took part in 15 focus groups and a further 33 took part in in-depth interviews. This qualitative fieldwork took place between November 2015 and February 2016.

1.9 In-depth interviews were also conducted with representatives from all 32 Local Authorities (LAs) and with 21 other key educational stakeholders (all the Initial Teacher Education providers in Scotland; all the teaching unions; Association of Directors of Education in Scotland; Association of Head Teachers & Deputies in Scotland; COSLA; Education Scotland; GTCS; School Leaders Scotland; Scottish College for Educational Leadership; Scottish Council of Independent Schools; and the Scottish Teacher Education Committee). The interviews were conducted in November 2015.

The context

1.10 The 2010 TSF review of teacher education took place at a time when governments across the world were reforming their education systems to address challenges arising from globalisation, societal change and technological development. The immediate context in Scotland was, and remains, Curriculum for Excellence (CfE). The opportunity offered – and the challenge posed – by CfE is that curriculum development, and transformational change at school and system level, will be driven by the professional capacity of teachers rather than through the central development of guidance and resources and external accountability. The recommendations contained in TSF were designed to build the capacity of the teaching profession to deliver this ambitious reform.

1.11 In the five years since TSF was published, there has been no let up in the pace of change and implementation of the recommendations has taken place against a challenging background. In addition to CfE, teachers are adapting to, and implementing, significant new policies and initiatives including the new National Qualifications, Getting it Right for Every Child and Raising Attainment for All. At the same time, resources (particularly LA resources) have been constrained; there are widespread problems obtaining supply cover; and recruitment of teachers in some geographic areas and subjects has become increasingly difficult. All of these issues have impacted on workloads.
Key findings: progress

1.12 The teaching profession has risen to the challenge set out in TSF. The evaluation found evidence of real progress in many areas of teacher education and, above all, there has been a significant shift in the culture of professional learning. This shift in culture was demonstrated in four key areas of improvement:

- **teachers are more engaged with professional learning.** Several inter-related aspects to this increased engagement were identified: heightened awareness of the importance of professional learning; a move away from a conception of professional learning as ‘going on a course’ and a broader understanding of the range of professional learning activities; increased ownership by individual teachers’ of their career-long professional learning (CLPL); and an increased focus on learning relevant to a teacher’s own particular development needs.

- **there is a greater focus on the impact of professional learning on pupils.** Decisions about what professional learning to undertake are now more likely to involve a consideration of the needs of the individual pupils that a teacher is working with.

- **there is a consensus that teachers are engaging in professional dialogue more often** and that there has been a cultural shift towards more openness, sharing of experience and willingness to talk about pedagogy.

- **there is a greater willingness to try new approaches.** One important marker of the change in culture is that a sizeable minority of teachers (41%) say that they try new teaching practices and strategies more often than they did five years ago (40% say they try them the same amount and 18% say they try them less often).

1.13 In addition to this cultural shift, there have been a number of specific improvements to teacher education at all stages:

- At the ITE and early career stage, partnerships between LAs and universities have developed further, and support for students on placement and probationary teachers has improved.

- In relation to CLPL, the proportion of teachers reporting that they face barriers in accessing professional learning has greatly decreased in the last five years, from 68% in 2010 to 42% in 2015. This is, in part, due to their increased participation in a wider range of different professional learning activities and, in particular, an increase in collaborative working and in-school activity.

- There has also been a substantial increase in the number of teachers participating in mentoring/coaching and indications of an increased interest in, and increased provision of, professional learning opportunities to develop mentoring and coaching skills.
• Although there was already a considerable focus on leadership prior to TSF, it has increased further and teachers (at all career stages) are more aware of opportunities to develop their leadership skills. The new GTCS Standard for Leadership and Management has helped clarify the pathway for formal leadership positions. Leadership skills are the main focus for head teachers’ CLPL and they reported that both the range and the number of high quality CLPL opportunities available to them have increased over the past five years.

What has helped change the culture?

1.14 Participants in the qualitative research pointed to several factors which they felt had driven the cultural changes discussed above. Some of these were a direct result of TSF, some were given increased impetus by TSF and some were independent.

1.15 There was widespread agreement that the introduction of Professional Update and the new GTCS Standards played a very important role in increasing engagement with professional learning. It was felt that the new Standards provided coherence to CLPL through all career stages. It was also noted that they promoted a shared language around CLPL and pedagogy.

1.16 There was also a widespread view that the ‘new generation’ of teachers emerging from Initial Teacher Education in recent years had helped change the culture. It was felt that it was ‘ingrained’ in these teachers from the start that they should be self-reflective, engage in professional dialogue, share practice and work collaboratively. Not only did this help change the culture simply because the new generation were gradually replacing the older generation, but it also forced more experienced staff to ‘raise their game’.

1.17 There were two other factors, independent of TSF, which were felt to be important drivers of the cultural shift. Firstly, the need to adapt to the significant changes in Scottish education in recent years including GIRFEC, the new National Qualifications, How Good is Our School and, above all, CfE. It was suggested that the only way that teachers could possibly keep up to date and adapt to these changes was by engaging more with professional learning – and with professional dialogue and collaborative working in particular.

1.18 Secondly, reduced resources (particularly LA support and provision of courses) and limitations on time had forced schools and individual members of staff to look at other ways of meeting professional learning needs. Although the drivers may have been unwelcome, it was clear that this had stimulated more internal work within schools, more collaborative working among colleagues, more sharing of practice, and more variety and creativity in ways to achieve professional learning. It also encouraged prioritisation of activities that would have most impact on pupils and best meet the development needs of the individual teachers.
Key findings: remaining challenges

1.19 Nonetheless, there was widespread acknowledgement – across the teaching profession and among LA and national stakeholders – that there is a considerable way to go before the vision set out in TSF is fully realised. As one participant put it ‘the profession is on the path, but not there yet’.

1.20 The evaluation has identified the following areas where further improvement is required – or where progress would help facilitate improvements:

- At the ITE and early career stage, the development of teachers would be enhanced by: further clarification and agreement of the respective roles of the school and the university in relation to joint assessment; improved communication between the university and the school on aspects of student placements; and the provision of additional support for probationers to further develop key pedagogical skills.

- CLPL for class teachers could be improved by: increasing their awareness and involvement in LA/university partnerships; raising awareness of different options for SCQF level 11 learning; better PRD support for supply teachers; developing a shared understand of coaching and mentoring; increasing coaching and mentoring skills; and by encouraging teachers to reflect more on experiences of leading initiatives and more actively using the experiences to develop leadership skills.

- CLPL for all teachers could be enhanced by better signposting to high quality resources and by the development of more professional networks. With so much creativity happening at a school level, networks could help share good practice more effectively and they would be particularly beneficial for those with relatively specialist expertise, interests or needs.

1.21 There are also two system-wide challenges that should be addressed. Firstly, the difficulties in obtaining supply cover due to a lack of available supply teachers: this is one of the main barriers to CLPL.

1.22 Secondly, the number of national ‘priorities’. One of the concerns most commonly raised was that there are currently too many priorities in education. This has a perceived impact on ITE (because of the need to cover all the different, emerging priorities which leaves less time for core pedagogical skills) and on CLPL more generally (because the impact on workloads reduced the time available for CLPL and some of the remaining CLPL time was spent ‘getting to grips’ with the priorities).

1.23 Some of these improvements will be easier to achieve than others and most will require the teaching profession, universities providing teacher education, LAs and national bodies to continue to work together. However, the significant progress that has already been made and the teaching profession’s engagement with professional learning provides a strong base. With the continued commitment and support of all stakeholders, the next five years should see the
teaching profession move further along the path and ‘strengthen further its vital role in building Scotland’s future’.

2 Introduction

Teaching Scotland’s Future

2.1 In November 2009, the Scottish Government commissioned Professor Graham Donaldson to undertake a review of teacher education in Scotland. The review followed a period of substantial change within the profession, including the introduction of A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century and the introduction of the Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) in 2005. CfE offers a less prescriptive curriculum than earlier models and there is the expectation that teachers will tailor their programmes of learning to better meet the needs of their learners and introduce greater depth of learning. This, alongside other key policy developments, such as Getting It Right for Every Child (GIRFEC), Raising Attainment For All and Developing Scotland’s Young Workforce, require the teaching force to have greater skills to meet the higher and changing demands of the education system. Professor Graham Donaldson’s report ‘Teaching Scotland’s Future – Report of a review of teacher education in Scotland’ was published early in 2011, setting out 50 recommendations for how improvements could be made to teacher education.

2.2 The review identified major strengths in teacher education. These included the all-graduate nature of the profession; the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) Standard for Initial Teacher Education (ITE) and the Standard for Full Registration; that parents in Scotland generally held the teaching profession in high regard; and that newly qualified teachers benefitted from an induction scheme and were guaranteed paid employment for one year, with the support of a mentor.

2.3 However, the review also noted weaknesses such as the ad hoc and fragmented nature of continuous professional development and aspects of ITE for the primary sector that needed improvement. For example, many teachers who followed the B.Ed. route into primary teaching were thought to have relatively limited literacy and numeracy skills and a lack of in-depth subject knowledge. The review also noted that post-graduate students had limited time to come to terms with all aspects of the primary curriculum.

2.4 The report identified Leadership as a key area for development, highlighting the increasing difficulty in recruiting head teachers that many education authorities were experiencing. Recommendations were made aimed at increasing the number and skills of leaders to meet the perceived shortage, and improve the quality of leadership. It recommended more opportunities for experienced head teachers to develop their leadership skills, and the establishment of a leadership college to improve leadership capacity at all levels within Scottish education. The review also suggested that teacher leadership skills should be developed from the outset of their careers within a distributed model of school leadership.

2.5 Changes to ITE were recommended so that future cohorts of teachers would be equipped with the right skills to work effectively with CfE. The report suggested
that reforms to ITE would also contribute to raising the levels of professionalism within future generations of teachers.

2.6 The report recommended that professional development should move away from one-off courses towards a culture of career-long professional learning, and emphasis should be placed upon more school-focused and collegiate learning linked to school priorities. These priorities were to be informed by self-evaluation and research evidence gathered by teachers within their daily practice. In order to encourage this cultural shift, the report recommended that the GTCS introduce Standards that recognise this continuous professional learning.

2.7 The Scottish Government accepted, in full or in part, all of the recommendations of the report and subsequently established a National Partnership Group to consider them in more detail. Ultimately this resulted in 20 substantial projects being taken forward by the National Implementation Board for Teacher Education, nearly all of which have now been completed.

Research aims and objectives

2.8 Ipsos MORI was commissioned by the Scottish Government in July 2015 to evaluate the early impact of Teaching Scotland’s Future (TSF) on teacher education and professional learning.

2.9 The evaluation was based on an online survey of a representative sample of teachers at all career stages and qualitative research with teachers at all career stages as well as representatives from the 32 Scottish Local Authorities (LAs) and a range of national stakeholders.

2.10 The broad aim of the project was to:

- explore views and perception of teachers, LA representatives and, national stakeholders on the impact of current teacher education and professional learning on:
  - teachers’ skills, knowledge and practice
  - pupils’ educational experiences
  - the culture within teacher education.

2.11 The specific objectives were to:

- assess awareness and understanding of current professional development opportunities, including changes that have followed the TSF report such as revised Professional Standards, SCQF level 11 learning, Professional Review and Development (PRD), Professional Update, mentoring and the Scottish College for Educational Leadership (SCEL)
- understand views on the quality and culture of current teacher education
- understand views on the possible impact of the current teacher education provision on pupils’ educational experiences
• assess how much the increased focus and investment in career-long professional learning (CLPL) has supported teachers to maintain and improve their teaching skills and knowledge, and apply this to their teaching practice
• assess how much the increased focus on professional learning is supporting and enhancing the confidence of early career teachers (years 1–6)
• identify the impact that digital technology has had on the delivery of teacher education and the extent to which new teaching practices (or new pedagogies) made possible by digital technology feature as part of teacher education provision
• assess the extent of changes (on some specific measures) since the TSF survey in 2010
• identify differences between sub-groups (e.g. teachers at different stages, teachers in different geographical areas, teachers in primary/secondary/special schools).

Scope of the research

2.12 The purpose of the evaluation was to guide and inform future improvements in teacher education and professional learning and, ultimately, to help build the capacity of teachers and improve the learning of young people.

2.13 Some evaluations are designed to measure the impact of a specific initiative or programme of work, in order to assess whether it ‘works’, and whether it should be continued or rolled out. However, TSF was not a single programme of work; it was a wide-ranging review resulting in 50 recommendations some of which set out a vision for 21st century teacher professionalism while others specified particular actions. Moreover, TSF did not emerge in isolation from other policy developments or existing work that was already in progress.

2.14 This evaluation does not assess progress on each of the 50 recommendations, and, although some of the drivers and facilitators of change are discussed, it does not attempt to measure the precise contribution of TSF to areas where there has been progress. Rather, this report offers an overview of the current landscape of teacher education, highlighting what progress has been made in key areas since TSF was published and where further progress and improvements are still needed.

Report structure

2.15 The next chapter in this report explains the methodology (with further details in Appendices A to D). Key aspects of teacher education and professional learning are then explored thematically in the subsequent chapters as follows: the culture of professional learning; ITE; Probation; LA and university partnerships; CLPL activities; professional review and development; mentoring and coaching; leadership; and national and LA support.
2.16 Each of these chapters contain a section on what is working well, a section on what the challenges are, and ends by highlighting a few key areas for consideration.

2.17 The final chapter presents our overall conclusions.

Notes on terminology

2.18 Those who took part in the quantitative research are referred to as ‘respondents’ and those who took part in the qualitative research are described as ‘participants’.

2.19 In the qualitative research, ‘current probationers’ are those who were part-way through their probationary year, and were asked to discuss their recent experiences of ITE. ‘Early career teachers’ are those who had completed probation and had up to five years’ experience as fully registered teachers. These teaching staff were asked to talk about their experiences of undertaking probation and the subsequent early years of their career.
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3 Methodology

Summary of the approach

3.1 This evaluation used a mixed-method approach. The first stage comprised an online quantitative survey carried out with teachers in primary, secondary, and special schools across Scotland (including both the state and independent sectors). The second stage involved in-depth interviews with representatives from all LAs and with key educational stakeholders, and in-depth interviews and focus groups with teachers.

3.2 All research materials, including the survey questionnaire and interview topic guides, were developed by Ipsos MORI in consultation with the Scottish Government and the Teaching Scotland’s Future steering group. Terry Carr, an independent education consultant and former HM Inspector of Schools, worked with Ipsos MORI as an advisor. All fieldwork was carried out between September 2015 and February 2016. All fieldwork was conducted by the core Ipsos MORI research team (the four authors of this report).

Online survey

3.3 An online survey was conducted with 6,346 members of the teaching profession between 14th September and 9th October 2015.

3.4 A small pilot was conducted in early September 2015 with 35 teachers (these were sampled to ensure a mix of sector, teaching experience and LA). Following the pilot, minor amendments were made to the questionnaire. The final version used is shown in Appendix A.

3.5 The sampling approach is detailed in Appendix B. In summary, a stratified random sampling approach was used to select staff. The sample was stratified by sector and staff group and within each strata respondents were sorted by school level variables (rurality, percentage of BME pupils, SIMD, school size) and local authority. Finally, respondents were selected using a random, 1 in n approach\(^2\). In total, 30,157 respondents were sampled.

3.6 The overall response rate was 21%. The profile of respondents was compared with the known profile of all staff (using Scottish Government data on school sector, staff group, age, sex, school size, proportion of BME pupils in school, rurality of school, deprivation of school, whether full-time/part-time and whether permanent/temporary). The profiles were very similar which indicates that the achieved sample was representative of all staff - at least in terms of those variables. The data were weighted to take account of the slight differences. Full details are contained in Appendix C.

---

\(^2\) The exact sampling ratio differed between strata depending on the total number in the population and the number of respondents to be selected for that sample.
LA interviews
3.7 Letters were sent to all Directors of Education requesting their support with the research and to nominate a representative to participate in an in-depth interview about the impact of the implementation of TSF on the teachers, schools and pupils in their area. Interviews were carried out by telephone, and all 32 LAs took part. The interviews were semi-structured and included qualitative and quantitative elements. Interviews were carried out between September and November 2015.

Key stakeholder interviews
3.8 Key stakeholders (shown below) were identified by the TSF steering group, and representatives from each organisation participated in a telephone interview. As with the LAs, these interviews were semi-structured, with both qualitative and quantitative elements. Fieldwork took place during November 2015.

Stakeholders
ITE providers
- University of Aberdeen
- University of Dundee
- University of Edinburgh
- University of Glasgow
- University of the Highlands and Islands
- The Open University
- University of Strathclyde
- University of Stirling
- University of the West of Scotland

Teaching unions
- EIS
- NASUWT
- Scottish Secondary Teachers’ Association (SSTA)
- VOICE – the union

Other stakeholder bodies
- Association of Directors of Education in Scotland (ADES)
- Association of Head Teachers & Deputes in Scotland (AHDS)
- COSLA
- Education Scotland
Interviews with teachers

3.9 Face-to-face in-depth interviews and focus groups were carried out between November 2015 and February 2016 with a range of teachers in Scotland to gain further insight into the impact of TSF on their professional learning and teaching practice. Teachers who had taken part in the survey and agreed to be recontacted were invited to participate in this follow-up qualitative research. Head teachers who had taken part were also used to recruit staff from their school.

3.10 In cases when it was difficult to recruit from survey recontacts, recruitment was undertaken by ‘snowballing’ from confirmed participants, and working with LA Education Service contacts to reach out to teacher networks or groups. Teachers and schools were selected to ensure a wide range of different experiences was covered in relation to the following characteristics:

- Sector: early years, primary, secondary and special school
- Geography: urban/rural
- Number of years teaching experience
- Role (e.g. class teacher, principal teacher, depute head teacher, head teacher, probationer, early career teacher)

3.11 In addition, supply teachers, those who undertook ITE outwith Scotland and those who had returned from a career break and were interviewed (these interviews were largely undertaken by telephone though some took part in focus groups).

---

3 Snowballing is a sampling methodology used in qualitative research to find hard-to-reach groups. It involves existing study subjects recruiting future subjects from among their acquaintances.
Table 3.1 Profile of qualitative interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant career stage/sector</th>
<th>Early Years</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Primary &amp; Secondary mixed group</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Special</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups: number of groups (total number of participants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depute Head/Head teacher</td>
<td>1(10) 4</td>
<td>1(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers with 10+ years’ experience</td>
<td>1(6)</td>
<td>1(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers with 5-10 years’ experience</td>
<td>2(7)</td>
<td>2(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed group: teachers with 5+ years’ experience</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews: number of participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depute/Head teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studied ITE outwith Scotland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned from a career break</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpreting the data

Quantitative data

3.12 Data tables were created from the online survey results. Each question in the survey was shown with results broken down by key analysis variables. The tables included significance tests to highlight differences between sub-groups. Throughout the report, differences between sub-groups are commented upon only where these are statistically significant i.e. where we can be 95% certain that they have not occurred by chance.

3.13 The analysis comprised question by question analysis examining both the frequency of response to each survey question and the extent to which responses varied by key demographics such as school sector, teacher type and teaching experience.

3.14 In the charts throughout the report, where percentages do not sum to 100%, this may be due to computer rounding, the exclusion of ‘don’t know’ categories or multiple answers. Throughout the report, an asterisk (*) denotes any value of less than half a per cent and a dash (-) denotes zero.

4 The number in the cell indicates how many discussion groups were conducted for that subgroup. The number in brackets shows the number of individual participants that contributed to the research.
3.15 Where possible, comparisons have been drawn between the 2010 TSF teacher survey and the survey in this study. Due to the changes made to the questionnaire, only a small number of questions were directly comparable – these questions are highlighted in the survey topline results in Appendix A.

3.16 As noted above, the online survey from the evaluation was weighted to reflect the teaching current teaching population, while the 2010 data was not. This meant that, in order to allow comparison, the 2010 results had to be weighted in line with the procedures in 2015. The resulting figures may, therefore, differ from those found in the 2010 TSF Report.

Qualitative data

3.17 Unlike survey research, qualitative social research does not aim to produce a quantifiable summary of attitudes or experiences, but seeks to identify and explore the different issues and themes relating to the subject being researched. The assumption is that issues and themes affecting participants are a reflection of issues and themes in the wider population concerned, and the way in which these impact on people.

3.18 With the permission of participants, interviews and groups were audio-recorded and transcribed for analysis. In addition, after completing each interview or group, detailed field notes were written up to capture the key points of the discussion.

3.19 Once the fieldwork was completed, the team held a series of meetings to enable a collaborative discussion of the findings and their implications.

3.20 This process culminated in the identification of themes and sub-themes. Transcripts and notes were then systematically analysed for key points within these themes. This method ensured that analysis and reporting of the data was rigorous, balanced and accurate, and that key messages were identified.
4 Culture of professional learning

4.1 This chapter provides an overview of the current culture of professional learning among Scotland’s teachers and how it has changed since the TSF review in 2010. Subsequent chapters (particularly the chapter on CLPL activities) explore specific aspects in more detail.

What has changed?

4.2 The overwhelming view, from teachers at all career stages and from national and local authority stakeholders, was that – while there are challenges and there is still a considerable way to go – there has been a significant shift in the culture of professional learning over recent years. There was evidence, from both the survey and the qualitative research, that:

- teachers are more engaged with professional learning
- there is more professional dialogue taking place
- there is a greater willingness to try new approaches.

Increased engagement with professional learning

4.3 Almost all LA representatives reported increased engagement with professional learning: 22 of the 30 who were asked thought teachers in their LA were ‘more engaged’ than they were five years ago and six of the 30 thought they were ‘much more engaged’. The remaining two thought there was no difference.

4.4 The views of teachers themselves were more mixed but nonetheless 43%\(^5\) of survey respondents thought that teachers were ‘more engaged’ with professional learning than they were five years ago, while 36% thought there was no difference and just 11% thought they were ‘less engaged’ (Figure 4.1).

Figure 4.1: Based on your experience, how engaged are teachers with professional learning in comparison to 5 years ago?

---

\(^5\) Where individual responses do not sum to combined responses, this is due to rounding
Participants in the qualitative research identified several inter-related aspects to this increased engagement:

- **Increased focus on professional learning.** National stakeholders and LA representatives felt that one of the main benefits of TSF was that it had helped raise the profile of professional learning – and this heightened awareness came through strongly in the qualitative research with teachers. 
  
  *I think it's more at the forefront of people’s minds now than it has ever been.*

  Secondary Head Teacher

- **Increased ownership of CLPL.** In the qualitative research discussions with teachers, it came through strongly that they felt an ownership of their professional learning: while they expected (to a greater or lesser extent depending on their experience) to be supported, they saw it as chiefly their responsibility to identify their needs and take the initiative in trying to address those needs. LA representatives also felt that teachers now had a greater sense of ownership of their professional learning – and that this was one of the main benefits of TSF.

- **Greater awareness of the range of activities that can lead to professional learning.** There was a shift away from the assumption that CLPL equated to ‘going on a training course’ and teachers talked about a wide range of professional learning activities that they had undertaken. Not only were teachers more aware of, and more open to, different ways of addressing their own learning needs, they also realised that much of what they were already doing was professional learning.
  
  *[There is a realisation] that it's not about going on course – it might be as simple as speaking to the teacher next door – and that's a huge mind shift.*

  LA representative

- **More relevant to needs.** There was an increased focus on prioritising learning that was relevant to the individual teacher’s particular development needs – rather than going on a course just because it was on.

- **Increased focus on impact.** Linked to the above, there was also an increased focus on the potential impact of professional learning on the pupils. Decisions about what professional learning to undertake were now more likely to involve a consideration of the needs of the individual pupils that a teacher was working with.

**More professional dialogue**

There was a consensus that teachers were engaging in professional dialogue more often (see section 8.11) and that there was a cultural shift towards more openness, sharing of experience and willingness to talk about pedagogy.
Teachers in the qualitative research commonly contrasted the current culture with the situation they experienced earlier in their careers.

*If you went into a class as a student and asked questions, some teachers were quite open to having discussion with you about different things, but other teachers would kind of shut you down because they didn’t want to feel like they were being questioned. I think that culture is slowly going away.*

Teacher who qualified 10 years ago

**Greater willingness to try new approaches**

4.7 One important marker of the change in culture is that a sizeable minority of teachers (41%) say that they try new teaching practices and strategies more often than they did five years ago (Figure 4.2).

Figure 4.2: In your professional practice, do you try new teaching practices and strategies more or less often than you did around 5 years ago?

4.8 The evidence from the survey is that most teachers regularly try new approaches and feel encouraged to do so (Figure 4.3). However, although two-thirds (67%) agree that they ‘feel supported to try new approaches’, it is worth noting that there was more disagreement with this than with the other aspects asked about.
What has helped change the culture?

4.9 Participants in the qualitative research pointed to several factors which they felt had driven the cultural changes discussed above. Some of these were a direct result of TSF, some were given increased impetus by TSF and some were independent.

4.10 There was widespread agreement that the introduction of Professional Update and the new GTCS Standards played a very important role in increasing engagement with professional learning. It was felt that the new Standards provided coherence to CLPL through all career stages. It was also noted that they promoted a shared language around CLPL and pedagogy.

4.11 There was also a widespread view that the ‘new generation’ of teachers emerging from ITE in recent years had helped change the culture. It was felt that it was ‘ingrained’ in these teachers from the start that they should be self-reflective, engage in professional dialogue, share practice and work collaboratively. Not only did this help change the culture simply because the new generation were gradually replacing the older generation, but it also forced more experienced staff to ‘raise their game’.

For me, somebody who is relatively new to the profession, it almost feels like an ethos in terms of you should be self-reflective, you should be constantly evaluating your own practice, I think. So, I guess, it’s almost an institutionalised mechanism, if you like, of almost forcing you to evaluate – in a positive way.

Teacher with 5 years’ experience
4.12 Similarly, some participants referred to a ‘new generation of head teachers’ who were more focused on trying to embed professional learning and create a culture of openness and collaboration.

[Why have things changed?] There have been a few retirements which were… fantastic and great professionals… however, less likely to be interested in engaging in sort of really soft emotional chat about their teaching and learning. For example, great professionals but interested in a different way of looking at things. Whereas we probably are more interested in engaging with each other and learning from each other’s experiences

Early career teacher

4.13 There were two other factors, independent of TSF, which were felt to be important drivers of the cultural shift. Firstly, the need to adapt to the significant changes in Scottish education in recent years including GIRFEC, the new National Qualifications, How Good is Our School (HGIOS) and, above all, CfE. It was suggested that the only way that teachers could possibly keep up to date and adapt to these changes was by engaging more with professional learning – and with professional dialogue and collaborative working in particular.

4.14 Secondly, reduced resources (particularly LA support and provision of courses) and limitations on time had forced schools and individual members of staff to look at other ways of meeting professional learning needs. Although the drivers may have been unwelcome, it was clear that this had stimulated more internal work within schools, more collaborative working among colleagues, more sharing of practice, and more variety and creativity in ways to achieve professional learning. It also encouraged prioritisation of activities that would have most impact on pupils and best meet the development needs of the individual teachers.

What are the challenges?

The impact of barriers on engagement

4.15 The cultural change has occurred despite a challenging context (outlined in sections 4.13 and 4.14 above) for Scottish education. All of these issues have impacted on workloads. While, as noted above, the challenges have driven some positive changes, it has to be acknowledged that they have also hindered progress.

4.16 The specific barriers to undertaking CLPL are discussed in section 8.37. In this context, however, it is worth noting a concern that emerged in the qualitative research about the potential impact of barriers on the overall culture. It was felt that the experience of having attempts to undertake professional learning activities thwarted can impact individual teachers’ motivation to engage with professional learning. Similarly, there was a view that some teachers may want to undertake more professional learning and understand its importance, but feel
that other pressures (particularly workloads) make it unrealistic. This, in turn, has a knock-on impact on the overall culture and the speed of change.

You can't expect people to engage in it and take on this idea that it is a journey if there is no outcome at the other end. If you can't promise them that what they are putting down, you're sitting having the deep and meaningful conversation, that coaching conversation, that they then feel, but what's the point in this because I never get to go? That is, I would say, a massive issue.

Principal teacher

It's almost like a door seems to open and then it's closed really quickly again, because actually you can't do it, I can't ask. I got all the paperwork through [to apply for a secondment] and looked at it, but there would be no point in applying because I can't be released to do it.

Teacher

4.17 There is a danger, therefore, that the heightened profile of professional learning raises expectations and makes it even more demoralising if the barriers cannot be overcome.

Teachers who have not embraced professional development

4.18 Although there was widespread agreement that there has been a significant change for the better in the culture of professional learning – while acknowledging the barriers discussed in section 4.163 and 4.14 above – there was also a widespread view that not all teachers have embraced the changes.

There is still a body of staff who are not engaged. The profession is on the path but not there yet.

LA representative

4.19 Participants in the qualitative research most frequently cited the longest serving teachers as not embracing the changes (though they were at pains to point out that they were not referring to all of these teachers). They also thought the culture of some departments and some schools inhibited change. In particular, they talked about departments and schools where there was a lack of openness and an unwillingness to share practice or engage in professional dialogue. A lack of turnover and/or a longer serving staff profile were thought to be contributing factors.

4.20 Some took the view that a reluctance to engage with professional learning was inevitable among some teachers and things would change over time. Others felt that the pace of change was too slow and that more effective leadership (at both LA and school level) was needed to both challenge and support those who were not engaging sufficiently with professional learning.
A continuing focus on courses

4.21 There was a greater awareness of the range of activities that can lead to professional learning (see section 4.5 above) and participants in the qualitative research frequently made the point that there was much more awareness now that CLPL was not just about going on courses. However it was telling that, later on the discussions, many of those same participants reverted to talking about courses. So, for example, when they were asked about barriers to CLPL or what support the LA provided for CLPL, they naturally talked about barriers to going on courses, or what courses the LA provided/did not provide.

4.22 This suggests that there is some way to go before an appreciation of the range of ways to approach professional learning is fully embedded.

Overall quantitative trends

4.23 While subgroup differences in the results of the online survey are discussed in the relevant chapters, there were some broader trends from the 2010 findings that cut across most of the results and are worth noting:

- those in promoted posts were more positive and engaged with professional learning than those in non-promoted posts (with the exception of probationers) – as the level of responsibility increased (e.g. from PT to DHT), so did engagement
- those working in the primary sector held more positive views about professional learning than those in the secondary sector
- those who have temporary contracts and, in particular, those that work on a supply basis had poorer experiences of professional learning than those on permanent contracts.

4.24 We have not commented on the above differences every time they occur in order to prevent the findings from becoming repetitive but when interpreting the results, readers should bear in mind the overall pattern.
5 Initial Teacher Education

5.1 TSF identified the need for substantial developments within ITE in order to raise the overall consistency of quality within the profession and develop the capacity of teachers to respond flexibly to a new curriculum (CfE); be confident in their ability to address social disadvantage, work with additional support needs, and teach literacy and numeracy. Recommendations highlighted a need for more coherence between ITE and induction, with greater opportunity for teachers to continue to learn at SQCF level 11. The report also identified student placements as a key element of ITE, and recommended that universities and Local Authorities work more closely to deliver high quality placements.

What’s working well?

Effectiveness of ITE

5.2 LA representatives considered ITE to be more effective than five years ago, and both teachers and LA representatives in the qualitative research noted an improvement in the quality of students and probationers.

5.3 In addition, students appeared to be confident going into their probationary year – two-thirds of survey respondents who had completed ITE at a Scottish university within the last five years thought that their ITE was ‘effective’ or ‘very effective’ in preparing them for their first post (Figure 5.1).

Figure 5.1 Overall, how effective do you think your Initial Teacher Education (ITE) at university was in preparing you for your first post as a teacher?

5.4 Teachers were asked in the survey if, in their experience of working with probationers over the last two to three years, they thought ITE was more or less effective in preparing probationers for their first post. Teachers with more than five years’ experience were less positive about the effectiveness of ITE to prepare probationers than those who had more recently qualified. Fifty-four per
cent of respondents said that it was ‘effective’ or ‘very effective’. However, those in promoted posts were more likely to think that ITE was effective than classroom teachers, in particular depute heads (68%).

5.5 The survey also asked teachers if, in their experience of working with probationers over the last two to three years, ITE was more effective than it was five years ago. Views were split; 29% thought ITE was no more or less effective than five years ago, 17% thought it was less effective and 16% thought it was more effective than five years ago.

5.6 The main reasons given by teachers from the qualitative research for why ITE was effective was that students and probationers had improved knowledge and understanding of pedagogy, classroom management, behaviour management and ASN, and were better prepared to work with national policy changes and priorities, than they had been in the past. This meant that they came to their first post more prepared, more confident and better able to deal with the challenges of the profession.

5.7 However, it is clear from the survey results that not all teachers feel that ITE is as effective as it could be – although less commonly this was also reflected in the qualitative research. Some teachers felt that the proliferation of topics covered in ITE due to wider policy priorities (e.g. health & wellbeing, outdoor learning, GIRFEC etc.) had led to an erosion of core pedagogical skills.

5.8 Those in the survey who had completed ITE in the last five years reported that the most useful aspects were pedagogy/approaches to learning and teaching (81% found these very useful/useful), self-reflection (77% found these very useful/useful) and professional studies (68% found these very useful/useful).

5.9 This reflects the feelings of current probationers and early career teachers in the qualitative research who felt that the most useful aspects were those that provided them with practical strategies in the classroom – reflected in how positively they viewed the hands on experience they get during school placements (see section 5.18 below for more details).

_Uni is very theory based and obviously that’s good because you need that to be able to inform your practice. But, at the same time I could have done with a bit more like practical strategies as well in terms of actually how to implement certain things._

_Current probationer_

_I thought mine [ITE] was amazing, I think that was down to my tutor […] I think my tutor made it a bit like classroom practice, and so many things that I did part of my probation year, he had taught me to do it when we were learning it_

_Early career teacher_
The topic areas thought to be least useful by those who had completed their ITE within the last 5 years were; working with relevant professionals (42% found this very useful/useful), using digital technologies (43% found this very useful/useful), working with additional support needs (48% found this very useful/useful) and behaviour management (49% found this very useful/useful) (Table 5.1).

In contrast to the views of more experienced teachers outlined above, current probationers would have liked more input on ASN and behaviour management within core ITE programmes. To some extent this was purely about the number of inputs provided but, again, concerns were often related to the course inputs not providing enough in the way of practical strategies rather than not being provided at all.

As I say they've got so much to fit in it's not the Uni's fault because they did a great job in the time they had. I felt like the [behaviour management] course I was on, I thought it was great, but just in terms if you're asking are we all prepared? I think it could have been hammered home a lot more.

Early career teacher

Current probationers acknowledged that behaviour management is a difficult topic to cover because the problems, and appropriate strategies can vary in any given situation.

I think the behaviour stuff is so difficult, because it is going to be so different in every class.

Current probationers

In general, current probationers and early career teachers felt that literacy and numeracy were adequately covered during ITE – more so in primary than secondary. However, as with all aspects of ITE there was still a feeling that more practical strategies would be beneficial.

Current probationers felt that while literacy and numeracy were covered well, there were fewer inputs about how to incorporate health and wellbeing into teaching and learning.

Considering it's given the same weight as literacy and numeracy in policy there's very little on it compared to either of those.

Current probationer

In light of the national policy focus on Raising Attainment for All, current probationers were asked in the research to comment on the input they received on principles of social justice within their ITE. Overall, they were content with this input and felt that the topic was covered in depth by their university. However, there were still some who lacked confidence in applying the principles in their daily teaching practice. This was often more to do with feeling daunted about the
extent to which they are able to help individual children in challenging situations than thinking that the courses provided were insufficient.

*It makes you almost think that you should be able to change the world and when you go in you can't do that, you've been teaching for three weeks, you can't change that child's whole life*

*There was talk of teachers as activists and I'm not saying that's bad, I think it's an excellent aspiration, but I think it puts quite a lot of pressure on you as a probationer*

Current probationer

**Table 5.1 How useful did you find the following aspects of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) at university in preparing you for your first post as a teacher?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very useful/useful</th>
<th>Neither useful nor not useful</th>
<th>Not useful/not at all useful</th>
<th>DK/prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy/approaches to learning and teaching</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflection</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional studies</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection safeguarding</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject content</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour management</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional support needs</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using digital technologies to support learning and teaching</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with relevant professionals</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: All who completed ITE at a Scottish University in the last 5 years (903)*

5.16 Current probationers in the qualitative research viewed CLPL as an ongoing process and considered it to be integral to their professional lives. This suggests that improvements made to ITE have helped to embed the cultural values of TSF into those who have newly joined the profession.

5.17 One important value that was thought to have been embedded was that newly qualified teachers have a good appreciation of the fact that while they have an entitlement to CLPL, this must be undertaken in the context of pupil outcomes.

*I think as you see new teachers coming into the profession, they understand that this is for [the pupils'] benefit. It's too impact on learners in the classroom.*

Depute head teacher

**Placements**

5.18 Overall, respondents who had completed ITE in the last five years were positive about the support they received from their university during their school placement: 52% reported that it was ‘effective’ and a further 20% said that it was
‘very effective’ (Figure 5.2). There was no significant change since the 2010 TSF survey, which found that 54% thought that support from the university during their ITE placement was ‘effective’ and 20% said that it was ‘very effective’.

**Figure 5.2** Thinking about your school placement during your Initial Teacher Education, how effective was the support given to you by the [university/school] to help successfully complete the placement?

![Bar chart showing support effectiveness](image)

**Base:** All who completed ITE at a Scottish University in the last 5 years (903)

5.19 However, the proportion of respondents who thought that the support provided by the school during their ITE placement was ‘very effective’ has increased substantially since the 2010 TSF survey (41% in 2015, compared with 28% in 2010).

5.20 Respondents who had completed their ITE in the last five years thought that the support they were given by the school during ITE placements was more effective than that given by the university (41% of respondents thought that support given by the school was ‘very effective’, compared with 20% who thought the same about the university). This is perhaps to be expected given that students work with teachers on a daily basis while on placement. Probationers in the qualitative research valued being able to discuss teaching strategies and practical solutions to problems they encountered with teachers in their placement schools.

5.21 In the qualitative research, current probationers stated that they had been given a range of placements during their ITE, allowing them to experience working in different sizes and locations of schools and with different year groups – although this was not the case across the board. They highlighted this as an effective means of broadening their skills base.
5.22 There was a sense from teachers, some stakeholders and current probationers that schools and universities were carrying out more joint assessment\textsuperscript{6} of student teachers. Teachers and students welcomed this, viewing joint assessment as a fairer process that allows for teachers to comment more effectively on student performance over the duration of a placement.

Predictors of views of ITE effectiveness

5.23 Statistical analysis\textsuperscript{7} was used to determine which variables from the survey best predicted a respondent's\textsuperscript{8} answer to the question ‘Overall, how effective do you think your Initial Teacher Education (ITE) at university was in preparing you for your first post as a teacher?’.

5.24 By far the strongest predictor was finding the support provided by the University during your school placement effective. Individual aspects of the ITE course that also had a strong influence were finding the pedagogy/approaches to learning and teaching element useful and finding Additional Support Needs element useful.

5.25 Other variables included in the model were the demographic variables\textsuperscript{9}, other individual aspects of the ITE course\textsuperscript{10} and support provided by the school during school placement.

What are the challenges?

Aspects of joint assessment

5.26 While there was a perception that joint assessment was taking place more widely, teachers who participated in the qualitative research thought that the operational and organisational aspects of this activity could be improved further\textsuperscript{11}. Teachers made suggestions for improvement in relation to:

---

\textsuperscript{6} Joint assessment means that the assessment of student teachers during placement and, where appropriate, of probationers during induction should be a shared responsibility of the school, the university and the local authority.

\textsuperscript{7} The analysis was conducted using Logistic Regression, for full technical details please see Appendix E.

\textsuperscript{8} This question was only asked of those who had completed their ITE in the last five years.

\textsuperscript{9} Sex, sector (primary, secondary etc.), full-time vs. part-time, permanent vs. temporary employment, rurality of school and school type (independent vs. local authority).

\textsuperscript{10} Literacy, numeracy, Health and Wellbeing, Professional Studies, Classroom management, Subject content, Assessment, Self-reflection, Using digital technologies, Behaviour Management, Child protection/safeguarding and Working with other professionals.

\textsuperscript{11} The qualitative research did not explore the perspectives of ITE lecturers and tutors on these matters. University representatives did take part in interviews but the focus of these discussions was mainly on the strategic level operation of University and LA partnerships.
the respective roles of the school and university in the assessment process (and the weighting of school and university input to student grades and passing/failing of modules) need additional clarification

- the materials (e.g. forms, marking criteria) from universities that teachers use to carry out joint assessments are not always distributed to schools in a regular and timely way
- the additional administrative and time requirements of joint assessment could be better supported or recognised in relation to teacher workloads
- ensuring both schools and universities are up-to-date on current practice with each sector.

Aspects of school placements

5.27 Most of the concerns about ITE raised in the qualitative research were related to school placements:

- There were mixed views about student supporters. While most current probationers thought that their own supporters had been helpful, there was a concern based on experiences of some of their fellow students that some supporters did not have the requisite skills to act in this role. The probationers who raised this point thought that supporters of students should be given mentoring training and detailed guidance on the role. This view was echoed in interviews with teachers.

- Some teachers and school senior management said they were not regularly supplied with accessible information from the university about changes to assessments and ITE content when they were hosting student placements.

- Teachers and senior management also indicated that there should be better protocols for communicating concerns about students to universities during placements.

- Schools often found it challenging to know what individual students were capable of, and as result, provide suitable on-placement experiences. Teachers suggested that it would be helpful for universities to provide them with clarification on the ITE topics that students have covered and their areas of experience before each placement.

- Current probationers also suggested that improved communication between university and schools could help to fill student knowledge gaps in an immediate and practical way while students are on placement (e.g. trying out different ways of integrating numeracy into lessons, or understanding Experiences and Outcomes within daily practice).

On the placements I felt there wasn't a connection […] between school and Uni, […] there was no real communication. I felt there were expectations on both sides that the other party would be providing a certain amount of learning.

Probationer teacher
• Teachers and current probationers thought that assignment topics and submission dates were not always well co-ordinated in relation to placements (e.g. assignments being due the day after placement ends on a topic not related to the placement learning).

• Teachers in a special school highlighted the fact that students very rarely, if ever, have placements in special schools/units. They felt that such placements (even very short ones) would be beneficial. They would be valuable for those who might want to work in a special school/unit and it would potentially increase the pool of such people. Moreover, it would give students more experience of different ASN strategies which would be useful in mainstream schools too – something that current probationers identified as being useful (see section 5.11 above).

5.28 Current probationers also highlighted the extent of portfolio work (e.g. writing up reflective lesson plans) which they felt was a considerable burden alongside school preparatory work during ITE placements.

Key areas for consideration

- Joint assessment: further clarification and agreement of the respective roles of the school and the university

- Student placements: improved communication between the university and the school on a number of aspects

- Consider ways of incorporating more practical strategies into ITE – particularly in relation to behaviour management.
6 Probation

What’s working well?

Support during probation

6.1 There was widespread agreement among teachers, LA representatives and national stakeholders, that programmes to support the full-time probationary year had improved over recent years, providing a more effective transition for newly qualified teachers into their first post.

*I felt hugely supported on [my probationary year] and I very much enjoyed it and I feel much more confident. I’m only in the year after my probation year, and I already feel much more confident than I did this time last year.*

Early Career teachers

6.2 A similar picture emerged from the survey with respondents viewing the support that they received from their school during the probation period very positively – 86% of respondents thought that the support was ‘effective’ or ‘very effective’ (with 56% stating that it was ‘very effective’) in helping them achieve the Standard for Full Registration\(^ {12} \) (Figure 6.1).

**Figure 6.1 How effective was the support given to you by the school/establishment to help you successfully achieve the Standard for Full Registration?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All who completed ITE at a Scottish University in the last 5 years (632)

---

Professional learning

6.3 Professional learning undertaken during the probationary period was also highly rated. Eighty-five per cent of respondents thought that it was ‘effective’ or ‘very effective’ in helping them to achieve the GTCS Standard for Full Registration (Figure 6.2).

6.4 Probationers and early career teachers highly valued the role of the probationary year in equipping them with practical teaching skills – more so than their ITE placements- due in part to the extended time they spend in school and the consequent need to develop longer term solutions to problems and strategies for their classes.

Figure 6.2 During your probationary period, how effective was the professional learning you undertook in helping you achieve the GTCS Standard for Full Registration?

6.5 In the qualitative research, current probationers said they thought there was a good balance between the structured CLPL programme delivered by LAs and having the freedom to tailor their CLPL activity to their own specific needs. This was reflected in responses to the survey, where nearly all aspects of professional learning during the probationary period were viewed favourably – in particular, support provided by a mentor (55% thought this was ‘very effective’). The exceptions to this were contact with university staff and further accredited study. For both of these aspects, almost half of the survey respondents (47% and 48%, respectively) reported that they were ‘not applicable’ to their probationary period or were not available to them (Figure 6.3).
6.6 One of the main outcomes of the high levels of support and effective professional learning provided – particularly in terms of developing practical skills – was that probationers felt confident. This was reflected in secondary teachers’ views who thought that probationers were more confident than in earlier generations; taking the initiative to suggest ideas, share practice and actively engage in developing departmental teaching practices.

*M: I think there is more openness and a confidence with probationers now. Even having done mine eight, nine years ago, I feel it's completely different now [...] there was an underlying thing of “we’ll go in and try and fit in with the department. Go in with ideas, but don't rock the boat”. But, now I think they are coming in much more... and we as teachers are a bit more open to other ideas. It's not so much, tow the party line and don’t step out. I think there is a culture shift really."

*F: I did mine about 11 years ago and there is a culture shift. Just their confidence, they're like a breath of fresh air when they come into your department, because they do come in with lots of ideas and they do, they are really open to share them as well.*

Secondary teacher group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors of views of probationary period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.7 Statistical analysis(^{13}) was conducted to explore which variables best predicted whether a respondent thought that the professional learning they undertook during their probationary period was effective in helping them to achieve the GTCS Standard for Full Registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8 The strongest predictor was whether the respondent had stayed in touch with university staff — those that had stayed in touch were more likely to think that the professional learning they undertook was effective. Other factors that made a respondent more likely to think that the professional learning was effective were being male, working in a school in an urban area, finding the support provided by their mentor effective and finding the opportunity for self-study effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9 Other variables included in the model were the demographic variables(^{14}), other individual aspects of professional learning during the probationary period(^{15}) and awareness of the LA/university partnership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the challenges?

Consistency of ITE experiences

6.10 In the qualitative research, teachers noted that probationer skill-sets, knowledge and experience varied by ITE provider. They were not necessarily better or worse, just different, but this made it difficult for schools to set realistic expectations about what probationers are able to achieve and the elements of teaching they will need additional support with.

6.11 Although teachers were generally positive about the quality of students and probationers, they also raised the point that probationers still needed support during their probationary period to develop their core pedagogical skills – the ‘nuts and bolts’ of teaching (as noted in section 5.7).

Mentoring

6.12 Current probationers and early career teachers who participated in the qualitative research had mixed experiences of being mentored. They discussed the importance for those designated as probationer supporters to be skilled and have the capacity to provide the appropriate support. Both these groups appreciated mentors who communicated well, and supported them by observing practice, listening to concerns and talking through teaching strategies.

---

\(^{13}\) The analysis was conducted using Logistic Regression, for full technical details please see Appendix E.

\(^{14}\) Sector (primary, secondary etc.), full-time vs. part-time, permanent vs. temporary employment and school type (independent vs. local authority).

\(^{15}\) Local authority provision, School-based provision, Shadowing, Non-contact time, Contact with university staff and Further accredited study.
Access to courses

6.13 One of the few negative elements of professional learning during the probationary year that early career teachers highlighted was that they felt the availability of places on specialist courses (e.g. SEAL\textsuperscript{16} Maths and SQA National Qualifications training) was not meeting the high demand from probationers seeking to develop their curriculum knowledge at the outset of their probationary year.

Probationer Scheme - Flexible route

6.14 While the probationer scheme – flexible route was not directly addressed in the qualitative research as very few of the teachers interviewed in the main interviews had come through that route, a number of those who were interviewed to specifically explore the views of those who had qualified outwith Scotland had. It was clear that their experiences of the probationary period were much less positive than those on the Teacher Induction Scheme (see section 6.19 below for more details).

6.15 In the survey the numbers coming through the probationer scheme – flexible route were again too low to analyse. However, the open-ended responses of those who had showed similar dissatisfaction with the levels of support provided.

As Flexible Route Probationer who completed a PGCE in England, I have felt very unsupported and unaware of any training opportunities available to me, especially in comparison with the support given to Route A probationers [Teacher Induction Scheme]. I continue to look for other full-time, permanent Secondary Art and Design teaching work but there have been very few, if any, jobs to apply for in my area in the past year. I have already had to relocate 3 times since graduation, going to wherever there has been work available and fear I will have to move again if I am to find employment to complete my probation.

Teachers who qualified outwith Scotland

6.16 In total, eight interviews were conducted with teachers who had qualified outwith Scotland – three had qualified in Poland, two in England, one in Greece, one in Belgium and one in Bulgaria.

6.17 These teachers felt that, to some extent, they had to seek out information and support for their transition to the Scottish Education system themselves. However, this was not always viewed negatively. There was a feeling from some that, as they have chosen to come to work in Scotland, it was their responsibility to “get up to speed”.

6.18 The support and information provided by GTCS, when they first made enquiries about registering to work in Scotland, was thought to be helpful. However, for those who had qualified outside of the UK, there were difficulties around

\textsuperscript{16} Stages of Early Arithmetical Learning (SEAL): a strategy for maths learning used in Primary schools.
evidencing qualification equivalency and paperwork requirements for registration, for example:

- only being given 30 days to obtain disclosure information from Poland
- issues in sourcing references from Polish Universities as they do not have a culture of providing references – they see the degree award as the necessary evidence
- mapping degree qualifications against subject registration.

6.19 Most of those who participated in the research were required to go through at least some probationary period (through the probationer scheme – flexible route) before gaining full registration, although this depended on the extent of their teaching experience. While the discussion was not focused on the probationer scheme – flexible route, it became clear that this was where most of the participants’ concerns about the transition to the Scottish system lay. The issues they raised included:

- a lack of support in helping them to find appropriate probationary positions
- inconsistent experiences of mentoring – if the participant was not able to complete their probation at a single school they had no single point of contact that they could go to with concerns or questions, although they acknowledged that their colleagues were generally very helpful if they went to them for help
- problems arranging teaching observations – participants often worked on a short-term, supply basis. The unpredictable nature of their teaching commitments meant that it was difficult for them to arrange suitable times and dates for others to come and observe their lessons.
- a lack of interaction with other probationers
- a lack of a structured CLPL programme.

6.20 Beyond the issues connected to the probationer scheme – flexible route, the main concerns were around connecting the Scottish Education terminology to that used in the country in which they qualified and adapting to the less structured nature of CfE. A couple of teachers commented that, at the time they came to Scotland, CfE was still in its early stages and there was CLPL available introducing the new curriculum – so they felt that they were ‘in the same boat’ as everyone else. However, they expressed concerns that, as CfE has become more embedded, these types of CLPL activities will be less common.

6.21 It is important to note that while these teachers were faced with the challenges of adapting to a new system, exacerbated by the issues raised by coming through the probationer scheme – flexible route, and often being on temporary or supply contracts, they had coped well with the changes and seemed to be happily settled in the Scottish education system.

6.22 One of the participants noted that it would have been useful to have someone who had been through the same process, particularly if they had come from the same country, as a “buddy” to provide support and advice on what to expect.
Teachers who have returned to teaching after a break

6.23 TSF recommended that “where an individual seeks to return to teaching, local authorities should provide them with relevant training to support their return to the classroom”\(^\text{17}\). 

6.24 Eight depth interviews were conducted with teachers who had recently returned to teaching after a career-break (five had returned after having children, one had been travelling and two had done both).\(^\text{18}\) While these interviews did not strictly cover probation, this section has been included here as many similar themes emerged as did among those who qualified outwith Scotland.

6.25 As those who had undertaken their ITE outwith Scotland, there was little evidence of any structured support (from LAs or elsewhere) for returners and they had very largely supported themselves: they identified and organised the information, training and support they felt they needed as best they could. However, although schools tended not to provide structured support, participants did stress that their colleagues were generally very supportive and helpful when they asked for assistance.

6.26 For those who had returned after not working at all for several years, the issues were as much to do with returning to work as they were with returning to teaching. What would have helped to build their confidence and ease the transition, would have been:

- the opportunity to shadow/undertake observations before they returned. One participant had approached several schools to ask if she could shadow/observe but was told they were ‘too busy’.
- a phased return. One returner indicated that her LA guaranteed a permanent job to anyone taking a career-break and returning within five years. However, she found there was no flexibility in terms of where or what the role was, and it had to be full-time.

6.27 One returner had received exactly this support – the opportunity to shadow/observe and a phased return – and had found it very beneficial.

6.28 The aspects that returners most wanted support with were CfE and the new National Qualifications and what that meant for their teaching practice. Those who had returned two or three years ago felt they were probably in a better position than those who had very recently returned, because there were more professional learning opportunities around the implementation of CfE and the new qualifications at that point (because everyone was adapting to them).

\(^\text{17}\) TSF, p86.

\(^\text{18}\) It should be noted that there is potential bias here as the individuals we interviewed were, at least to some extent, ‘successful’ returners (in the sense that they were currently employed as teachers). Those who found the barriers to returning too great or were deterred by the lack of support were not included in the research.
One participant, who had been unsuccessful in several job applications before securing a supply post, had tried to obtain feedback on why she had been unsuccessful but had received very little. While she understood that there were probably applicants with more recent, relevant experience and did not feel she had been unfairly treated, she suggested that more detailed feedback would be helpful for those attempting to return.

### Key areas for consideration

- Support for probationers to further develop key pedagogical skills
- Ensuring all probationer supporters have the necessary mentoring and coaching skills
- Increased support for those on the probationer scheme – flexible route
7 LA/University partnerships

7.1 Partnership working between Local Authorities and Universities was highlighted in TSF as a key means of delivering a more coherent transition between ITE and induction, with all LAs to be committed to a formal partnership with a university by August 2013. TSF recommended that partnerships could improve student experiences of school placements but also identified the role of partnerships in providing high quality probationer placements and professional learning, and increasing professional dialogue between the school and university sectors. In addition, the report suggested there was scope for partnerships to develop a broader CLPL remit beyond the early phase.

7.2 In September 2015, Education Scotland published the Aspect Review of the Education Authority and University ITE Partnership Arrangements (phase one). The Aspect Review presents findings on the first stage evaluation of the LA/University partnerships. Our findings in this report are broadly in line with those of the Aspect Review, particularly in relation to joint assessment and placements, and the impacts of collaborative working.

What’s working well?

7.3 LA representatives reported that partnerships with ITE providers were one of the main benefits of TSF.

Support for ITE

7.4 Three quarters of LA representatives rated their partnerships as ‘very effective’ or ‘effective’ at supporting student experiences of ITE. This included increased teacher involvement in ITE student selection processes and increased joint assessment of student placements.

Collaborative working

7.5 Partnerships have increased collaborative working not only between LAs and universities, but also between LAs and other LAs, and among universities who are in the same partnerships. This has had the following benefits:

- improving cross-sectoral understanding of working practices and procedures, and challenges and pressures
- providing a focus for universities and LAs to share resources and co-develop learning activities (e.g. trialling practitioner enquiry and experiential learning courses)
- creating opportunities for LAs to share resources and co-deliver CLPL with other LAs
- developing SCQF level 11 accreditation of Local Authority CLPL courses
- increasing SCQF level 11 opportunities for Leadership CLPL (e.g. Into Headship, middle leadership programmes)
- increasing opportunities for cross-sectoral secondments (e.g. teacher secondment to ITE tutoring roles).

7.6 Students valued the role and input of seconded teachers in ITE as they were able to discuss current ‘on the ground’ realities of classroom practice and approaches to teaching.

7.7 As noted in chapter 5, university stakeholders saw increased collaborative working between themselves and individual schools and teachers (rather than local authorities) as a positive development. However, they felt that there was still scope to develop a closer working relationship.

**What are the challenges?**

**Awareness of partnerships**

7.8 Awareness of LA/university partnerships was low. Only 30% of survey respondents were aware of a partnership between their LA and a university to support professional learning.

7.9 Furthermore, only 29% of respondents who had completed ITE in Scotland in the last year were aware of a partnership between their LA and a university when completing their probationary period. However, the results do suggest that awareness is increasing over time: 29% of the most recent cohort compared with 25% of those who had completed ITE 1-2 years ago and 10% of those who had completed ITE 2-5 years ago.

7.10 Among those who had recently completed ITE and were aware of a partnership, views of the partnership were mixed: 34% thought the university and local authority worked together well to deliver the probationary period; 31% thought they worked together adequately; and 22% thought they worked together poorly (Figure 7.1). There was no difference on this point between those who had completed their ITE less than a year ago, those who had completed it 1-2 years ago, and those who had completed it 2-5 years ago.
Figure 7.1 How well or poorly do you think the university and the Local Authority worked together to deliver your probationary period?

![Circle chart showing responses to the question.]

Contact with university during probation

7.11 It was not common for respondents to keep in touch with university staff in their probationary year: only 13% did so. Forty-nine per cent did not know that they had the opportunity, 28% said they were not given the opportunity and 10% were given the opportunity but chose not to stay in touch. Those in the secondary sector were nearly twice as likely to keep in touch as those in the primary sector (17%, compared with 9%) (Figure 7.2).

7.12 However, based on a broadly comparable question in the 2010 TSF survey19, it appears that the proportion of teachers staying in touch with university staff in their probationary year has more than doubled over the past five years (13% in 2015, compared with 5% in 2010).

---

19 In the 2010 survey, respondents were asked ‘Did you have the opportunity to retain links to your university during your probation/induction?’
Partnership roles

7.13 Although LA representatives highlighted partnership working as one of the main benefits of TSF, there was a perception from some that there was an imbalance of input, with universities having the greater input into the partnerships. In general, LA representatives would prefer increased input into their partnerships, particularly around joint assessment. However, universities identified the reduction of Local Authority central capacity and resources as creating a challenge for partnership working, as LA staff had wider remits than the partnership alone, resulting in their having less time available to dedicate to the partnership, and having limited financial resources to work with.

Partnership CLPL remit

7.14 Some national stakeholders and LA representatives stated that partnerships had not yet fully extended their CLPL remit beyond ITE and Leadership. While national stakeholders and LA representatives generally thought that CLPL in Leadership at SCQF level 11 was well supported by partnerships, there was also a perception that there is potential to develop the CLPL remit into other areas of professional learning. It was also suggested by some of these participants that as the CLPL remit of partnerships widened and CLPL opportunities were publicised, teachers would become more aware of their LA/university partnership.

7.15 University stakeholders recognised this as an area for further development and were keen to increase the sharing of expertise between themselves and LAs/schools. For example, through providing accreditation for CLPL developed by local authorities or by increasing opportunities for teachers to be seconded to ITE.
### Key areas for consideration

- More involvement of class teachers in partnership activities
- Continuing the contact between probationers and their ITE providers
- The balance of input from LAs and universities to the partnerships
8 CLPL activities

8.1 There were three key elements set out in the TSF report for the further development of CLPL activities.

8.2 Firstly, the balance of professional learning activities should:

- shift from set-piece events to more local, team-based approaches
- centre around self-evaluation and professional collaboration, and
- achieve an appropriate blend of tailored individual development and school improvement.

8.3 Secondly, teachers should have access to high quality professional learning for their subject and other specialist responsibilities.

8.4 Finally, a greater range of professional learning should be formally accredited at SCQF level 11 (Masters level).

8.5 This chapter explores CLPL activities, including how the type and range of CLPL activities undertaken have changed, the development of SCQF level 11 opportunities and what the barriers are to accessing high quality professional learning opportunities.

Satisfaction with current provision of CLPL

8.6 Satisfaction with current provision of CLPL was mixed (32% were satisfied and 24% were dissatisfied). However, it was most common for respondents to give a neutral response (43% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied) (Figure 8.1).

8.7 This reflected the findings in the qualitative research in which views were again mixed – there were aspects of CLPL provision that were viewed positively, but also many that were less so.

8.8 The key elements of CLPL provision (explored in detail in the subsequent sections) that participants viewed positively and contributed to satisfaction were:

- a broader definition of what CLPL encompasses
- an increase in collaborative working
- an increase in in-school activities
- an increased focus on impact on pupils
8.9 The main drivers behind dissatisfaction with CLPL provision were mostly related to access to CLPL, rather than content – again these are discussed in greater detail in ‘what are the challenges’ section. The key issues were:

- the choice of available CLPL being driven by national and LA priorities and not individual development needs
- gaps in specific topic coverage
- a tendency among some teachers to still focus on courses
- the need for more national networks
- barriers to participation – a lack of supply cover; the cost of CLPL; increasing workloads
- misconceptions about what SCQF level 11 learning involves
- the difficulties faced by supply teachers when accessing professional learning

**What’s working well?**

**Understanding of CLPL activities**

8.10 There was a high level of awareness among survey respondents of the professional learning opportunities that were available to them: 83% said they were ‘aware’/‘very aware’ (Figure 8.2).
Figure 8.2 How aware are you of the professional learning opportunities available to you?
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8.11 Participants in the qualitative research felt that there was a broader understanding of what CLPL might include than there had been in the past and, in particular, a move away from a narrow conception of CLPL as ‘courses’. Professional reading, professional dialogue and self-reflection were all highlighted as activities that were now ‘embedded’ in day to day teaching practice and were of great value.

**Increased collaborative working**

8.12 The survey results suggest (Figure 8.3) that participation in nearly every CLPL activity has increased since 2010, with a particularly large increase in the proportion reporting that they had undertaken professional reading (55% in 2010, compared with 81% in 2015). It is important to note that this increase has happened alongside an increase in awareness of what constitutes CLPL so may be an increase in recording rather than undertaking different CLPL activities.

8.13 This increase in participation in CLPL activities included an increase in collaborative working. Between 2010 and 2015, there have been increases in the proportion who have undertaken group discussion (increased from 46% in 2010 to 68% in 2015), peer observation (increased from 50% to 61%), networking (increased from 32% to 46%) and good practice visits (increased from 24% to 35%).

> I think generally there is a big emphasis on having professional dialogue that wasn't there before. About sharing good practice and it wasn't there before I don't think.

Teacher

8.14 This was supported by a feeling among those in the qualitative research that there had been an increase in collaborative working, which was seen as beneficial by all participants. Examples included more opportunities for teachers to be seconded to local authorities or national bodies, increased use of peer networks (particularly among head teachers) and inter-school collaboration in developing professional learning activities.
The culture is changing as well because of the newer teachers coming in who when they’ve done some courses or professional learning or whatever it is, are more keen to come back and actually share that.

Teacher

Figure 8.3 Which professional learning activities have you participated in during the last full academic year?

- **Increased in-school activity**
  
  While there has only been a small increase between 2010 and 2015 in the survey results (Figure 8.3), there was a feeling among qualitative participants that the amount of in-house school level CLPL has increased. This was seen as
beneficial as courses could be tailored to need and there was agreement that CLPL tended to be better when it was small scale and more relevant to the needs of staff and pupils.

8.16 Participants from independent schools thought that one of the differences between the independent and maintained sectors was that there were more opportunities in the former to go on external courses:

They have a lot more neighbourhood things, whereas we specifically go out for a day possibly, you know, a series of things where theirs is more…

…In the schools.

Teachers from independent schools

8.17 While these participants saw the ability to go on more courses as an advantage – and clearly it is in some instances – the other side of the coin is that the constraints have led to the more local, team-based activities recommended by TSF (see also section 8.2). Similar, staff in a special school talked about the fact that most of their activity was internal – driven by the fact that almost all external provision was mainstream focused.

**Increased impact on pupils**

8.18 National stakeholders and LA representative often commented that it was too soon to say what the impact of TSF as a whole had been on pupil learning and outcomes. However, LA representatives did agree that teachers were more concerned about how their professional learning impacted on pupils than they had in the past.

8.19 This was also supported by the views of teachers in the qualitative and the quantitative research – they felt that the impact on pupils has become much more of a focus for teachers undertaking professional learning. Furthermore, they were also more aware of the need to measure the impact of their professional learning.

8.20 As noted in section 4.5, the impact that professional learning has on pupil outcomes now underpins the way that teachers make decisions about what CLPL they undertake. Some teachers also used 'impact' as a way of measuring the quality of the CLPL they had undertaken.

Our CLPL programme now for staff is about, well it's got to be having an impact. If you're not having an impact you shouldn't be doing it. If [the CLPL] wasn't good enough for you to have an impact, guess what, we're not going back.

Head teacher

8.21 In addition to impact being a driver of what CLPL to undertake, teachers also felt that they could see, in practice, the impact the professional learning they
participated in had on pupils. In the survey, the vast majority (82%) of teachers said that they thought that their participation in professional learning had a positive impact on the learning experiences of children and young people (Figure 8.4).

**Figure 8.4 To what extent do you think that your own participation in professional learning has a positive impact on the learning experiences of children and young people?**
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8.22 This was reflected in the qualitative research with teachers giving examples of the impact that their professional learning had on pupils.

> Yes, because the professional learning I did in national 5 ESOL 20 meant that the girl I was working with got an A. I did professional learning on higher arts the girl had been moved from national 5 to higher and was struggling with the written part, because I had professional dialogues and did a lot of research in that, she ended up getting a B, which her teachers were very pleased about. So, yes, I can see it in results.

Teacher

8.23 In general, teachers in the qualitative research tended to feel that short one-off courses tended to have the least impact and sometimes found it difficult to apply what they had learnt in the classroom. However, as noted above, participation in other forms of CLPL had increased (e.g. professional reading, professional dialogue, collaborative learning and in-school activities) and were thought to be better as they could be tailored to the needs of pupils.

8.24 There was a concern from some teachers in the qualitative research that it takes more time for the impact of their CLPL activities to emerge making it difficult for

---
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them to evidence this. This suggests that teachers may need further support with measuring the impact of CLPL on a long-term basis.

That impact might not be measurable for two or three years, and there’s no method for recognising that. It’s ‘you’ve done that CPD, what’s the impact?’ I don’t know yet because that’s going to take time to be embedded into the practice, until we can actually see what the impact is going to be.

Secondary teacher

8.25 Previous research\(^{21}\) has shown that “professional learning experiences that focus on the links between particular teaching activities and valued student outcomes are associated with positive impacts on those outcomes” (Timperley, 2008). In this evaluation, there are several indicators that teachers in Scotland are moving in this direction, they are:

- using the impact on pupils to decide what professional learning activities to undertake
- using impact as a means of measuring the quality of CLPL
- moving away from one-off short courses to more tailored professional learning activities that put the needs of learners at the forefront.

8.26 This suggests that the changes implemented as part of TSF, may contribute to better outcomes for children and young people.

Priorities for CLPL

8.27 The most common LA level CLPL priorities were literacy and numeracy, and Raising Attainment. Also mentioned, but to a lesser extent, were SCQF level 11 CLPL and GIRFEC.

8.28 Among those working in schools, priorities tended to focus more on the day-to-day running of the school including new National qualifications, HGIOS 4 and Raising Attainment.

What are the challenges?

Range and quality of CLPL activities

8.29 In the survey, respondents were split on whether there was a greater variety of professional learning opportunities and whether there were more high quality opportunities than five years ago (Figures 8.5 and 8.6). Three findings from the qualitative research might explain this.

Figure 8.5 Comparing how things are now with the period before 2010 (5 years ago), what do you think about the range of professional learning opportunities that are available to you?

Base: All who completed ITE more than 5 year ago (5,086)

Figure 8.6 Do you think the number of high quality professional learning opportunities available to you has increased or decreased over the last 5 years?

Base: All who completed ITE more than 5 year ago (5,081)

8.30 Firstly, there was a feeling among classroom teachers that the choice of CLPL activities available to them was driven too much by national and local authority priorities. This meant that their individual development goals were given less time and attention. Although, as noted in the Culture chapter (section 4.21), this feeling was driven to some extent by a discussion about courses rather than a broader definition of professional learning.
Secondly, a number of issues were raised in relation to specific topic coverage. The following gaps in CLPL opportunities were identified:

- more input required on specialist areas in primary schools e.g. music, art, P.E.
- subject specific learning in secondary schools – particularly in subjects that require frequent updates e.g. computing, design and technology
- not enough CLPL input on expectations for new National qualifications
- a lack of ‘refresher’ courses – for those who may want to move (e.g. from a special school to mainstream school) or those who have returned to teaching after a break.

Third, LA representatives and those in promoted posts felt that there was still a group of teachers that put too great an emphasis on courses when it came to professional learning. This meant that they had yet to embrace other professional learning opportunities and felt that there was less available to them.

National networks

While collaborative working has increased, there was a view that more national networks were required. This was because:

- with so much development work and creativity happening at a school level networks could help share good practice more effectively
- schools or individual teachers with relatively specialist expertise/interests/needs (e.g. those working in a special school with profoundly disabled pupils) may not have local counterparts meaning that a national network would be more appropriate.

On a related point, qualitative participants from the independent sector thought it would be beneficial to undertake more professional learning in conjunction with their peers in the maintained sector:

…the most beneficial thing you can do on any given year is go and observe your peers. It’s just the same kind of idea, albeit it a national level or a sector level, you know, any kind of sharing of experience I think can be so valuable.

Secondary teacher in an independent school

Barriers to accessing CLPL

As outlined in chapter 4, it was felt that individual teachers could disengage from the culture change in professional learning if they face barriers to participating in CLPL activities – as the heightened profile of professional learning has raised expectations, it makes it demoralising if barriers cannot be overcome.

It is therefore crucial to note that dissatisfaction with CLPL provision among teachers in the qualitative research mostly stemmed from facing practical barriers to access.
8.37 The main barriers identified by participants in the qualitative research were:

- the lack of supply cover – this was a key issue for all participants in the qualitative research; finding and paying for supply cover for short term absences was extremely difficult. (This was less of an issue in the independent sector).

- the cost of CLPL – while head teachers and LA representatives saw professional learning as a priority, it was one of many priorities and there were restrictions on the budget available at both a school and a local authority level. This meant that teachers were not able to participate in some of the CLPL activities that they wished to, or had to consider self-funding. Even if a teacher did want to self-fund, they were not always able to due to the cost of the course to them personally.

- a lack of time due to workloads – teachers at all levels felt the tensions of competing priorities – particularly a sense of guilt about their responsibility to other teachers and pupils if they took time out of the classroom for professional learning

  For me the big change in the past five years, it almost feels like a teaching cliché, is that absolutely the workload has increased and that inevitably then has an impact on something like PRD and how willing people are to kind of embrace that.

  Teacher (in an independent school)

  … there is no staff to cover me. You feel a bit responsible to the kids, also to the parents and your staff team.

  Teacher in promoted post

- some professional learning was increasingly only available as twilight or weekend sessions – while this was welcomed by some (as it was the only opportunity they would have to participate in CLPL due primarily to the lack of supply cover), others were concerned about access for those with childcare or other commitments

- issues of rurality – many of the barriers were greater in rural areas (such as difficulties in getting teachers together in one place, the time and cost of travel and, especially, the issue of supply cover).

8.38 Overall, 42% of survey respondents had experienced barriers to accessing appropriate professional learning opportunities in the last five years and, as shown in Figure 8.7, these reflected the feedback from the qualitative research.
8.39 However, it is very important to note that the proportion of survey respondents reporting that they faced barriers in accessing professional learning has greatly decreased in the last five years, from 68% in 2010 to 42% in 2015. So, while there are undoubtedly still some significant barriers to accessing professional learning, the situation has improved. This may be due in part to the wider understanding of the range of activities that professional learning can encompass meaning – if there are more options available, fewer barriers will be faced.

**SCQF level 11 learning**

8.40 Although the extent to which this was happening varied across Scotland, local authorities and universities had done a good deal of work to develop SCQF level 11 courses, both in terms of leadership programmes and developing accredited CLPL modules. However, for some there has been concern about the low level of uptake of the courses created and the extent to which teachers’ understand what SCQF level 11 learning involves.

8.41 In line with findings from the survey – just 22% knew ‘a fair amount’ or ‘a lot’ about opportunities to undertake professional learning at SCQF level 11 (Figure 8.8) – participants in the qualitative research had low levels of awareness of SCQF level 11 learning. Participants rarely distinguished between working towards a Masters degree and participating in CLPL that was accredited at SCQF level 11, suggesting they are not fully aware of the options available to them and they do not necessarily understand what SCQF level 11 accredited CLPL actually entails.
8.42 For the most part, non-promoted teachers in the qualitative research were not interested in undertaking SCQF level 11 learning, unless they were interested in moving into a promoted post. This was supported by the survey results: only a quarter had either undertaken, were currently undertaking or planned to undertake SCQF level 11 learning in the near future. This may be due to the lack of awareness, and misconceptions about what SCQF level 11 learning involves. There were a number of aspects to this:

- For many teachers in the qualitative research, completing SCQF level 11 learning was associated with moving up a leadership pathway and they felt this would take them away from the classroom – the reason they originally joined the profession.
- SCQF level 11 learning was thought to be time-consuming and unrealistic in the context of current workloads.
- There were concerns over the financial implications of undertaking SCQF level 11 learning. As teachers commonly thought that this referred to undertaking a full Masters qualification they assumed that this would be something they would have to self-fund.

8.43 Furthermore, even among those that were aware of SCQF level 11 learning, accreditation was not seen to be a priority in relation to which CLPL to undertake – it was more important that the course was of high quality and that the content was relevant. In the survey only 23% of respondents said that it was important that the professional learning they undertake has an accredited award attached.
Figure 8.9 Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about undertaking professional learning at SCQF level 11 (Masters level)?

![Pie chart showing the percentage of respondents for each statement.]

Base: All (6,048)

8.44 A third of survey respondents said they had faced barriers in accessing SCQF level 11 learning. The main barriers experienced were not having enough time to study and the financial cost (Figure 8.10).

Figure 8.10 What are the main barriers which prevent you from studying at SCQF level 11?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents facing each barrier.]

Base: All who face barriers accessing learning at SCQF level 11 (1,955)
CLPL in digital techniques for supporting learning

8.45 A recent literature review for the Scottish Government suggested that effective use of digital technologies could help to raise attainment in literacy and numeracy in the classroom and states that “more effective use of digital teaching to raise attainment happens when teachers are able to identify how digital tools and resources can be used to achieve improved learning outcomes, as well as having knowledge and understanding of the technology.” Therefore, it is important that professional learning in this area is available and working well.

8.46 In the qualitative research, using digital technologies to support learning was not spontaneously raised as a professional learning priority by any of the teachers who participated. This could suggest that more should be done to convince teachers of the benefits of participating in professional learning on this topic, particularly in the context of other competing priorities for CLPL e.g. GIRFEC, the new National Qualifications etc.

8.47 Most of the LA representatives reported that they did have professional learning available to support the use of digital technology in the classroom – often in connection with the use of handheld devices in the classroom.

8.48 However, many thought that this was an area that needed to be further developed. Further development was constrained to some extent by reduced LA resources and staffing but LA representatives also raised the issue that the IT infrastructure in schools was often not sufficient to allow effective use of digital technologies (e.g. Wi-Fi provision) and until that was improved it would be difficult to provide adequate training.

8.49 In the survey, two-thirds (64%) of respondents were aware of the opportunities available to them to access professional learning in using digital technologies to support learning and teaching – although this left a substantial minority who were not (34%). A similar proportion (67%) had actually accessed professional learning about the use of digital technologies (Figure 8.11).

In the past year, have you accessed professional learning in using digital technologies to support learning and teaching?

Among those who had accessed professional learning, it was most commonly undertaken through staff meetings (46%), reading (46%), face-to-face courses (40%), and eLearning (38%) (Figure 8.12) and provided by the school/establishment (54%) or the local authority (47%).

While 80% of those who had undertaken CLPL on this topic had put it into practice, only 66% felt confident doing so. The majority of those who had implemented their professional learning thought it had been successful (79%).
In terms of using digital technology to deliver professional learning more generally, 29% of respondents had participated in eLearning in the last year (see Figure 8.3 for more details).

This might suggest that use of digital technology is limited, but this may be obscured by the question wording and teachers interpretation of digital learning – for example, 81% of respondents said that they participated in professional reading, the vast majority of these people will be accessing that reading material online. In the qualitative research, LA representative mentioned that teachers were using Google Scholar to access articles and one teacher mentioned that in her school they had created a CLPL reading area within a common drive in the system.

This could also apply to many of the different types of professional learning activities listed in Figure 8.3 – LA CPD course, networking, national CPD course, private provider course, collaborative spaces etc.

Participants in the qualitative research who mentioned online courses were fairly indifferent. One felt that the online courses provided by their local authority were adequate (if a little basic); while another mentioned that their personal preference was to participate in face-to-face training.

*I haven’t had any face-to-face discussion or dialogue [as part of the course] and that I found quite unsettling, you haven’t had something that is grounded to say it’s that person that’s assessing this and here’s the thinking behind it.*

Primary teacher

*There is quite a lot of online training, which well I wouldn’t say I’m a huge fan of it, but at times it works reasonably well.*

Secondary teacher

However, there was some evidence of teachers using digital methodologies in less traditional ways which were viewed much more positively. These included:

- using massive open online courses (MOOCs) through Coursera
- sharing research and practice through networks on Facebook
- accessing reading materials on Twitter and Facebook
- watching Ted Talks.

*Technology has made us more aware of what’s going on in other schools, in other areas and authorities. We can look on Twitter and see amazing practice going on somewhere else and want to know about it.*

Primary teacher
Ted Talks and things are always good, you will use them at staff CPDs and things just to hone in on an area and then put them on the common drive so they’re there for staff to dip into.

Depute head teacher

8.57 Overall, there is evidence that professional learning is available for teachers who want to develop their skills in using digital technology to support learning and teaching. However, this is still an area that requires further development and local authorities require more support to do so.

8.58 It is also believed that in order for further development to be successful, further investment is required in schools’ IT infrastructure.

8.59 As with CLPL as a whole, there needs to be a greater emphasis on the range of digital CLPL activities beyond narrow definition of ‘online courses’. It seems that, while there is a place for online courses, one of the most effective uses of digital technology in delivering professional learning, is to encourage collaborative working – whether that is through a national network for teachers with specialist skills or by using Twitter as a forum to share best practice.

Supply teachers

8.60 Findings about supply teachers from the survey are highlighted where relevant in the report but are in general are more negative than other types of teachers. To supplement this we also undertook six depth interviews to explore the issues around supply teachers in more detail – one working in special schools, two working in primary schools and three working in secondary schools.

8.61 All felt that it was difficult for them to access professional learning opportunities – a feeling that was exacerbated if they were working short term contracts across a number of schools rather than longer-term contracts.

There’s quite honestly very little opportunity as a supply teacher, you really do feel incredibly isolated.

Secondary, supply teacher

8.62 It is also important to acknowledge that there were some supply teachers working in circumstances that meant they were not fully motivated to engage in professional learning.

8.63 Supply teachers faced a number of barriers when it came to accessing professional learning:

- **Low awareness of what is available** – unless they were working in the school at the time, they had no way of knowing when a school was running CLPL activities or what professional learning would be available on in-service days.
• **Low involvement with in-school CLPL** – even when they were aware of in-school CLPL activities, it did not necessarily mean that they would be invited to participate. This was often raised in relation to in-service days and courses but other forms of CLPL were also mentioned. Supply teachers felt there was little chance for them to shadow other teachers or observe good practice, or even to participate in professional dialogue because they were often not invited to department meetings.

• **Harder to access LA opportunities** – if they were between contracts, or only doing the odd day here or there, and did not have a school email address, it was harder for them to access the Glow system and they could not find out what was available at an LA level. Furthermore, there was a feeling that their LAs were not doing enough to provide CLPL tailored to the needs and working patterns of supply teachers.

• **Financial barriers** – supply teachers felt that, since they are paid only for their time in school (including a little time for preparation and marking), any CLPL they do is essentially unpaid. In addition, as there is no budget provided for supply teachers’ professional learning, if they wanted to complete a course they would have to pay for it themselves.

8.64 These barriers meant that supply teachers felt they had to be very pro-active in seeking out any CLPL opportunities – one even referred to feeling she had to “force her way in” to professional learning. A strong sense of ownership of their professional learning was essential; otherwise their personal development would be limited.

> I have had to hunt around and find ways of doing it. I have had to approach schools and say, ‘look, can I come to you on in-service days or can I come to some of your departmental meetings?’ to ensure that I’m keeping up with things.

Special schools, supply teacher

8.65 Another consequence of the difficulties that supply teachers faced was that they tended to feel like they were at risk of falling behind their permanently employed colleagues, particularly in terms of changes to the curriculum and associated terminology. It was felt that, as the pace of change had been challenging, it was getting hard for them to keep up. For example, one supply teacher said she was concerned about ensuring she had the appropriate teaching skills to adapt to the greater focus on literacy and numeracy.

8.66 A similar picture emerged in terms of accessing a PRD. It was common for supply teachers to report that they had to push to get a PRD meeting set up. For those who had had a PRD meeting, there were mixed experiences of it. While some found it a very useful, productive conversation, others felt that the reviewer

---

23 It is important to note that these interviews only covered six local authorities and while this message was consistent across all of the supply interviews it does not necessarily mean that it applies to all local authorities.
saw it as an obligation to fulfil rather than making a real attempt to help them assess their professional learning needs and plan their personal development.

**Key areas for consideration**

- Look at options to deal with the shortage of supply cover
- Supporting the development of more professional networks across Scotland
- Raising awareness of different options for SCQF level 11 and why teaching staff should undertake learning at this level
9 Professional Review and Development

9.1 The TSF review highlighted the importance of PRD in ensuring that CLPL is effective and well-managed.

9.2 It recommended a revision of the GTCS Professional Standards to reflect a greater level of teacher professionalism— including a new Standard to clarify expectations for professional learning. These have been developed by the GTCS alongside Professional Update which aims to:

- maintain and improve the quality of our teachers as outlined in the relevant Professional Standards and to enhance the impact that they have on pupils' learning.
- support, maintain and enhance teachers' continued professionalism and the reputation of the teaching profession in Scotland.

9.3 This chapter explores what is working well in PRD, including the GTCS Standards and Professional Update, and the challenges that remain.

What’s working well?

Availability of PRD

9.4 Teachers, for the most part, are going through a PRD process – the majority of survey respondents (76%) had taken part in a formal PRD meeting in the last 12 months. There was a feeling among those in the qualitative research that PRDs had been happening more over the last few years than they had in the past.

9.5 Participants from independent schools felt that there may have been a particularly marked change within that sector. In addition to the changes instigated by TSF, they highlighted the role of the Scottish Council of Independent Schools in supporting professional learning.

I think the emphasis has changed a lot in the last five to ten years, you’re now given a support network and far more opportunities to go away and develop and do training and do courses and be reviewed. Looking back at the first ten years, I was thrown into positions; just, “there you go get on with it”.

I agree with that, I didn’t have a professional review meeting until two years ago, in all my career, it just hadn’t happened. Firstly, I had a lot of support when I was in the maintained sector but when I moved into the independent sector […] it was sink or swim, there was no mention of anything other than just ‘get in and get on with it’.

[...] I just took that as a standard, you get an annual review and those mechanisms should be and are in place. So, it’s really interesting to hear round the table that, not so very long ago, that wasn’t the case.

Teachers from the independent sector
While there had been improvement in the availability of PRD overall, it was much less common for temporary and supply staff to have had a PRD meeting in the last 12 months than permanent staff (57% of temporary staff and 43% of supply staff, compared with 81% of permanent staff). As noted previously, supply teachers in the qualitative research commented that, if they wished to engage in PRD, they had to actively seek out a formal meeting to discuss their professional learning needs.

### Improvements to PRD

Participants in the qualitative research, particularly LA representatives and national stakeholders, saw improvement to PRD as one of the main benefits of Teaching Scotland’s Future.

This was due to four key outcomes:

- a greater focus on professional learning in general. It was thought that this increased focus meant that teaching staff were engaging more with CLPL and had a better understanding of the range of activities that professional learning can encompass (see section 8.11).

- a greater sense of ownership of professional learning among individual teachers. Within the context of wider school, LA and national priorities, it was common for teachers to feel that they were able to drive the direction of their professional learning activities.

- better evidencing of CLPL activities. LA representatives and teachers in promoted posts commonly felt that this encouraged greater accountability among teachers for their professional learning activities. Teachers appreciated the opportunity for greater recognition of the time and effort they spent on CLPL, particularly if on the path to leadership.

- an increased focus on measuring impact on pupils. It was felt that the emphasis of PRD discussions has changed from what professional learning activities will be undertaken to the impact of those activities will be, mainly driven by the introduction of Professional Update. While the focus on impact has increased, and its importance is recognised, there were still concerns about whether teachers have been given enough guidance on how to measure impact.

> When I first started I kind of viewed CPD as things I was interested in finding out more about [...] I had a handbook and I would sit and flick through it: ‘oh, that sounds interesting’, ‘oh, that sounds nice’ [...] just recently, I’ve become a lot more focused with my CPD and thinking [...] what are my gaps? What do I need to address? [...] you’re linking it into the school improvement plan, what your school needs are.

Primary teacher

> I do honestly think it’s sort of in the last five years, that people come back and they actually want to do something with the course that they have been on, they want to see that they are actually having an impact
in school. [...] Even people who didn't do it in the past, it's the whole culture has changed a bit.

Secondary teacher

If somebody does come in and say to me, 'oh I just want to read a couple of books over the next year on leadership'. I would say well what difference is it making, as good as that might be, what difference is that going to make to raising the attainment with your young people?

Head teacher

Responsibility for PRD

9.9 As noted above, individual teachers in the qualitative research felt much greater ownership of their professional learning. While their responsibility for directing their professional development was acknowledged, having the support of their line manager and the opportunity to discuss and receive advice on their professional learning was much appreciated. This was reflected in the survey results as well.

9.10 Overall, 91% of respondents felt that they made their own decisions about their professional learning (either on their own or in discussion with their line manager) (Figure 9.1).

Figure 9.1 Teachers have different amounts of involvement in deciding what professional learning they undertake. Which of the following statements best describes your situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I make decisions about my professional learning on my own</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make decisions about my professional learning in discussion with my line manager</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My line manager makes most of the decisions about my professional learning on my behalf</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My line manager makes all of the decisions about my professional learning on my behalf</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All (5,785)
New GTCS Standards

9.11 Survey respondents reported making use of the new Standards to guide their professional learning: only 7% had not used any of the Standards. It was most common for teachers to use either the Standard for CLPL (54%) or the Standard for Full Registration (52%).

9.12 A more detailed breakdown (Figure 9.2) shows a number of areas where the use of Standards could be increased:

- Class teachers are using the Standards less than any other teacher group suggesting more could be done to encourage use of the Standards among those in non-promoted posts, including which Standards they should be using.
- There did not appear to be much evidence of teachers using the Standards to reflect on their next career step, rather they tended to use the Standards that applied to their current position. For example, there was little use of the Middle Leaders Standard among class teachers or the Head teachers Standard among PTs or DHTs.

Figure 9.2 Which, if any, of the following GTCS Professional Standards have you used to guide your professional learning?

Participants in the qualitative research viewed using the different GTCS Standards as a basis for PRD discussions as beneficial for two reasons. First, the Standards provide a good starting point for staff to reflect critically on their practice in preparation for the PRD meeting and, second, they help teachers to map the professional learning they have undertaken (or are planning to undertake) to outcomes.
…we [she and her depute head] took over in 2011. At that point the PRDs were, even at that point, ‘Well how’s things? How are you going? What are your challenges? What course do you want to do?’ You know, we were still a wee bit naive at that point. But, very soon, within a year we had adapted the paperwork, I was making sure they had copies of the Standard for Registration. Getting them to try before they came for their PRD to look at the standards and assess themselves against it.

Head teacher

Better PRD discussions

9.14 Survey respondents found their last formal PRD meeting valuable – 67% thought that their last PRD meeting was ‘very useful’ or ‘fairly useful’ (Figure 9.3).

Figure 9.3 Thinking back to the last formal PRD meeting you had, how useful was it?

9.15 In addition to the perception that GTCS Standards were improving the quality of PRD discussions, there was a more general sense from participants in the qualitative research that conversations about professional learning, both in the formal PRD setting and informal meetings, were more useful than they had been previously.

9.16 This was thought to be due to a greater degree of self-reflection from the individuals involved and that discussions were part of a continuing process of review and development, rather than just an annual event – although there were mixed views on this issue (see section 9.23). Just under two-thirds (62%) of survey respondents who had a PRD meeting thought ‘PRD feels like an on-going process rather than a stand-alone meeting’ (Figure 9.4).
Three-quarters of those who have ever had a PRD meeting (76%) agreed that “I know where to find the relevant information and materials I need to enable me to engage in PRD”. The PRD resources provided by GTCS on their website were often praised – advice on using the Standards for self-evaluation was commonly cited as an example.
Predictors of confidence in skills

9.18 Statistical analysis was conducted to explore the variables that best predict if teachers feel confident that they have the skills they need for their current role.

9.19 The strongest predictor was agreement with the statement ‘I have developed a plan for my career-long professional learning’. Other factors that made a respondent more confident in their skills were agreement that PRD feels like an ongoing process rather than a stand-alone meeting, having had mentoring/coaching in the last 12 months and working in a secondary school.

9.20 Other variables included in the model were the demographic variables, experiences of other forms of professional learning, whether they had had a PRD in the last 12 months, how useful PRD was, the extent to which colleagues provided mentoring/coaching for their professional learning, whether they had experienced barriers to accessing CLPL, whether they were satisfied with the CLPL available to them, the extent to which they are involved in making decisions about their professional learning, having leadership opportunities.

What are the challenges?

9.21 While participants in the qualitative research were generally positive about the changes that had been made to PRD and the greater focus and accountability that brings, the survey results suggest that there is still some way to go in ensuring that teachers are satisfied with the process. Less than half of respondents (46%) were satisfied with the PRD process that was made available to them (Figure 9.5).

---

24 The analysis was conducted using Logistic Regression, for full technical details please see Appendix E.

25 Sex, sector (primary, secondary etc.), full-time vs. part-time, permanent vs. temporary employment, rurality of school, school type (independent vs. local authority), age, position and number of years’ experience.

26 National CPD course, Local Authority CPD course, Teacher Union/Professional Association events/courses, Private provider course, Internal/school-organised activity, Peer observation, Shadowing, Accredited study (below SCQF 11/Masters level), Accredited study (SCQF 11/Masters level), Accredited study, E learning, Collaborative spaces, Professional enquiry/teacher-led research, Good practice visit, Networking, Group discussion, Reading, Using digital technologies to support learning and teaching, Learning Rounds, Teacher Learning community and Teacher research.
Figure 9.5 How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the PRD process which has been made available to you?

9.22 The question wording refers specifically to the PRD process, which could suggest the dissatisfaction may be related to the main criticisms of the PRD process which were connected to the bureaucratic elements and how this impacted on the quality of the discussion:

- There was a perception that the new PRD process resulted in increased burden, particularly in the way that CLPL activities were recorded. This was most commonly raised by those who considered themselves already engaged with professional learning and acting in a self-reflective way.
- Another concern was that online recording had moved the focus from face-to-face discussions to completing forms – which had resulted in a primarily ‘tick-box’.
- Some felt that moving from paper to online recording of CLPL activities had led to a duplication of effort as they were still writing everything down as they went along.

9.23 However, there were other aspects of PRD that may have led to dissatisfaction that were not administrative. As previously noted, there were mixed views on the extent to which PRD was an on-going process. For those who disagreed, the main concern was around a lack of follow-up on the PRD plan and objectives they had set, and the absence of on-going feedback throughout the year. While some felt that this was down to a lack of time and increasing workloads, others were concerned that line managers providing PRD meetings lacked the necessary coaching skills to deliver effective feedback.

9.24 Participants from independent schools felt that it could be difficult to find a suitably qualified individual to undertake PRD discussions for head teachers
working in that sector (and sign-off their professional update). In some cases there may be an appropriately experienced person on the school’s Board of Governors but this may not always be the case.

Key areas for consideration

- Better provision of PRD support for supply teachers
- Encouraging the development of mentoring and coaching skills
10 Mentoring and coaching

10.1 The TSF report stated that “Mentoring is central to professional development at all stages in a teacher’s career and all teachers should see themselves as mentors not just of students and newly qualified teachers but more generally. The required skills should be developed and refreshed through initial teacher education, induction and CPD." In addition, the review advised that “...every teacher will be engaged in professional dialogue with peers. Mentoring and coaching skills enable much more effective dialogue and learning to take place within groups of teachers and with stakeholders and partners.”

10.2 This section explores mentoring and coaching in the context of CLPL for teachers. Mentoring during student placements and probation is discussed separately in the Probation chapter section 6.12.

What's working well?

Increased mentoring and coaching activity

10.3 There has been a substantial increase in the number of teachers participating in mentoring/coaching since 2010. When asked ‘Which professional learning activities have you participated in during the last full academic year?’, 37% of all teachers in the 2015 survey said they had participated in mentoring/coaching, compared with 20% in the 2010 survey.

10.4 The findings also suggest that teachers’ are finding it beneficial. The more that teachers had received mentoring/coaching support, the more they felt it had a positive impact on their practice: most of those who said they had received ‘a great deal’ reported that it had ‘a great deal’ of impact on their practice; those that had received ’a fair amount’ said that it had a ‘fair amount’ of impact; and those that had ‘a little’ said it had ‘a little’ impact.

10.5 Participants in the qualitative research also indicated that they had found mentoring/coaching from colleagues helpful. In addition, they felt that acting as a mentor/coach benefited them, as well as the recipient, as it encouraged them to reflect on their own practice.

Links with leadership and increased provision of professional learning opportunities

10.6 There were also indications from the qualitative research of an increased interest in, and increased provision of, professional learning opportunities to develop mentoring and coaching skills. This is driven, in part, by the increased focus on leadership. Participants (head teachers and deputes in particular), saw mentoring and coaching as one of the key components of leadership and, when

---

27 TSF, 2010 p.98
28 Ibid. p.73
talking about developing their leadership skills, they often talked about training in mentoring and coaching.

10.7 Class teachers who were mentors to students and probationers also linked mentoring and coaching with leadership – seeing their mentoring/coaching role as a form of leadership.

10.8 LA leadership programmes often included mentoring and coaching modules and several LA representatives identified mentoring and coaching as one of their priorities for development.

What are the challenges?

Mentoring/coaching still not widespread

10.9 However, despite the increase in activity and interest in developing mentoring and coaching skills, there is still a long way to go before all teachers see themselves as mentors and all teachers are benefitting from mentoring.

10.10 When asked ‘To what extent do your colleagues provide mentoring/coaching support for your professional learning?’, most teachers\(^{29}\) (61%) indicated that they were receiving little or no mentoring: 15% said ‘not at all’, 47% ‘a little’, 30% ‘a fair amount’ and 8% ‘a great deal’. There was little difference by grade although depute head teachers were slightly more likely to be receiving it: 49% said ‘a fair amount’/‘a great deal’ compared with 38% overall. The qualitative research suggests they are receiving it from their head teachers. Supply teachers were least likely to be receiving it: 38% said ‘not at all’ compared with 15% overall.

10.11 Moreover, only a third of class teachers currently see themselves as a mentor/coach to their colleagues (Figure 10.1). This compares with 77% of principal teachers, 92% of depute head teachers and 96% of head teachers.

10.12 It is worth noting that more teachers felt they had the skills to mentor/coach than were currently seeing themselves this way. So, although opportunities to increase mentoring/coaching skills are required, there is already a degree of untapped potential.

\(^{29}\) The figures do not include probationers
Different interpretations of mentoring and coaching

10.13 One of the issues to emerge from the qualitative research, which may partly explain why more teachers don’t see themselves as mentors, is a lack of a shared understanding of what constitutes ‘mentoring’ and ‘coaching’. Some saw mentoring and coaching as something that teachers who are more senior and experienced would do with staff for whom they have a line management responsibility (e.g. head teachers with depute head teachers, principal teachers with non-promoted teachers), or something that more experienced teachers would do with students, probationers and early career teachers. In other words, it is something that a more experienced/senior teacher does with a less experienced teacher – rather than something that peers would do with each other or that less experienced teachers would do with more experienced colleagues. This somewhat hierarchical perception of mentoring and coaching may be perpetuated by the fact that many mentoring and coaching courses are linked with leadership programmes or are aimed at student/probationer supporters.

10.14 At the opposite end of the spectrum, there was a view that almost any professional dialogue equated to ‘mentoring’ and ‘coaching’. The potential problem with this interpretation is that it misses a crucial aspect of the TSF report point about professional dialogue – which was not that professional dialogue is mentoring or coaching but that “mentoring and coaching skills enable much more effective dialogue and learning”. Teachers with this interpretation were therefore less likely to reflect on the mentoring/coaching skills aspect of different forms of professional dialogue or to be consciously trying to develop their skills in this area.
Key area for consideration

- Develop a common understanding of what mentoring and coaching is within the profession
- Raising awareness of the benefits of coaching and mentoring skills for ALL teachers
11 Leadership

11.1 Along with supporting and strengthening the quality of teaching, the TSF report identified supporting and strengthening the quality of leadership as “the two most important and achievable ways in which school education can realise the high aspirations Scotland has for its young people”\(^{30}\). Recommendations related to leadership include clearer pathways to senior management and improvements to the quality of professional learning opportunities relating to leadership – especially for head teachers.

What’s working well?

Sharpened focus on leadership

11.2 Although there was already a considerable focus on leadership prior to TSF, it has increased further. In addition to TSF, this can also be attributed to the need to adapt to CfE and other significant changes (see also section 4.13) and to continued problems with the shortage of applicants for head teacher positions.

11.3 Participants in the qualitative research felt that newly qualified teachers were more aware of, and more interested in, the leadership aspects of the role than previous generations.

…and newly qualified teachers that we’re getting in, are also of a different mind-set, because there’s this whole idea of leadership and leadership learning, they’ve come here for that, they’re quite happy to do that.

Principal teacher

Increased professional learning opportunities in leadership

11.4 The evidence from the qualitative research was that teachers are becoming increasingly aware of professional learning opportunities in leadership. The survey shows that awareness increased steeply by grade: only 27% of probationers said they were ‘very aware’ or ‘aware’ of professional learning opportunities to develop their leadership skills, compared with 43% of class teachers, 69% of principal teachers and 91% of depute head teachers and head teachers.

11.5 Participants in the qualitative research talked about there being more opportunities for teachers to take a lead on projects/initiatives in school and in sharing practice on pedagogy and curricular expertise. Again, this was driven in part by necessity, including the need to adapt to major changes and the reduction, in many schools, of the numbers of promoted posts. However, it was also driven by head teachers’ desire to encourage distributive leadership and to develop the leadership skills of their staff.

---

\(^{30}\) TSF, 2010 p.2
Because you do have that jump from an un-promoted staff, you don’t have that PT in the middle, the kind of faculty there, I think staff, younger staff, are much more conscious that they need to be looking at opportunities and upskilling themselves, because it is that much bigger jump as well.

Secondary head teacher

Clearer leadership pathways

11.6 Participants agreed that the introduction of the new GTCS Standards for Leadership and Management (which comprise the Standard for Middle Leaders and the Standard for Head Teachers) had helped clarify the pathway for formal leadership positions and use of these Standards was high among those in the most senior positions. Almost all head teachers surveyed had used the Standard for Head Teachers and almost all depute head teachers had used either the Standard for Head Teachers or the Standard for Middle Leaders.

11.7 However, there is scope to increase the use of the Standard for Middle Leaders among principal teachers – particularly in secondary schools: 82% of principal teachers in primary schools and 65% in secondary schools had used them. (A very few in both sectors had also used the Standard for Head Teachers).

11.8 While 82% of all those who had used the Standards for Leadership and Management found them ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ helpful, principal teachers in secondary schools were slightly less positive (72% found them ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ helpful). Those in the independent sector were also less positive (64% found them ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ helpful).

Improved CLPL opportunities for head teachers

11.9 The TSF report recommended improvements to the quality of professional learning opportunities relating to leadership, especially for head teachers, and while the views on the current provision of CLPL for head teachers were mixed (43% were satisfied and 23% were dissatisfied), respondents did feel that both the range and the number of high quality opportunities had increased over the past five years (see Figures 11.1 and 11.2). While these questions were about CLPL in general, it was clear from the qualitative research that leadership skills were the main focus for head teachers’ own CLPL.

---

31 Whether the Standard for Middle Leaders or the Standard for Head Teachers or both
11.10 In the qualitative research, head teachers talked positively about the benefits of headship qualifications (both the previous Scottish Qualification for Headship and the new Into Headship qualification), particularly in relation to learning about theories of leadership and then applying the theory to their own practice. Some also felt they were benefitting from the increased focus on leadership among their colleagues.

11.11 In addition to their role as leaders within their own school, head teachers also saw involvement in local and national working groups as opportunities to develop their leadership skills.
What are the challenges?

Understanding of leadership

11.12 There was a lack of shared understanding about the different forms of leadership. Some class teachers equated leadership with career advancement rather than seeing it more broadly in terms of leading pieces of work or aspects of the curriculum. These teachers therefore felt that there were limited opportunities for class teachers to develop leadership skills within their existing roles. The emphasis on promoted posts is perhaps exacerbated by the focus on leadership pathways and the new Standard for Middle Leaders and Standard for Headship, and the fact that many leadership programmes are aimed at head teachers or aspiring head teachers.

I'm fascinated by the whole idea that everybody is a leader, because leaders of what? You'll be a leader of pupil learning and a leader of developing the curriculum and a leader of the pedagogy that you demonstrate in your class. But, this discussion that takes place about "we're all leaders in this collegiate system", I think we're getting away from the sense that [in] some way the Head Teacher runs the school whether we like it or not.

Depute head teacher

11.13 This lack of a shared understanding about the different forms of leadership led to disagreements regarding the extent to which taking a lead on projects/initiatives constitutes a genuine leadership opportunity. For example, some felt that situations where teachers were given responsibility for a task or a piece of work, where the outcome and the means of achieving it were prescribed from the start, were being erroneously described as ‘leadership’ opportunities. This issue was raised both by the teachers who were being given these opportunities and by senior staff who felt that teachers were sometimes ‘inflating’ experiences by describing them as leadership when they were not (e.g. in PRDs).

Yes, I've got a member of staff, for instance, who has taken on [...] a lot of reading into autism and dealing with people on the autistic spectrum. She put that down as being 'leadership and management' because she eventually would like to go into a leadership role and sees that as something she would need [...] I'm seeing that as a professional development in other ways. [...] But, it's not leadership; it's not leading for leadership and reflecting on leadership.

Teachers in promoted posts

Learning from leadership experiences

11.14 While class teachers often had experience of leading pieces of work, in the qualitative research, they talked much less about reflecting on those experiences in terms of leadership skills or consciously using the opportunities to develop their skills. There was a sense in which they were ‘just doing it’.
11.15 Related to this, there was a concern raised by class teachers that these opportunities were often short-term and there was a lack of feedback or review afterwards. It was felt that guidance was needed on how opportunities can be extended, or joined up, so that leadership skills can be more fully developed in the longer-term.

**Head teacher specific barriers**

11.16 Some teachers in the qualitative research expressed concerns about the equity of access to head teacher positions because of barriers to achieving the new Into Headship qualification. These related to the time commitment required to complete a Masters level qualification while practicing as a class teacher/depute head teacher and to the cost. This is particularly pertinent as the Into Headship qualification will become mandatory in 2018-2019\(^{32}\). There was a worry that this will exacerbate the shortage of applicants for head teacher positions.

**Knowledge of the main new initiatives related to leadership**

11.17 Participants agreed that the introduction of the new GTCS Standards for Leadership and Management had helped clarify the pathway for formal leadership positions and use of these Standards was high among those in the most senior positions. Almost all head teachers surveyed had used the Standard for Head Teachers and almost all depute head teachers had used either the Standard for Head Teachers or the Standard for Middle Leaders.

11.18 However, there is scope to increase the use of the Standard for Middle Leaders among principal teachers – particularly in secondary schools: 82% of principal teachers in primary schools and 65% in secondary schools had used them. (A very few in both sectors had also used the Standard for Head Teachers).

11.19 While 82% of all those who had used the Standards for Leadership and Management found them ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ helpful, principal teachers in secondary schools were slightly less positive (72% found them ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ helpful). Those in the independent sector were also less positive (64% found them ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ helpful).

**Key areas for consideration**

- Improving understanding of the different forms of leadership
- Encouraging class teachers to reflect more on experiences of leading initiatives and more actively use the experiences to develop leadership skills.

\(^{32}\) The exception to this is anyone who has successfully achieved and been awarded the Standard for Headship through the Scottish Qualification for Headship or the Flexible Route to Headship, or is an existing head teacher.
12 National and LA support

12.1 The TSF Report set out a number of ambitious goals for the development of teacher education in Scotland. These goals have implications for not just for the teaching profession but for the organisations that provide it with support. This chapter looks at perceptions of support from national bodies and LAs.

What’s working well?

Support from national bodies

12.2 There was agreement across all participant groups that the support provided by national bodies was effective and that the Scottish Government’s engagement with Teaching Scotland’s Future was good. LA representatives highlighted positive experiences of face-to-face visits from officers at both Education Scotland and GTCS as examples of this support, while teachers more commonly cited the resources available to them to assist them in their PRD preparations.

Figure 12.1 Overall, how would you rate what is available from national bodies (e.g. GTCS, Education Scotland, Scottish College for Educational Leadership) on the following aspects of support for professional learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very good/good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Very poor/poor</th>
<th>Don’t know/prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being a source of up to date information, advice and guidance about professional learning</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing learning materials</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively promoting professional learning opportunities for all teachers</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing courses</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking a coherent approach: ensuring other priorities and initiatives do not undermine professional learning</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing networking opportunities</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing opportunities to learn with other teachers</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All (5,821)

12.3 In the survey, the aspects of national support that were most highly rated were ‘being a source of up to date information’ (43% thought that this was ‘very good’/’good’) and ‘providing learning materials’ (42% thought that this was ‘very good’/’good’). The lowest rated elements were providing networking opportunities (23% thought that this was ‘very good’/’good’) and providing opportunities to learn with other teachers (20% thought that this was ‘very good’/’good’) (Figure 12.1).
12.4 Teachers in the qualitative research frequently singled out the GTCS and commented that the resources it provides have improved over the past five years or so – most often with reference to the updated Standards and the usability of their website. LA representatives and national stakeholders were also positive about the work of the GTCS in raising awareness of CLPL more generally.

12.5 While participants thought that there was still some way to go, there was a feeling among LA representative and national stakeholders that joined-up working among national bodies had improved.

12.6 However, participants also highlighted a number of areas where they felt that greater national collaboration would be of benefit:

- National investment in IT infrastructure to support e-portfolios and the use of MyGTCS.
- Having a national research strategy for education – it was felt that some of the academic research taking place was not relevant to current priorities.
- The problems caused by a lack of supply cover for professional learning appeared extensive and nationwide. There was a suggestion that, in order to deal with the issue effectively, a national approach was required.

Aspects of local authority support

12.7 While views on the support for professional learning provided by LA representatives were mixed, several aspects were thought to be working well. These included:

- provision of leadership programmes
- provision of principal teacher secondments from schools to the LA – thought to be beneficial in incorporating teachers' ‘front-line’ experience into LA CLPL activities (although some felt the opportunities could be better advertised)
- signposting of the CLPL activities available (although this was better in some LAs than others).
Overall, survey respondents were less positive about LA support than they were about support from national bodies (Figure 12.2). The highest ratings for LA support were in relation to providing courses (36% thought this was ‘very good’/’good’) and for actively promoting professional learning opportunities for all teachers (35% ‘very good’/’good’). Providing learning materials (24% ‘very good’/’good’) and taking a coherent approach (19% ‘very good’/’good’) were seen as the least effective aspects of LA support for professional learning.

What are the challenges?

Balance of national priorities

One of the concerns most commonly raised by those in the qualitative research was that there are currently too many priorities in education.

There is so much going on for national agenda just now, healthy working lives, BGE, new curriculum, Developing Scotland’s Young Workforce, the named person agenda, STEM, tracking and monitoring. I mean there’s CPD out there for everything.

And they are all high priority and that’s the thing out of all the things that you’ve mentioned there, they are all high priority. It’s not as if you can pick and choose one...

Secondary Principal Teachers

While teachers said they supported the principles underpinning almost all the policies, there was a feeling that not everything could be a priority. Teachers
often described feeling ‘overwhelmed’ by the number of initiatives and policies, and the impact that this had on their workload – they felt that there was simply not enough time to cover everything.

12.11 One of the perceived consequences of this was that, as teachers had to spend their CLPL time ‘getting to grips’ with all of the priorities, this left little time for them to cover anything else. This was an even greater concern for head teachers as they not only had to familiarise themselves with the issues, they then had to incorporate them into the school improvement plan and ensure that the information is disseminated to their staff.

12.12 Another consequence was the perceived impact on ITE. LA representatives often talked positively about new graduates’ knowledge of, and ability to adapt to, changes to education policy. However, there was a concern from teachers that in order to cover all of the different, emerging priorities in ITE, the focus on core ‘how to teach skill’ had lessened.

Signposting

12.13 Some participants felt that they could not comment on national support. This was due to the sheer volume of materials available from different national organisations, perceived duplication of guidance and advice (which, on occasion, was considered to be contradictory), and poor signposting to relevant information. As a result, they felt that they simply did not have the time to identify the best sources of support and did not know if there were any gaps in provision.

Loss of LA resources

12.14 Both teaching staff and LA representatives commented on the impact of reduced staff resources available in LA education departments:

- education officers had less time to develop as wide a range of CLPL activities as they would like (although this was mitigated to some degree by local authorities within some partnerships working together)
- more responsibilities were moving to individual head teachers, resulting in less time for them to participate in professional learning
- head teachers noted that senior education officers did not always have a background in education. There was a perception that this meant they did not have a full appreciation of the issues effecting schools.

12.15 While LA representatives felt that teachers had a greater focus on the impact of professional learning, they felt that the strategies used for measuring impact could be improved, particularly on a long-term basis. They felt that they were not able to provide this support due to the reduced staff resources available to them and that they required more national support on this issue.

Support for rural areas

12.16 Those working in rural LAs (particularly smaller ones) felt that national support for rural areas was vital as they do not have the same resources as larger local
authorities, yet they are more affected by some issues (e.g. shortage of supply
cover, lack of applicants for leadership positions). In addition, some logistical
issues relating to the provision of CLPL are also exacerbated by their geography
(e.g. how best to bring staff together, travel time and cost etc.). However, there
was a perception that national support was focused on the Central Belt and was
not sufficiently addressing the specific needs of rural areas – and so they were
not getting an equitable level of support.

Key areas for consideration

- The number of national ‘priorities’
- Better signposting to high quality resources
13 Conclusions

The context

13.1 Graham Donaldson’s 2010 review of teacher education took place at a time when governments across the world were reforming their education systems to address challenges arising from globalisation, societal change and technological development. The immediate context in Scotland was, and remains, Curriculum for Excellence. The opportunity offered – and the challenge posed – by CfE is that curriculum development, and transformational change at school and system level, will be driven by the professional capacity of teachers rather than through the central development of guidance and resources and external accountability.

13.2 The recommendations contained in Teaching Scotland’s Future were designed to build the capacity of the teaching profession to deliver this ambitious reform:

...long-term and sustained improvement which has a real impact on the quality of children’s learning will be better achieved through determined efforts to build the capacity of teachers themselves to take responsibility for their own professional development, building their pedagogical expertise, engaging with the need for change, undertaking well-thought through development and always evaluating impact in relation to improvement in the quality of children’s learning. That is the message from successful education systems across the world and that is the explicit philosophy upon which Curriculum for Excellence is based. Its ultimate success will depend partly on the extent to which teachers receive the kind of external support and encouragement which they need to build their professional capacity and, crucially, on how far the teaching profession itself rises to the challenge.\(^33\).

13.3 In the five years since TSF was published, there has been no let-up in the pace of change and implementation of the recommendations has taken place against a challenging background. In addition to CfE, teachers are adapting to, and implementing, significant new policies and initiatives including the new National Qualifications, GIRFEC and Raising Attainment for All. At the same time, resources (particularly LA resources) have been constrained; there are widespread problems obtaining supply cover; and recruitment of teachers in some geographic areas and subjects has become increasingly difficult. All of these issues have impacted on workloads.

A significant cultural shift

13.4 The teaching profession has risen to the challenge set out in TSF. The evaluation found evidence of real progress in many areas of teacher education and, above all, there has been a significant shift in the culture of professional learning. This shift in culture was demonstrated in four key areas of improvement described below.

\(^{33}\) TSF p.84
13.5 **Teachers are more engaged with professional learning.** Several inter-related aspects to this increased engagement: heightened awareness of the importance of professional learning; a move away from a conception of professional learning as ‘going on a course’ and a broader understanding of the range of professional learning activities; increased ownership by individual teachers’ of their CLPL; and an increased focus on learning relevant to a teacher’s own particular development needs.

13.6 There is a **greater focus on the impact of professional learning on pupils.** Decisions about what professional learning to undertake are now more likely to involve a consideration of the needs of the individual pupils that a teacher is working with.

13.7 There is a consensus that **teachers are engaging in professional dialogue more often** and that there has been a cultural shift towards more openness, sharing of experience and willingness to talk about pedagogy.

13.8 There is a **greater willingness to try new approaches.** One important marker of the change in culture is that a sizeable minority of teachers (41%) say that they try new teaching practices and strategies more often than they did five years ago (40% say they try them the same amount and 18% say they try them less often).

13.9 In addition to this cultural shift, there have been a number of specific improvements to teacher education at all stages.

13.10 At the ITE and early career stage, partnerships between LAs and universities have developed further, and support for students on placement and probationary teachers has improved.

13.11 In relation to CLPL, the proportion of teachers reporting that they face barriers in accessing professional learning has greatly decreased in the last five years, from 68% in 2010 to 42% in 2015. This is, in part, due to their increased participation in a wider range of different professional learning activities and, in particular, an increase in collaborative working and in-school activity.

13.12 There has also been a substantial increase in the number of teachers participating in mentoring/coaching and indications of an increased interest in, and increased provision of, professional learning opportunities to develop mentoring and coaching skills.

13.13 Although there was already a considerable focus on leadership prior to TSF, it has increased further and teachers (at all career stages) are more aware of opportunities to develop their leadership skills. The new GTCS Standard for Leadership and Management has helped clarify the pathway for formal leadership positions. Leadership skills are the main focus for head teachers’ CLPL and they reported that both the range and the number of high quality CLPL opportunities available to them have increased over the past five years.
On the path – but not there yet

13.14 However, there was widespread acknowledgement – across the teaching profession and among LA and national stakeholders – that there is a considerable way to go before the vision set out in TSF is fully realised. As one participant put it ‘the profession is on the path, but not there yet’.

13.15 The evaluation has identified a number of areas where further progress is required.

13.16 At the ITE and early career stage, the development of teachers would be enhanced by: further clarification and agreement of the respective roles of the school and the university in relation to joint assessment; improved communication between the university and the school on aspects of student placements; and the provision of additional support for probationers to further develop key pedagogical skills.

13.17 CLPL for class teachers could be improved by: increasing their awareness and involvement in LA/university partnerships; raising awareness of different options for SCQF level 11 learning; better PRD support for supply teachers; develop a shared understanding of what mentoring and coaching involve; increasing coaching and mentoring skills; and by encouraging teachers to reflect more on experiences of leading initiatives and more actively using the experiences to develop leadership skills.

13.18 CLPL for all teachers could be enhanced by better signposting to high quality resources and by the development of more professional networks. With so much creativity happening at a school level, networks could help share good practice more effectively and they would be particularly beneficial for those with relatively specialist expertise, interests or needs.

13.19 There are also two system-wide challenges that should be addressed. Firstly, the difficulties in obtaining supply cover due to a lack of available supply teachers: this is one of the main barriers to CLPL.

13.20 Secondly, the number of national ‘priorities’. One of the concerns most commonly raised was that there are currently too many priorities in education. This has a perceived impact on ITE (because of the need to cover all the different, emerging priorities which leaves less time for core pedagogical skills) and on CLPL more generally (because the impact on workloads reduced the time available for CLPL and some of the remaining CLPL time was spent ‘getting to grips’ with the priorities).

13.21 Some of these improvements will be easier to achieve than others and most will require the teaching profession, universities providing teacher education, LAs and national bodies to continue to work together. However, the significant progress that has already been made and the teaching profession’s engagement with professional learning provide a strong base. With the continued commitment and support of all stakeholders, the next five years should see the teaching
profession move further along the path and 'strengthen further its vital role in building Scotland’s future'.
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Appendix A – Online survey and topline results

Evaluation of the Implementation of Teaching Scotland’s Future
Teacher questionnaire
Version 1

Technical details

- This document comprises topline results from the 2015 Teaching Scotland’s Future Survey
- Results are based on a survey of 6,346 respondents conducted online
- Fieldwork dates: 14th September – 9th October 2015
- Through the topline a dash (-) denotes zero and an asterisk (*) denotes <0.5%
- Where results do not sum to 100%, this may be due to computer rounding, multiple responses, or the exclusion of “don’t know” categories.

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS

Q1 Are you male or female?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>5,647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 How old are you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>5,646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 Which teaching sector do you work in?
Secondary 44%
Primary 43%
Special School 5%
Early Years 2%
Local Authority (Centrally Employed) 2%
College 1%
University 1%
Other, please specify 2%
Prefer not to say *
Base 6,334

Q5 Which school sector do you work in?
Public Sector 91%
Independent 7%
Grant aided *
Other *
Not applicable 1%
Prefer not to say *
Base 6,346

Q6 How many years has it been since you completed your initial teacher education?
Less than 1 year 6%
Between 1 and 2 years 6%
Between 2 and 3 years 3%
Between 3 and 4 years 3%
Between 4 and 5 years 3%
Between 5 and 6 years 3%
Between 6 and 10 years 14%
Between 10 and 15 years 13%
Between 15 and 20 years 11%
Between 20 and 30 years 18%
Between 30 and 40 years 18%
More than 40 years 2%
Prefer not to say *
Base 6,346

Q7 How many years of teaching experience as a qualified teacher do you have (not including career breaks or maternity leave)?
Less than 1 year 7%
Between 1 and 2 years 6%
Between 2 and 3 years 3%
Between 3 and 4 years 3%
Between 4 and 5 years 3%
Between 5 and 6 years 4%
Between 6 and 10 years 14%
Between 10 and 15 years 15%
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Between 15 and 20 years 12%
Between 20 and 30 years 19%
Between 30 and 40 years 13%
More than 40 years 1%
Prefer not to say *
Base 6,346

Q8 What is your current position/grade?
Probationer teacher (teacher induction scheme) 4%
Probationer teacher (flexible route) *
Class teacher 61%
Acting Principal teacher/faculty head 1%
Principal teacher/faculty head 14%
Acting Depute Head teacher 1%
Depute Head teacher 5%
Acting Head teacher 1%
Head teacher 4%
ASN/behaviour/learning support 2%
LA staff (based centrally) 1%
Retired/no longer working as a teacher 1%
Seconded *
Supply teacher 2%
Teacher education 1%
Visiting/peripatetic/specialist teachers 1%
Other, please specify *
Prefer not to say 2%
Base 6,346

Q9 What is your current employment status?
Permanent full time 68%
Permanent part time/job share 13%
Probationer full time 4%
Probationer part time *
Temporary full time 6%
Temporary part time/job share 2%
Supply 5%
Retired *
Not currently teaching/on a career break *
No answer *
Other *
Prefer not to say *
Base: all 6,346
Q10 In which local authority is your school/establishment located?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen City Council</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire Council</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus Council</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll and Bute Council</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edinburgh Council</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackmannanshire Council</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comhairle nan Eilean Siar</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway Council</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ayrshire Council</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dunbartonshire Council</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lothian Council</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire Council</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkirk Council</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife Council</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City Council</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Council</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde Council</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian Council</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray Council</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ayrshire Council</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lanarkshire Council</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney Islands Council</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross Council</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire Council</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Borders Council</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland Islands Council</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ayrshire Council</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire Council</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling Council</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dunbartonshire Council</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian Council</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: all except those in independent sector*  5,154
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject/Curriculum Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Years</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy and Mathematics</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy and English</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy and Gaidhlig</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Languages</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as Additional Language</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious and Moral Education</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Studies</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Studies</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing Studies</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Education</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE/Guidance</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and Drama</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,642</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION B: INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION

Q12 Where did you undertake your Initial Teacher Education (ITE)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Aberdeen</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Dundee</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Glasgow</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Highland and Islands</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Stirling</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Strathclyde</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of West of Scotland</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Open University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other UK University</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European (Not UK) University</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all who completed ITE in the last 5 years 944

Q13 Thinking about your school placement during your Initial Teacher Education, how effective was the support given to you by the University to help you successfully complete the placement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither effective nor ineffective</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very ineffective</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All who completed ITE at a Scottish University 903 2,381 (all)

Q14 Thinking about your school placement during your Initial Teacher Education, how effective was the support given to you by the school to help you successfully complete the placement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither effective nor ineffective</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very ineffective</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all who completed ITE at a Scottish University 903 2,381 (all)
Q15 How useful did you find the following aspects of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) at university in preparing you for your first post as a teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Neither useful nor not useful</th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>Not at all useful</th>
<th>Not applicable/did not study this</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Studies (e.g. child development, psychology, curriculum development)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy/ approaches to learning and teaching</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject content</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflection</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional support needs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using digital technologies to support teaching and learning</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour Management</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection/ safeguarding</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with other relevant professionals</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all who completed ITE at a Scottish University (903)
Q16 Overall how effective do you think your Initial Teacher Education (ITE) at university was in preparing you for your first post as a teacher?

Very effective 10%
Effective 54%
Neither effective nor ineffective 15%
Ineffective 16%
Very ineffective 5%
Prefer not to say *

Base: all who completed ITE at a Scottish University 903

Q17 How did you undertake your probationary period?
Teacher Induction Scheme 98%
Flexible Route 2%
Prefer not to say -

Base: all those who completed ITE at a Scottish University 632

Q18 Thinking about your probationary period, how effective was the support given to you by the school/establishment to help you successfully achieve the Standard for Full Registration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither effective nor ineffective</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very ineffective</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All those who completed ITE at a Scottish University 632 2,381 (all)
Q19 Thinking about your probationary period, how effective were the following aspects of professional learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Neither effective nor ineffective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>Not applicable/ Was not available</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority provision of professional learning experiences</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based professional learning experiences</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The support provided by your mentor</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for self-study</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadowing/ learning with experienced teachers/teacher learning communities/learning rounds</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contact time</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with university staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further accredited study</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: all those who completed ITE at a Scottish University (632)*
Q20 During your probationary period, how effective was the professional learning you undertook in helping you achieve the GTCS Standard for Full Registration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither effective nor ineffective</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very ineffective</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all those who completed ITE in a Scottish University 632

Q21 Did you keep in touch with university staff during your probationary period?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - I didn’t know about the opportunity to keep in touch with university staff during my probationary period</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - I was not given the opportunity to keep in touch with university staff during my probationary period</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - I had the opportunity but didn’t choose to keep in touch</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all those who completed ITE at a Scottish University  634  1,184

Q22 Were you aware of there being a partnership between your local authority and a university (any) when you were undertaking your probationary period?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all those who completed ITE at a Scottish University and are not working in the independent sector 634

Q23 How well or poorly do you think the university and the local authority worked together to deliver your probationary period?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poorly</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all who were aware of a partnership between their local authority and university during probation 113
SECTION C: PROFESSIONAL REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT

Q24 Have you had a formal Professional Review and Development (PRD) meeting within the last 12 months?
Yes 76%
No 22%
Prefer not to say 1%
*Base: all except probationers 6,056

Q25 When was the last time you had a formal PRD meeting?
Within the last 1-2 years 24%
Within the last 2-3 years 23%
3-5 years ago 13%
More than 5 years ago 9%
Never 22%
Not applicable 9%
Prefer not to say *
*Base All those who had a PRD meeting in the last 12 months 1,272

Q26 Thinking back to the last formal PRD meeting you had, how useful was it?
Very useful 18%
Fairly useful 49%
Not very useful 24%
Not at all useful 8%
Don't know 1%
Prefer not to say *
*Base: all those who have ever had a PRD 5,711

These next questions are about the whole PRD process, not just the formal PRD meetings

Q27 To what extent do you think that participating in the PRD process improves your ability to self-evaluate against the relevant GTCS standard?
A great deal 15%
A fair amount 41%
Just a little 28%
Not at all 13%
Don't know 3%
Prefer not to say *
*Base: all who have ever had a PRD 5,710

Q28 How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the PRD process which has been made available to you?
Very satisfied 9%
Satisfied 37%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 33%
Dissatisfied 14%
Very dissatisfied 5%
Don't know 1%
Prefer not to say 1%
*Base: all who have ever had a PRD 5,710
Q29 How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the PRD process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know where to find the relevant information and materials I need to enable me to engage in professional review/development</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have developed a plan for my career-long professional learning</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRD feels like an on-going process rather than a stand-alone meeting</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: all who have ever had a PRD (5,710)*
Q30 Which ‘if any’ of the following GTCS Professional Standards have you used to guide your professional learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Standard for Provisional Registration</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Standard for Full Registration</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Standard for Career-long Professional Learning</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Standard for Leadership and Management (Middle Leaders)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Standard for Leadership and Management (Head teachers)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 6,346

SECTION D: MENTORING

Q31 To what extent do you see yourself as a mentor/coach (formal or informal) to colleagues who are not students or probationers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair amount</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all except probationers 6,045

Q32 To what extent do you feel the mentoring/coaching (formal or informal) you have provided has had a positive impact on your colleagues’ practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair amount</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all those who see themselves as a mentor at least ‘a little’ 5,232

Q33 To what extent do your colleagues provide mentoring/coaching support for your professional learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair amount</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all except probationers 6,017
Q34 To what extent has the mentoring/coaching support you received from other colleagues had a positive impact on your practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair amount</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all who receive mentoring/coaching to support professional learning 5,123

Q35 To what extent do feel you have the skills to mentor/coach colleagues who are not students or probationers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair amount</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all except probationers 5,995
**SECTION E: CAREER LONG PROFESSIONAL LEARNING**

**Q36 How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am encouraged to try new approaches in my professional practice</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel supported to try new approaches in my professional practice</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regularly try new approaches to improve my professional practice</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regularly adapt my own practice following professional reflection</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I collaborate with colleagues to try new ways of teaching</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable experimenting with new approaches even if they might not work</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would know how to evaluate the impact of the new approaches that I try</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base (6,158)*
Q37 In your professional practice, do you try new teaching practices and strategies more or less often than you did around 5 years ago?
I try new teaching practices…
Much more often now 19%
A little more often now 21%
About the me amount 40%
A little less often now 13%
Much less often now 5%
Prefer not to say 1%
Base: all who completed ITE more than 5 years ago 5,202

Q38 And in general, do you feel teachers in schools are willing to try new approaches more or less often than they did around 5 years ago?
Teachers try new approaches….  
Much more often now 17%
A little more often now 27%
About the me amount 31%
A little less often now 11%
Much less often now 5%
Prefer not to say 1%
Don’t know 7%
Base: all who completed ITE more than 5 years ago 5,193

Q39 Overall, how confident are you that …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...you have the skills needed for your current role</th>
<th>Very confident</th>
<th>Fairly confident</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Fairly unconfident</th>
<th>Very unconfident</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...you have the pedagogical knowledge needed to work effectively in your current role</th>
<th>Very confident</th>
<th>Fairly confident</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Fairly unconfident</th>
<th>Very unconfident</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base (6,122)

Q40 How aware are you of the professional learning opportunities available to you?
Very aware 26%
Aware 57%
Not very aware 15%
Not aware at all 2%
Don’t know 1%
Prefer not to say *
Base 6,116
Q41 Which professional learning activities have you participated in during the last full academic year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National CPD course</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority CPD course</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Union/Professional Association events /courses</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private provider course</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal/school-organised activity</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring/coaching</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer observation</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadowing</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited study (below SCQF 11/Masters level)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited study (SCQF 11/Masters level)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited study</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E learning</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative spaces</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional enquiry/teacher-led research</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good practice visit</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using digital technologies to support learning and teaching</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Rounds</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Learning community</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher research</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td>6,094</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q42 Based on your experience, how engaged are teachers with professional learning in comparison to 5 years ago?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much more engaged</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More engaged</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither more nor less engaged</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less engaged</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much less engaged</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base: all who completed ITE more than 5 years ago</strong></td>
<td>5,155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q44 In your experience, how supportive do you think teachers are of each other's professional learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportiveness</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very supportive</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly supportive</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither supportive nor unsupportive</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly unsupportive</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsupportive</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td>6,077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional learning at SCQF Level 11 refers to all learning undertaken at Masters level, including short courses and modules as well as the full Masters qualification.

Q45 How much do you know about opportunities to undertake professional learning at SCQF Level 11 (Masters level)?
I know nothing/very little about this 48%
I know a little about this 30%
I know a fair amount about this 12%
I know a lot about this 10%
Prefer not to say 1%
Base 6,064

Q46 Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about undertaking professional learning at SCQF Level 11 (Masters level)?
I have already undertaken learning at this level 14%
I am currently undertaking learning at this level 5%
I am planning to do this in the near future 6%
I might be interested at some point but have no current plans 29%
I am interested but I do not think my school/ Local Authority would support/encourage me 6%
I am not interested in doing this 29%
I don’t know enough about it 10%
Prefer not to say 1%
Base 6,048

Q47 Do you face any barriers to accessing learning at SCQF Level 11 (Masters level)?
Yes 32%
No 33%
Don’t know 34%
Prefer not to say 2%
Base 6,046

Q48 What are the main barriers which prevent you from studying at SCQF 11 (Masters level)?
Don’t feel I have enough time to study 74%
Financial cost for me 69%
Financial cost for my employer 23%
Lack of options in flexible delivery 19%
Lack of support from my employer 19%
Too academically challenging for me 4%
Family/personal commitments 4%
No offers from a relevant University 4%
Age/too old/retired/no longer relevant 2%
Other 1%
Prefer not to say *
Base: all who face barriers accessing learning at SCQF level 11 1,955
Q49 How satisfied are you with the current provision of career-long professional learning (CLPL) targeted specifically for teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All except HTs (including acting) 4,691

Q50 And how satisfied are you with the current provision of career-long professional learning targeted specifically for Head teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: HTs (including acting) 557

Q51 Have you experienced any barriers over the last 5 years to accessing appropriate professional learning opportunities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered, less than 1 year experience</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all who experienced barriers accessing professional learning in the last 5 years 2,665

Q52 What barriers have limited your access to professional learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority/ school financial budget</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of supply cover</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/life balance</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of time required to undertake the activity</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No suitable activities available for the subject or type of learning I wish to undertake</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too expensive for me, personally</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity too expensive</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support/encouragement from school/ local authority</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of activity is inaccessible</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My working pattern (e.g. part time/job share/supply/peripatetic/seconded)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital technology is unavailable</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all who experienced barriers accessing professional learning in the last 5 years 2,665
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Q53 What are the main reasons for you choosing to undertake professional learning?

**It will help me to...**

- Improve my existing teaching skills: 86%
- Learn different teaching practices: 72%
- Increase subject area knowledge: 71%
- Share good practice: 60%
- Network with other teachers: 51%
- Gain greater theoretical knowledge: 49%
- Satisfy contractual CPD requirements: 41%
- Gain further accreditation/qualifications: 28%
- None of the above: 1%
- Prefer not to say: *

*Base: 6,018*

Q54 How important or unimportant is it to you that the professional learning you undertake has an accredited award attached to it?

- Very important: 7%
- Important: 16%
- Neither important nor unimportant: 30%
- Not very important: 23%
- Not important at all: 23%
- Don’t know: 1%
- Prefer not to say: *

*Base: 6,005*

Q55 Comparing how things are now with the period before 2010 (5 years ago), what do you think about the range of professional learning opportunities that are available to you?

- There is considerably more variety: 5%
- There is more variety: 28%
- Stayed the same: 20%
- There is less variety: 19%
- There is considerably less variety: 11%
- Don’t know: 16%
- Prefer not to say: 1%

*Base: all who completed ITE more than 5 years ago: 5,086*

Q56 Do you think the number of high quality professional learning opportunities available to you has increased or decreased over the last 5 years?

- Increased a lot: 7%
- Increased a little: 21%
- Stayed the same: 20%
- Decreased a little: 19%
- Decreased a lot: 17%
- Don’t know: 14%
- Prefer not to say: 1%

*Base: all who completed ITE more than 5 years ago: 5,081*
### Q57 Overall, how would you rate your Local Authority on the following aspects of support for professional learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing learning materials (e.g. books, online resources)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing courses</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing opportunities to learn with other teachers (e.g. shadowing, good practice visits, group discussion, learning rounds)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing networking opportunities</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively promoting professional learning opportunities for all teachers</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a source of up to date information, advice and guidance about professional learning</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking a coherent approach: ensuring other priorities and initiatives do not undermine professional learning</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base (5,921)*

### Q58 Overall, how do you rate national bodies (e.g. GTCS, Education Scotland, Scottish College for Educational Leadership) on the following aspects of support for professional learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing learning materials (e.g. books, online resources)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing courses</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing activities to learn with other teachers (e.g. shadowing, good practice visits, group discussion, learning rounds)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing networking opportunities</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively promoting professional learning opportunities for all teachers</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a source of up to date information, advice and guidance about professional learning</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking a coherent approach: ensuring other priorities and initiatives do not undermine professional learning</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base (5,821)*
Q59 Are you aware of there being a partnership agreement between your Local Authority and a university (any) to support professional learning?
Yes 30%
No 69%
Prefer not to say 2%
Base 5,816

Q60 Overall, to what extent do you think that undertaking professional learning makes you a better teacher?
A great deal 40%
A fair amount 39%
Just a little 15%
Not at all 3%
Don't know 2%
Prefer not to say 1%
Base 5,812

Q61 To what extent do you think that your own participation in professional learning has a positive impact on the learning experiences of children and young people?
A great deal 40%
A fair amount 42%
Just a little 14%
Not at all 2%
Don't know 1%
Prefer not to say 1%
Base 5,799

Q62 Teachers have different amounts of involvement in deciding what professional learning they undertake. Which of the following statements best describes your situation?
I make decisions about my professional learning on my own 35%
I make decisions about my professional learning in discussion with my line manager 56%
My line manager makes most of the decisions about my professional learning on my behalf 5%
My line manager makes all of the decisions about my professional learning on my behalf 1%
Don't know 2%
Prefer not to say 1%
Base 5,785

SECTION F: LEADERSHIP

Q63 Do you have opportunities to develop your leadership skills by leading projects/initiatives/pieces of work?
Yes 61%
Yes, but I’d like to have more 13%
No 21%
Prefer not to say 5%
Base 5,782
Q64 How aware are you of professional learning opportunities to develop your leadership skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very aware</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very aware</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not aware of any opportunities at all</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,773</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q65 Are you aware of the GTCS Professional Standards for Leadership and Management?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,771</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q66 You said earlier that you have used the GTCS Professional Standard for Leadership and Management. How useful has it been in guiding your leadership skills development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly useful</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very useful</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong>: all who have used the standard for leadership and management to guide professional learning</td>
<td><strong>2,469</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q67 How much do you know about each of the following.....:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Don't know nothing/very little about this</th>
<th>I know a little about this</th>
<th>I know a fair amount about this</th>
<th>I know a lot about this</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Scottish College for Educational Leadership (SCEL)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Framework for Educational Leadership</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Into Headship qualification</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SCEL Fellowship programme</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base (5,766)

Q68 Do you feel that initiative is relevant to your professional learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>The Scottish College for Educational Leadership (SCEL)</th>
<th>The Framework for Educational Leadership</th>
<th>The Into Headship qualification</th>
<th>The SCEL Fellowship programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I have already undertaken this</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I am currently undertaking this</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I already use/have used this</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, possibly</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at the moment but it might be in the future</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know enough about it</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all who know about each initiative 1,801 2,274 2,750 1,241
Q69 How useful is it/has it been for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Scottish College for Educational Leadership (SCEL)</th>
<th>The Framework for Educational Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly useful</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very useful</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base: all who have used each initiative</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION G: PROFESSIONAL LEARNING IN USING DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

Professional learning in using digital technologies refers to learning how to use digital technologies to support learning and how to incorporate using these into your teaching practice. Digital technology could include online virtual learning environments (e.g. Glow); interactive devices (e.g. tablets, smartphones and laptops); tools and services such as blogs, search engines, social media, video/audio content and other digital resources which can have a role in supporting learning (this list is not exhaustive).

Q70 How aware are you of the opportunities to access professional learning in using digital technologies to support learning and teaching?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very aware</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very aware</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not aware of any opportunities at all</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>5,736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q71 In the past year, have you accessed professional learning in using digital technologies to support teaching and learning?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, more than 16 hours in the past year</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, between 4 hours and 16 hours in the past year</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, up to 4 hours in the past year</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>5,729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q72 How was the professional learning delivered?

Reading 46%
Staff meetings 46%
Face-to-face training course 40%
eLearning 38%
Group discussions 33%
Peer observation 21%
Online collaborative spaces for professional learning 20%
Mentoring/coaching 19%
Good practice visit 14%
Shadowing 7%
Accredited study 6%
Self-directed/personal initiative 1%
Other *
Prefer not to say 1%

Base: all who have accessed professional learning using digital technologies in past year
3,849

Q73 Who provided this professional learning?

School/establishment 54%
Local authority CPD provider 47%
Private provider 17%
National CPD provider 14%
University 13%
I did it myself/independent reading/research 2%
Colleagues/peers 1%
Online resources/websites/MOOCs 1%
Social media e.g. Twitter, Facebook, YouTube 1%
Other 1%
Prefer not to say 1%
Don’t know 3%

Base: all who have accessed professional learning using digital technologies in past year
3,841

Q74 How confident do you feel in putting this professional learning into practice?

Very confident 12%
Confident 54%
Neither confident nor unsure 25%
 Unsure 7%
Very unsure 1%
Don’t know 1%
Prefer not to say 1%

Base: all who have accessed professional learning using digital technologies in past year
3,836

Q75 Have you already put this professional learning into practice?

Yes 80%
No 16%
Prefer not to say 4%

Base: all who have accessed professional learning using digital technologies in past year
3,834
Q76 How successful or unsuccessful do you think this was?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very successful</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither successful nor unsuccessful</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsuccessful</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: all who have put learning into practice 3,156

Sections H and I ask you now to think about the impact of changes in teacher education on your colleagues.

SECTION H: PERCEPTIONS OF INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION

Q77 In your experience of working with probationer teachers over the last 2-3 years, how effective is Initial Teacher Education at university in preparing them for their first post?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither effective nor ineffective</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very ineffective</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not worked with probationer teachers in the last 2-3 years</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: all who have completed ITE more than 5 years ago 4,779

Q78 Based on your experience of working with probationer teachers over the last 2-3 years, is Initial Teacher Education at university more or less effective now than it was 5 years ago?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much more effective</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More effective</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither more nor less effective</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much less effective</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not worked with probationer teachers in the last 2-3 years</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: all who completed ITE more than 5 years ago 4,775
Q79 Thinking of class teachers in non-promoted posts, what do you think the main barriers are to their participation in professional learning activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of supply cover</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of time required to undertake activity</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority/ school financial budget</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial cost for the individual teacher</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No suitable activities available for the subject or type of learning required</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working pattern (e.g. part time/job share/supply/peripatetic/seconded)</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of activity is inaccessible</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of options in flexible delivery</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support/encouragement from school/ local authority</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital technology is unavailable</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: acting principal teacher or principal teacher 1,310

Q80 Thinking of class teachers in non-promoted posts, and compared with 5 years ago, what do you think about the range of professional learning opportunities that are available to them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is considerably more variety</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is more variety</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is less variety</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is considerably less variety</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: acting principal teacher or principal teacher 1,310

Q81 Thinking of class teachers in non-promoted posts, and compared with 5 years ago, do you think the number of high quality professional learning opportunities available to them has increased or decreased?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased a lot</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased a little</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased a little</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased a lot</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: acting principal teacher or principal teacher 1,307
Q82 Thinking of teachers up to and including the level of Principal Teacher, what do you think are the main barriers to their participation in professional learning activities? 

Lack of supply cover 74% 
Amount of time required to undertake the activity 63% 
Local authority/school financial budget 53% 
Financial cost for the individual teacher 30% 
No suitable activities available for the subject or type of learning required 24% 
Location of activity is inaccessible 24% 
Working pattern (e.g. part time/job share/supply/peripatetic/seconded) 23% 
Lack of options in flexible delivery 22% 
Digital technology is unavailable 8% 
Lack of support/encouragement from school/local authority 7% 
Don’t know 2% 
Prefer not to say 2% 
Base: acting depute head teacher or head teacher 567

Q83 Thinking of teachers up to and including the level of Principal Teacher, and compared with 5 years ago, what do you think about the range of professional learning opportunities that are available to them? 

There is considerably more variety 7% 
There is more variety 40% 
Stayed the same 25% 
There is less variety 15% 
There is considerably less variety 6% 
Don’t know 6% 
Prefer not to say 1% 
Base: acting depute head teacher or head teacher 567

Q84 Thinking of teachers up to and including the level of Principal Teacher, and compared with 5 years ago, do you think the number of high quality professional learning opportunities available to them has increased or decreased? 

Increased a lot 11% 
Increased a little 32% 
Stayed the same 25% 
Decreased a little 16% 
Decreased a lot 8% 
Don’t know 7% 
Prefer not to say 1% 
Base: acting depute head teacher or head teacher 567
Q85 Thinking of teachers up to and including the level of Deputy Head teacher, what do you think are the main barriers to their participation in professional learning activities?

Lack of supply cover 85%
Amount of time required to undertake the activity 70%
Local authority/ school financial budget 49%
Financial cost for the individual teacher 40%
Location of activity is inaccessible 32%
Working pattern (e.g. part time/job share/supply/peripatetic/seconded) 31%
Lack of options in flexible delivery 25%
No suitable activities available for the subject or type of learning required 19%
Digital technology is unavailable 13%
Lack of support/encouragement from school/ local authority 7%
Don’t know 2%
Prefer not to say -
Base: acting head teacher or head teacher 533

Q86 Thinking of teachers up to and including the level of Deputy Head teacher, and compared with 5 years ago, what do you think about the range of professional learning opportunities that are available to them?

There is considerably more variety 7%
There is more variety 47%
Stayed the same 20%
There is less variety 15%
There is considerably less variety 4%
Don’t know 6%
Prefer not to say -
Base: acting head teacher or head teacher 533

Q87 Thinking of teachers up to and including the level of Deputy Head teacher, and compared with 5 years ago, do you think the number of high quality professional learning opportunities available to them has increased or decreased?

Increased a lot 12%
Increased a little 37%
Stayed the same 23%
Decreased a little 15%
Decreased a lot 6%
Don’t know 6%
Prefer not to say -
Base: acting head teacher or head teacher 533
Appendix B – Sampling approach

14.1 In essence, the aim of any sampling exercise is to create a subset of the survey population that is as representative as possible of that population. As such, it was important that the quantitative data collection should achieve a representative sample of teacher views. However, as different questions were asked of different staff groups, the survey also needed to be capable of providing robust and representative estimates of teachers’ views, disaggregated by sector and staff group (e.g. estimates for special school head teachers, secondary student teachers etc.).

14.2 The sampling frame used was the GTCS teacher register; those with incomplete data were excluded from the sampling procedures. In order to allow subgroup analysis a disproportionate sample stratified by sector and staff group was drawn. This involved sorting and splitting the sample into different groups (e.g. secondary head teachers, primary student teachers etc.), then within each group (or strata) selecting at random a certain number of respondents, based on target sample calculations (see Table A.1). This approach ensured that for every subgroup a sufficient number of respondents were selected to allow analysis. In order to allow overall estimates representative of the population, weighting was applied (full details can be found in Appendix C). For a number of groups (supply teachers, early years teachers, those working in FE, those working in HE, those working in central locations, those working in the special sector) the numbers available to sample were low so all possible respondents were selected.

14.3 The sample also had to reflect socio-economic, geographical (both in terms of LA and rurality) and ethnic differences. These variables were not set up as formal strata, as with the sector and staff group, because they did not need to be disproportionately sampled. Rather they needed to reflect the wider population profile. In order to achieve this, respondents within each strata were sorted by local authority, rurality of school, percentage of BME pupils at school, school size and SIMD of school. School level variables were taken from the Scottish Government schools database and matched into the GTCS teacher register.

14.4 Respondents were then selected at random before using a 1 in n approach to select respondents. The sampling calculation differed within each strata based on the selected sample number required and the total population. So, for example if there was a population of 1,000 and the selected sample number required was 100, the sampling calculation would be 1 in 10.

14.5 In summary, the sampling process was as follows:

- Match school information into the GTCS teacher register
- Stratify the sample by sector and staff group
- Within each strata, sort the respondents by school level variables (rurality, percentage of BME pupils, SIMD, school size) and local authority
• For each strata select every 1 in n respondents, based on selected sample calculations.

14.6 Due to a lower than anticipated response rate, halfway through fieldwork a second sample was drawn to boost responses, the same sampling approach was taken as outlined above.

Table A.1 Target sample numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary (assumed 35% response rate)</th>
<th>Primary (assumed 35% response rate)</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Original selected sample</th>
<th>Additional selected sample</th>
<th>Target achieved sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td></td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depute head teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td></td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,336</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td></td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early career</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td></td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td></td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (assumed 25% response rate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depute head teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>926</td>
<td>926</td>
<td></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,626</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,337</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td></td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early career</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td></td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>974</td>
<td>974</td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special (assumed 35% response rate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td></td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrally employed (assumed 35% response rate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>972</td>
<td>972</td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply teachers (assumed 35% response rate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>799</td>
<td>799</td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent schools (assumed response rate 35%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,979</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years (assumed response rate 35%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those working in FE (assumed response rate 35%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those working in HE (assumed response rate 35%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,828</td>
<td>22,620</td>
<td>8,095</td>
<td>6,854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C – Profile of respondents and weighting

14.7 There were two main factors to take into account when applying weights to the TSF dataset. The first was to compensate for the impact of the sample design on the probability of selection - design weights. In the case of TSF, the aspects of the sample design that had an impact on the probability of selection were; the disproportionate sampling of smaller staff groupings to allow subgroup analysis.

14.8 The second reason for weighting is to correct for any under/over representation of different groups of pupils as a result of non-response – corrective weights. While there were different motivations for applying weights to the sample, the different considerations were combined to create a single weighting variable which brings the sample in line with teacher census data both at a national level.

14.9 Rim weighting was applied for the following variables:

- Sector
- Age
- Sex
- Position
- Full-time/part-time
- Permanent/temporary
- Local authority/independent
- Rurality
- SIMD
- Proportion of ethnic minorities in school
- School size.

14.10 Weights were applied using data from the 2015 teacher census. Groups that were not included in the census, and for whom we had no other profile data on were not included in the weighting scheme.

14.11 The rim weighting was conducted using grossing weights which were then scaled back to align the teacher numbers in the weighted and unweighted data.

14.12 The profile of respondents, compared with national figures is shown in table C.1 below.
## Figure C.1 Profile of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Special</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher census</strong></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey</strong></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under 25</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25-34</strong></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35-44</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45-59</strong></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>55+</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head teacher</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depute head teacher</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal teacher</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time</strong></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-time</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permanent</strong></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporary</strong></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Across all sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher census</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LA</strong></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban</strong></td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0-5% pupils BME</strong></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5-10% pupils BME</strong></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10-20% pupils BME</strong></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20% or more pupils BME</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0-20% pupils in 20% most deprived</strong></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20-40% pupils in 20% most deprived</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40-60% pupils in 20% most deprived</strong></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60-80% pupils in 20% most deprived</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>80-100% pupils in 20% most deprived</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 - smallest schools</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 - largest schools</strong></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D – Topic guides

Evaluation of the Implementation of Teaching Scotland’s Future
Depute and Head teacher discussion guide
V2

This topic guide is designed to serve as an aide memoir to the interviewers, while also remaining flexible to allow for issues to be raised spontaneously. Probing questions like ‘why?’, ‘why not?’, etc., are not always included - but there will be plenty of these and the researchers will automatically probe, ask for explanation/clarification, and sum up at appropriate points. Although the guide is generally written in the form of questions or explanations that could be read out exactly as written, in reality, the researcher will amend the wording, rephrase and reorder as appropriate and to make it feel more like a natural discussion rather than a questionnaire.

Introduction (10 mins)

Thank participants for agreeing to take part.

Duration of focus group/interview: 1 hour

Explain purpose of research: to explore teachers’ views of the changes to teacher education and CLPL as a result of TSF. All teachers in this group/interview will be deputes or head teachers so we would like to explore their thoughts around their own professional learning opportunities, but also the impact of TSF on their staff, including probationer and student teachers they have worked with.

Explain confidentiality and anonymity

Obtain permission to record discussion – then record participants confirming consent to take part.

A: Overview of professional learning (15 mins)

1. What do you think about when you hear the phrase ‘Career Long Professional Learning’?

Probe: What makes you think that?

2. What areas of professional learning are currently of most/least importance to you?

Probe: Why?
Probe: What about SCQF 11 learning- is this something of interest? Why/why not?

3. Does current provision meet your CLPL needs?

Probe: What are your CLPL expectations? What form does your CLPL take? (Prompt e.g. shadowing, mentoring, good practice visits, courses, reading, online resources)

4. Do you feel you are supported to engage in professional learning?

Probe: What would help? What has been your experience of PRD? Has it supported you with your professional learning?

5. It has been said that professional learning is like a journey. Is that how you see it?

Probe: if yes, at what point do you see yourself at the moment? If no, then how do you see it?

Probe: Have you used the GTCS Standard for CLPL to guide your professional learning? Why/not? Effective/ineffective?

6. What barriers to participating in professional learning have you experienced?

Probe: What would help overcome them?

7. Thinking about all staff now, has the culture of professional learning in schools changed over the past 4 or 5 years (since TSF)?

Probe: What’s better? What’s worse? What hasn’t changed?

Probe: How or why do you think this change has come about?

Probe: What are the main barriers? How could these be overcome?

B. Leadership (10 mins)

Intro: One of the recommendations in Teaching Scotland’s Future was that opportunities for learning for leadership should be improved, and be available from the start of teacher education through to experienced senior managers.

Aspects of this likely to have been covered in discussions about their own priorities above.

1. What professional learning opportunities are available to you to continue to develop your knowledge and skills for your leadership role?
2. What do you think about the Into-Headship qualification as a form of developing leadership skills and knowledge?
Probe: Is this a qualification you would consider undertaking?

3. Have you used the GTCS Standards for Leadership and Management to guide your professional learning?
Probe: If yes, what has been useful/ less useful? If no, why not?

4. What are your thoughts about SCEL now that it has been operating for just over a year?
Probe: Have you found anything in particular to be helpful or useful? Anything that you would like to see improved or developed? How could teachers become more aware of SCEL?

5. Are there enough high quality leadership opportunities for teachers in non-promoted posts?

D. Supporting your professional learning (10 mins)

1. How have you found the support that your school has received from your local authority in relation to career-long professional learning?

   By ‘support’ we mean not only financial support but other types of resources such as development officers, information and guidance, materials or specific tools.

   Probe: Could this support be improved?

2. What are your local authority’s priorities for CLPL? Do you find these useful in supporting your teachers to engage with professional learning opportunities at your school?
Probe: What is useful/ less useful? Why?

3. What further support would be useful for supporting professional learning opportunities at your school?
   Probe: Support from: LA? National bodies? Commercial course and opportunities offered by professional bodies?

E. Student and probationer teachers (10 mins)

1. Based on your experience of working with students on placements and probationers over the past five years, has the quality changed in Initial Teacher Education?

   Probe: What’s changed? How or why has this come about? Probe: What are your experiences of student and probationer literacy and numeracy skills?
2. Thinking about school placements specifically, how effective are they?

Probe: What is works well? What could be improved? How?

3. What about the probationary year?

Probe: What is works well? What could be improved? How?  Probe: How prepared are probationers to work with challenging pupils?

4. Do you think new teachers have a different attitude to career-long professional learning than they did a few years ago?

5. How well or not does the partnership between the LA and the university work in relation to ITE?

Probe: What’s effective/ ineffective? What could be improved?

Review and wrap up (5 mins)

1. What are the main points about these topics that you'd like us to report back to the Scottish Government?

2. Finally, do you have any other comments you'd like to make about the changes that have come about since TSF?

Thank and close
**Evaluation of the Implementation of Teaching Scotland’s Future**

**Early career focus group discussion guide**

**V 1**

This topic guide is designed to serve as an aide memoir to the interviewers, while also remaining flexible to allow for issues to be raised spontaneously. Probing questions like ‘why?’, ‘why not?’, etc. are not always included - but there will be plenty of these and the researchers will automatically probe, ask for explanation/clarification, and sum up at appropriate points. Although the guide is generally written in the form of questions or explanations that could be read out exactly as written, in reality, the researcher will amend the wording, rephrase and reorder as appropriate and to make it feel more like a natural discussion rather than a questionnaire.

**Introduction (10 mins)**

Thank participant for agreeing to take part.

Duration of focus group: 1 hour

Explain purpose of research: to explore teachers’ views of the changes to teacher education and CLPL as a result of TSF. All teachers in this group will have less than five years’ experience as a fully registered teacher post-probation, so we would like to explore their thoughts around professional learning opportunities but also their experiences of their probationary year/ITE

*Check to see if any participants followed Flexible Route*

*Check where did ITE and whether 4/1 year course *

Explain confidentiality and anonymity

Obtain permission to record discussion – then record participants confirming consent to take part.

**A: Overview of professional learning (15 mins)**

1. What do you think about when you hear the phrase ‘Career Long Professional Learning’?

   Probe: What makes you think that?

2. What areas of professional learning are currently of most/least importance to you?

   Probe: Why? What about SCQF 11 learning- is this something of interest? Why/why not?
3. Does current provision meet your CLPL needs?

Probe: What are your CLPL expectations? What form does your CLPL take? (Prompt e.g. shadowing, mentoring, good practice visits, courses, reading, online resources).

4. Are you able to see an impact of your CLPL on yourself/ your pupils?

Probe: How do you know when CLPL has made an impact?

5. Do you feel you are supported to engage in professional learning?

Probe: What would help? What has been your experience of PRD? Has it supported you with your professional learning?

6. It has been said that professional learning is like a journey. Is that how you see it?

Probe: if yes, at what point do you see yourself at the moment? If no, then how do you see it? Probe: have you used the GTCS Standard for CLPL to guide your professional learning? Why/ not? Effective/ineffective?

7. Have you experienced barriers to participating in professional learning?

Probe: What would help overcome them?

B. ITE & Probationary year (15 mins)

1. Thinking back to your course and placements, how effective or ineffective was Initial Teacher Education in preparing you for your first post as a teacher?

Probe: By the end of your course, how did you feel confident about carrying out your role as a teacher? Which aspects of teaching did you feel more or less prepared for? How could it have been improved?

2. How effective was your probationary year in helping you reach the Standard for Full Registration and preparing you for the next few years?

Probe: What aspects were most/ least effective? Why? How could it have been improved?

3. How effective was the support given to you during your probationary year?

Probe: Who supported you- school staff, university staff, others? What form did this support take? If you didn’t feel sufficiently supported, what could have been done to make it more effective?
4. By the end of your ITE/probationary year how confident did you feel about carrying out your role as a teacher?

Probe: Which aspects of teaching did you feel more or less confident about? Ask about ASN and behaviour management and literacy and numeracy. Would more CLPL related to these areas have made a difference at that point?

Ask only if time- not SG priority:

5. Are you aware of aspects of ITE and the probation changing over the past few years (refer to differences within the group depending on mix of the group)?

Probe: What's changed? What's improved? What's not so good?

C. Leadership (10 mins)

Intro: One of the recommendations in Teaching Scotland’s Future was that opportunities for learning for leadership should be improved, and be available from the start of teacher education.

1. What does ‘leadership’ mean to you?

Probe: Do you see yourself a leader? Have you taken the lead in leading in a particular area or on an initiative?

2. What opportunities do you feel you have to develop your leadership skills?

Probe: Do these opportunities meet your needs?
Probe: What barriers do you face and how could you be better supported?

3. Have you undertaken any professional learning to develop your leadership skills?

Probe: What was the impact of this been? What was useful about it?

**********If there is time and not already covered*************

D: Mentoring & Coaching

1. What does ‘mentoring’ and ‘coaching’ mean to you?

Probe: What are your views on early-career teachers having a mentor/coach?

2. Do you receive mentoring or coaching?
Probe: In what kind of ways does this happen? Do you have a single mentor or does more than one person mentor you? (e.g.: different people for different purposes) If not mentored, what would you want from mentoring or coaching?

3. (If people have experience of being mentored/coached) Has the mentoring/coaching you've received had an impact on your practice?

4. Do you see yourself as a mentor or coach? Do you mentor or coach colleagues?

If yes probe- how did that start and how does it work?
If no probe - why not?

Review and wrap up (10 mins)

1. Finally, do you have any other comments you'd like to make about professional learning during the probationary year?

... and about career-long professional learning post-probation?

2. What are the main points about these topics that you'd like us to report back to the Scottish Government?
Where appropriate, probes specifically for supply or teachers in promoted posts have been included.

Introduction (10 mins)

Thank participants for agreeing to take part.

Duration of focus group: 1 hour

Explain purpose of research: to explore teachers’ views of the changes to teacher education as a result of TSF. All teachers in this group will have five to ten years/ over ten years teaching experience.

Explain confidentiality and anonymity

Obtain permission to record discussion – then record participants confirming consent to take part.

A: Overview of professional learning (20 mins)

1. What do you think about when you hear the phrase ‘Career Long Professional Learning’?

Probe: What makes you think that?

2. What areas of professional learning are currently of most/least importance to you?

Probe: Why? What about SCQF 11 learning- is this something of interest? Why/why not?
3. Does current provision meet your CLPL needs?
Probe: What are your CLPL expectations? What form does your CLPL take? (Prompt e.g. shadowing, mentoring, good practice visits, courses, reading, online resources). Is there sufficient CLPL on literacy and numeracy?

4. Are you able to see an impact of your CLPL on yourself/ your pupils?
Probe: How do you know when CLPL has made an impact?

5. Do you feel you are supported to engage in professional learning?
Probe for all: What would help? What could be improved?

Probe for all: What has been your experience of PRD? Has it supported you with your professional learning?

Probe for supply: Do you have opportunities to participate in CLPL activities within the school/s you work in?

Probe for supply: Does the Local Authority you work in have mechanisms to help supply teachers engage with CLPL?

6. It has been said that professional learning is like a journey. Is that how you see it?
Probe: if yes, at what point do you see yourself at the moment? If no, then how do you see it? Probe: have you used the GTCS Standard for CLPL to guide your professional learning? Why/ not? Effective/ineffective?

7. Have you experienced barriers to participating in professional learning?
Probe: What would help overcome them?

8. Has the culture of professional learning in schools changed over the past 4 or 5 years (since TSF)?
Probe: What’s better? What’s worse? What hasn’t changed?
Probe: How or why do you think this change has come about?

B. Leadership (10 mins)
Intro: One of the recommendations in Teaching Scotland’s Future was that opportunities for learning for leadership should be improved, and be available from the start of teacher education and throughout a teacher’s career.
1. What does ‘leadership’ mean to you?
   Probe: Do you see yourself a leader? Have you taken the lead in leading in a particular area or on an initiative?

2. What opportunities do you feel you have to develop your leadership skills?
   Probe: Do these opportunities meet your needs? If no, what further support do you need?
   Probe: What barriers do you face?

3. Have you undertaken any professional learning to develop your leadership skills?
   Probe: What was the impact of this been? What was useful about it?

4. Have you used the GTCS Standard for Leadership and Management to guide your professional learning?
   Probe: Yes – Which ones? How useful did you find them? No – why not?

5. (For PTs) What do you think about the Into-Headship qualification as a form of developing leadership skills and knowledge for those aspiring to be head teachers?
   Probe: Is this a qualification you would consider undertaking?

6. Has the culture of around leadership, and professional learning around leadership changed over the past 4 or 5 years (since TSF)?
   Probe: How or why do you think this change has come about?

C. Working with students and probationers (10 mins)

1. Based on your experience of working with students on placements and probationers over the past five years, how well do you think Initial Teacher Education prepares them for life as a teacher?
   Probe: what’s changed? How or why has this come about? Probe: What are your experiences of student and probationer literacy and numeracy skills?

2. Thinking about the experience of school placements specifically, how effective are they?
   Probe: What is works well? What could be improved? How?

3. What about the probationary year?
Probe: What is works well? What could be improved? How?

Probe: How prepared are probationers to work with challenging pupils?

4. Do you think new teachers have a different attitude to career-long professional learning than they did a few years ago?

5. How well or not does the partnership between the LA and the university work in relation to ITE?

Probe: What’s better than it was? What’s worse? What could be improved?

*************If there is time and not already covered**************

D: Mentoring & Coaching

1. What does ‘mentoring’ and ‘coaching’ mean to you?
   Probe: What are your views on early-career teachers having a mentor/coach?

2. Do you receive mentoring or coaching?
   Probe: In what kind of ways does this happen? Do you have a single mentor or does more than one person mentor you? (e.g.: different people for different purposes) If not mentored, what would you want from mentoring or coaching?

3. (If people have experience of being mentored/coached) Has the mentoring/coaching you've received had an impact on your practice?

4. Do you see yourself as a mentor or coach? Do you mentor or coach colleagues?
   If yes probe- how did that start and how does it work?
   If no probe- why not?

Review and wrap up (10 mins)

1. What are the main points about these topics that you’d like us to report back to the Scottish Government?

2. Finally, do you have any other comments you’d like to make about career-long professional learning for experienced teachers?

Thank and close
Introduction (10 mins)

Thank participants for agreeing to take part.

Duration of focus group: 1 hour

Explain purpose of research: to explore teachers’ views of the changes to teacher education as a result of TSF. All teachers in this group will be in the first term of their probationary year, so we would like to explore their thoughts around professional learning opportunities but also their experiences of Initial Teacher Education.

Explain confidentiality and anonymity

Obtain permission to record discussion – then record participants confirming consent to take part.

* Check where did ITE and whether 4 or 1 year course *

A: Overview of professional learning (20 mins)

1. What do you think about when you see or hear the phrase ‘Career Long Professional Learning’?
   Probe: What makes you think that?

2. What are your expectations about how CLPL will continue to be part of your career?
   Probe: What form/s might it take?

3. What areas of professional learning are currently of most importance to you?
   Probe: Why?
4. What opportunities do you have for professional learning in these areas?
Probe: What form does this take? (e.g.: shadowing, mentoring, good practice visits, meetings, courses, guided reading; online resources). Does this meet your needs?

5. What forms of professional learning are you undertaking?
Probe: Local Authority CLPL sessions? School-based activities? Other self-identified professional learning?
Probe: Could anything be done differently or improved?

6. Do you feel you are supported to engage in professional learning during your probation year?
Probe: Is this sufficient to meet your needs, or could this be done differently?

7. Have you experienced any barriers to participating in professional learning?
Probe: What are they? Is there anything that could help to overcome them?

B. Initial Teacher Education (20mins)

1. Thinking back to your degree course and placements, how effective was Initial Teacher Education in preparing you for your first post as a teacher?
Probe: By the end of your degree did you feel confident about carrying out your first post as a teacher? Which aspects of teaching did you feel more or less prepared for?
Probe: Did you feel ITE gave you the necessary skills to teach literacy and numeracy? Do you feel prepared to integrate the topics of wellbeing/health into your teaching?

2. In the online survey, when asked about Initial Teacher Education, we found that people said that the learning they undertook on pedagogy/approaches to teaching and learning and self-reflection was most useful, while ASN, behaviour management and digital technologies were least useful in preparing them for their first post. What do you think?
Probe: What elements of ITE were most/least useful for you? Why was this? What could have been improved in the aspects that were least useful?

3. What do you think about the quality of your placements?
Probe: How effectively were you supported during your placements by both the school and university? Could you have benefited from different or additional forms of support? How did you access the support that was available to you?

Probe: Do you think the school and university worked well together? What could be improved?
4. How much did your ITE prepare you to work with pupils from diverse social, cultural and/or economic backgrounds?

Probe: What could have been improved/ done differently to prepare you for doing so?

5. Professional values are part of the GTCS Standards for Provisional and Full Registration. Do you find them useful for framing your professional practice?

Values are: Social Justice, Integrity, Trust and Respect, Professional Commitment.

Probe: How do you find these values fit with your everyday teaching practice? Are there any challenges in working with these values?

6. What are your thoughts about continuing with academic study to undertake SCQF level 11 learning?

Probe: Is this something you want to do soon? Why/ not? What topic/s are you interested in? Why?

******************************************************************If there is time******************************************************************

C. Leadership

Intro: One of the recommendations in Teaching Scotland’s Future was that opportunities for learning for leadership should be improved, and be available from the start of teacher education. TSF also highlights that leadership can take on a number of forms.

1. What does ‘leadership’ mean to you?

Probe: Do you see yourselves as leaders in the classroom? Prompt if necessary: Have you taken the lead in developing teaching resources; or leading on new initiatives within school, for example?

2. How well did ITE prepare you for taking up leadership opportunities both within and outwith the classroom?

Probe: What worked well? What could be improved?

3. What opportunities do you have to develop your leadership experience?

Probe: Do these opportunities meet your needs? Why is this the case/ not the case? How well do senior colleagues support you with this?

D: Mentoring & Coaching

1. What does ‘mentoring’ and ‘coaching’ mean to you?
2. Have you received mentoring or coaching?

Probe: Do you have a single mentor or does more than one person mentor you? (e.g.: different people for different purposes).

3. (If people have experience of being mentored) Has the mentoring you’ve received had an impact on your practice?
   Probe: Did you find this useful? Why/ why not? What could be improved?

4. Do you mentor or coach colleagues?

   If yes probe- how did that start and how does it work?
   If no probe - why not?

5. (If not mentored); would you want to be mentored at this point in your career?

   Probe: What would you want from that kind of support?

6. Have you worked collaboratively with colleagues? What form does that take?

   Probe: What did you work on?

Review and wrap up (10 mins)

1. Finally, do you have any other comments you'd like to make about teacher education?
   ... or about other forms of career-long professional learning?

2. What are the main points about these topics that you’d like us to report back to the Scottish Government?

Thank and close
This topic guide is designed to serve as an aide memoir to the interviewers, while also remaining flexible to allow for issues to be raised spontaneously. Probing questions like ‘why?’; ‘why not?’; etc. are not always included - but there will be plenty of these and the researchers will automatically probe, ask for explanation/clarification, and sum up at appropriate points. Although the guide is generally written in the form of questions or explanations that could be read out exactly as written, in reality, the researcher will amend the wording, rephrase and reorder as appropriate and to make it feel more like a natural discussion rather than a questionnaire.

Introduction (5 mins)

Thank participant for agreeing to take part.

Duration of interview: 30-45 mins

Explain purpose of research: to explore experiences of those coming to teach in Scotland having trained elsewhere, including what support they received and what might have been helpful

Explain confidentiality and anonymity

Obtain permission to record discussion.

Background (5 mins)

1. Where did you train as a teacher?
   Probe: How did you get into teaching? (If English/Welsh probe on Teach First)

2. What teaching experience did you have before coming to Scotland?

3. Why did you move to Scotland?

4. When did you first start teaching in Scotland?
   Probe: Which LA was that in?

5. What’s your current role?
Overall experience of starting to teach in Scotland (10 mins)

1. Tell me about your initial experience of coming to teach in Scotland – how did you find it?

2. What was the biggest difference from teaching in [previous country]?

3. What were the biggest challenges you faced?
   Probe: Did anything help with that?
   Probe: What might have helped?

4. Thinking back to just before you started teaching in Scotland, what were you most concerned about?
   Probe: And how did you find that in practice?

Registration with the GTCS (5 mins)

1. Were you aware of the requirements needed to register as teacher in Scotland before you applied?
   Probe: How did you find out about the requirements?

2. How did you find the process of registering with the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS)?
   Probe: If came through Teach First, Schools Direct, and GTP and not mentioned, probe on implications for registration process.

Did you get any support to help you register?

Probe: from the GTCS? Education Scotland? Teaching Unions? Universities? (if already have a job – from the Local Authority? from the school?) Anyone else?

3. What, if anything, could be improved?

Support (10 mins)

1. When you began teaching in Scotland, did anyone formally discuss your professional learning/development needs with you?

2. Did you get any support to help you adapt to the following aspects of teaching in Scotland?
1. Curriculum and assessment (broad curriculum and emphasis on Health and Wellbeing)
2. Teaching pedagogy/style (child-centred/project based)
3. GTCS standards
4. Local and national priorities (e.g. GIRFEC/SHANARRI)
5. Anything else?

Probe for each aspect: from the LA? From the school? Colleagues? General Teaching Council for Scotland? Anyone else?

Probe: Were you offered that or did you have to seek it out?

Probe: How useful was it? What could be improved?

3. What (other) support might have helped?

4. What preparation, if any, were you able to do before you started?

Probe: reading, talking to staff, visits/observations

5. Looking back, what (other) preparation might have helped?

Refresher/introductory course (5 mins)

1. Did you go on a refresher/introductory course before you started teaching here?

If yes probe:
- How useful was it?
- Which aspects were most/least useful?
- How could it have been improved?
- Who ran the course?
- How did you find out about it?
- How well was it promoted?
- Was it a Local Authority requirement that you attended the course?

If no probe:
- Were you aware of any refresher/introductory courses being available?
- Do you think you would have found that useful?
- What would you like a course to have covered?

Culture of professional learning (5 mins)
1. One of the things we are exploring in this research more broadly is the culture of professional learning in Scottish schools. What would you say the differences are between [other country] and Scotland in relation to professional learning?

Probe: What's better? What's worse? What's just the same?

Wrap up

1. Is there anything else you'd like to say about how people moving to Scotland to teach could be better supported?

Thank and close
Evaluation of the Implementation of Teaching Scotland's Future
Depth interviews with those returning after a career break/working elsewhere

This topic guide is designed to serve as an aide memoir to the interviewers, while also remaining flexible to allow for issues to be raised spontaneously. Probing questions like ‘why?’, ‘why not?’, etc. are not always included - but there will be plenty of these and the researchers will automatically probe, ask for explanation/clarification, and sum up at appropriate points. Although the guide is generally written in the form of questions or explanations that could be read out exactly as written, in reality, the researcher will amend the wording, rephrase and reorder as appropriate and to make it feel more like a natural discussion rather than a questionnaire.

Introduction (4 mins)

Thank participant for agreeing to take part.

Duration of interview: 35-45 mins

Explain purpose of research: to explore experiences of returning to teaching after a break, including what support they received and what might have been helpful

Explain confidentiality and anonymity

Obtain permission to record discussion.

Background (5 mins)

Can I start by asking a few questions about your career history, just so I'm clear about how long you'd been away from teaching and when you came back and so on. So, working backwards...

1. When did you return to teaching and what's your current role?

   Probe: Are you currently full time or part time?
   Probe: Which LA are you working in currently?

2. How long had you been away from teaching?

3. What were you doing in that period?

4. How much teaching experience had you had before?

5. What role did you have immediately before you left?
Probe: How similar was that to your current role?

Probe if necessary to ensure you are clear on:
- How much teaching experience before break
- Length of break
- What doing during break
- When returned
- What LA returned to
- Whether returned to similar role

**During break (8 mins)**

1. During your break from teaching, did you think you would return at some point?

IF NO probe: At what point did you start thinking about returning?
Probe: What prompted that?

2. Did you keep in touch with the profession at all during your break?

Probe: through friends/former colleagues? Reading? News items? Professional bodies?

3. What aspects of teaching, if any, did you try to keep up with?

Probe: policy changes? curriculum changes? developments in your subject?
developments in pedagogy? contractual changes?

4. Were you aware of the new GTCS standards and the introduction of professional update?

5. Did you have access to any professional learning/development?

6. Did you have any access to any job/career information?

**Overall experience of returning (10 mins)**

1. Tell me about your experience of returning – how did you find it?

2. How did you find the process of looking for a job?

Probe: What support, if any, did you get?

Probe: Did you get any support from your local authority? the GTCS? Education Scotland? Anyone else?
3. What was the biggest change you noticed when you came back?

4. What was the best thing about returning?
   Probe: Did anything help with that?

5. What were the most difficult things?
   Probe: Did anything help with that?
   Probe: What might have helped?

6. Thinking back to just before you returned, what were you most concerned about?
   Probe: And how did you find that in practice?

Support (8 mins)

1. Did you get any support to help ease your return?
   Probe: Were you offered that or did you have to seek it out?
   Probe: How useful was it?

2. What (other) support might have helped?

3. Did you get any support in relation to changes in:
   - Pedagogy?
   - the curriculum?
   - GTCS standards?

4. What preparation, if any, were you able to do before you returned?
   Probe: reading about new developments, talking to colleagues, visits/observations

5. Looking back, what (other) preparation might have helped?

Refresher Course (4 mins)

1. Did you go on a refresher course before you returned?
   If yes probe:
• How useful was it?
• Which aspects were most/least useful?
• How could it have been improved?
• Who ran the course?
• How did you find out about it?
• Was it a Local Authority requirement that you attended the course?

If no: Were you aware of any refresher courses being available?

Probe: Do you think you would have found that useful?

Probe: What would you like a course to have covered?

**Culture change (4 mins)**

1. One of the things we are exploring in this research more broadly is whether there has been any change in the culture of professional learning in schools over the past few years. Based on your experience of what things were like before you left compared to when you returned, do you think there has been a culture change?

Probe: What’s better? What’s worse? What hasn’t changed?

Probe: How or why do you think this change has come about?

Probe: Has the way you approach your professional learning now changed in comparison with before?

**Wrap up**

1. Is there anything else you’d like to say about how people returning to teaching could be better supported?

Thank and close
Appendix E – Using logistic regression to examine predictors of aspects of teacher education

14.13 Logistic regression is commonly used to predict the probability of an outcome using several potential predictor variables. In this report, logistic regression was used to model three outcomes:

- whether Initial Teacher Education (ITE) at university was effective or not in preparing teachers for their first post
- whether a respondent thought that the professional learning they undertook during their probationary period was effective in helping them to achieve the GTCS Standard for Full Registration
- whether teachers feel confident that they have the skills they need for their current role.

14.14 For each model, a broad set of potential predictor variables was considered. These variables were explored to see if they helped to explain the outcome. The final predictor variables were selected on the basis that they were either statistically significant or had sufficient explanatory power.

14.15 For all three models, the following demographic variables were included in the initial analysis:

- sex
- sector (primary, secondary etc.)
- full-time vs. part-time
- permanent vs. temporary employment
- rurality of school
- school type (independent vs. local authority).

14.16 For the ITE model, further potential variables included were satisfaction with individual aspects of the ITE course; ITE provider; effectiveness of support provided by the school during their school placement; and support provided by the university.

---

14.17 For the probation model, further potential variables included were the effectiveness of individual aspects of professional learning during their probationary year\textsuperscript{36}; whether the respondent had stayed in touch with university staff; and awareness of the LA/university partnership.

14.18 For the confidence model, further potential variables included forms of professional learning undertaken\textsuperscript{37}; whether they agreed that they had a plan for career-long professional learning; whether PRD felt like an ongoing process.

14.19 Variables that were not significant were then excluded and the final models were run. For example, sex was not a significant predictor of confidence in skills and was not included in the final reported model.

Table E.1: Extract of output from the logistic regression confidence model: whether teachers feel confident that they have the skills they need for their current role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector (vs. primary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>9.432</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>1.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-.624</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>9.136</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether have developed a plan for career-long professional learning (vs. strongly agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>5.293</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>27.636</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>30.848</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>20.400</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether PRD feels like an ongoing process (vs. strongly agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>1.629</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>4.979</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>9.165</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>13.325</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.20 The main benefit of using logistic regression in this context is to clearly distinguish the different effects of the various factors. By including in the logistic regression models, for example, both the school sector (primary/secondary) and the school

\textsuperscript{36} Local authority provision, School-based provision, Shadowing, Non-contact time, Contact with university staff, Further accredited study, Support of a mentor and Opportunities for Self-Study.

\textsuperscript{37} National CPD course, Local Authority CPD course, Teacher Union/Professional Association events/courses, Private provider course, Internal/school-organised activity, Peer observation, Shadowing, Accredited study (below SCQF 11/Masters level), Accredited study (SCQF 11/Masters level), Accredited study, E learning, Collaborative spaces, Professional enquiry/teacher-led research, Good practice visit, Networking, Group discussion, Reading, Using digital technologies to support learning and teaching, Learning Rounds, Teacher Learning community, Teacher research and mentoring and coaching.
type (LA/independent), it is possible to separate the effect of each of these. This helps overcome the danger that the effect of one variable is confused with the effect of another.

14.21 Three columns in the table above are particularly informative. The first column indicates the different predictor factors included in the model. These can include ‘binary’ variables (either/or variables), continuous variables (variables that are measured numerically), and categorical factors (variables including a number of different categories). The logistic regression model shows whether each factor has a significant effect on the likelihood of teachers feeling confident that they have the skills they need to do their job once all other factors in the model are controlled for.

14.22 The fifth column, headed ‘Sig.’, shows whether the factor is significant. A value of less than 0.05 in this column suggests that this factor is significant. So, as the figure for whether a teacher has developed a plan for career-long professional learning (strongly agree vs. strongly disagree) is less than 0.05, it follows that, after controlling for the effect of all other factors in the model, the likelihood of those agreeing they have a plan for their career-long professional learning being confident in their skills is different from those who do not have a plan.

14.23 The second column, headed ‘Beta’ indicates the direction of the effect. A positive value indicates that those in the first category, for example those with a career-long professional learning plan, are more likely to feel confident, than those who do not.