

Professional development for citizenship teachers and leaders

An evaluation of citizenship training courses funded by the Department for Children, Schools and Families in 2006/08

Following a small-scale pilot in 2005/06, 17 higher education institutions now offer accredited training courses in citizenship for serving teachers, funded by the Department for Children, Schools and Families. The courses help participants to build their subject knowledge and skills in order to improve the quality of provision for citizenship in their own schools. This report is based on the 15 courses that Ofsted evaluated in 2007/08.

Age group: 11–19

Published: February 2009

Reference no: 070253

You may copy all or parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes, as long as you give details of the source and date of publication and do not alter the information in any way.

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects registered childcare and children's social care, including adoption and fostering agencies, residential schools, family centres and homes for children. We also inspect all state-maintained schools, non-association independent schools, pupil referral units, further education, initial teacher education, and publicly funded adult skills and employment-based training, the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (Cafcass), and the overall level of services for children in local authority areas.

Alexandra House
33 Kingsway
London WC2B 6SE
Phone: 08456 404040

Website: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>

Reference: 070253

© Crown Copyright 2009



Contents

Executive summary	4
Key findings	5
Recommendations	6
Professional development for citizenship teachers and leaders	7
The need for trained citizenship teachers and leaders	7
The course providers	9
Quality of the courses	10
Impact on teachers and schools	15
The sustainability of courses	17
Notes	17
Further information	18
Annex A: course providers and schools visited for the survey	20
Course providers	20
Schools	20
Annex B: DCSF Standards for the Certification of the Teaching of	
Citizenship	21
Introduction	21
Citizenship Standards	21

Executive summary

In 2005, the then Department for Education and Skills (DfES) commissioned a small-scale pilot for a certificated course in citizenship for serving teachers. It aimed to promote high quality citizenship education by remedying weaknesses in teachers' subject knowledge and pedagogical skills. Following evaluation, additional higher education institutions were invited to offer such courses. This expansion of courses was welcomed by the House of Commons Education and Skills Select Committee.¹

Between January 2007 and May 2008, Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI) evaluated 15 accredited courses in citizenship. Thirteen of these were taught courses; two used distance learning. Fourteen higher education institutions were involved, one of which provided both taught and distance learning options. Two thirds of the courses recruited teachers from primary, secondary and post-16 phases of education and the remaining third recruited teachers only from secondary schools.

The courses varied considerably in content and approach. In around four fifths of the courses, the emphasis in the teaching sessions was on pedagogy, with the expectation that participants would work in their own time to remedy the gaps in their knowledge. The remaining courses emphasised the subject's theoretical basis, with less attention to practical application.

The training sessions included work on: political literacy; critical thinking; global education; working in partnership with non-governmental organisations (NGOs); pedagogy for citizenship; progression in learning; assessment; classroom resources; and the teaching of controversial topics. The sessions were generally of good quality, expertly led and gave participants ample opportunity for discussion and debate as a whole group and in small groups.

Teachers who completed the course requirements and assessments gained a certificate. On all the courses it was also possible to gain Credit Accumulation and Transfer points towards a Postgraduate Certificate, Diploma or Masters qualification. Participants welcomed this enhancement, but on around one third of the courses they were unclear about what they needed to do to gain the extra accreditation. There were instances where participants who wanted to follow only the certificate course found the theory elements of their course burdensome.

HMI evaluated the impact of the courses by visits to the schools of 12 teachers who had attended the previous year's training and additional training in the summer of 2008. Evidence from this small-scale survey suggested that the impact on the whole-school ethos and on pupils' understanding of citizenship, was mostly good or outstanding. Ten of the 12 teachers had significantly improved their professional

¹ House of Commons Education and Skills Committee, Citizenship Education, Second Report of Session 2006–07, paragraph 89;
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200607/cmselect/cmeduski/147/14702.htm>.

knowledge and understanding of citizenship and their leadership skills. Departmental planning, monitoring and evaluation had improved. Two of the teachers had also contributed to whole-school in-service training on citizenship in other schools, thus widening the impact of the training beyond their own school.

However, despite funding from the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) to cover the costs to schools, as well as rigorous marketing and the overall good quality of the courses, over half of the total of 17 providers offering courses nationally were unable to fill all the available places; three could not recruit sufficient numbers of participants for their courses to go ahead. Nine of the courses surveyed were not in a position to be self-sustaining without support from partners or from additional continuing professional development funding gained, for example, by teachers registering on Masters courses, whether or not they intended to pursue them. Some local authorities made a contribution to recruitment and training, but in general the potential of local authority involvement was not fully realised. Many local authorities made no contribution to these courses.

Key findings

- Despite the general high quality of courses and considerable efforts to publicise them, over half of those available were undersubscribed and three courses failed to recruit sufficient numbers to run. Against the background of Ofsted's survey evidence of a continuing and profound training need, this low take up may be explained by insufficient access to local courses and a low priority given to citizenship training by schools.²
- The best courses were planned well to maximise the time in taught sessions and for self-study. Participants gained the greatest benefits when these two components were very well linked to help them consider citizenship teaching and learning in their own schools. The course sessions observed were planned and taught effectively by expert practitioners and maintained a good balance between intellectual rigour which was founded on research, and practical application.
- Although some of the training sessions benefited from the differing perspectives of teachers in the primary, secondary and post-16 sectors, the advantages of mixed provision rarely outweighed the disadvantages, especially when the time allocated to direct training was short.
- The impact of the courses was seen in teachers' increased confidence in working with school leaders; the higher profile given to citizenship; improved self-evaluation and action planning; improved curricular provision; changes in teaching styles; and improvements to the power of the student voice. In two of the schools, however, either the teachers' lack of seniority or insufficient support from school leaders meant that the impact was limited.

² See *Towards consensus? Citizenship in secondary schools* (HMI 2666), Ofsted, 2006; <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Publications-and-research/Browse-all-by/Education/Curriculum/Citizenship/Secondary/Towards-consensus-Citizenship-in-secondary-schools>.

- Needs analysis was effective in 11 of the 15 courses surveyed. It was used mostly to inform self-study and, on some of the courses, was used well for tutorial support.
- Courses were meant to provide the equivalent of five days of direct training, but approaches to using the time varied considerably. Four courses provided less than this, allocating some time for individuals' self-study which, in practice, was not necessarily undertaken.
- Participants on six of the courses did not understand how the training in citizenship was linked to accreditation at Masters level. The requirements for work at Masters level meant that some courses had a greater emphasis on theory than participants thought was necessary.
- Generally, participants found that the demands of the course outside the taught sessions were greater than they were able to meet and, as a result, some gave up, even though they were usually very positive about the provision.
- Two thirds of the providers thought the DCSF funding was insufficient. Four were able to offer the course only by requiring all the participants to register at Masters level, thus making it possible to draw on further funding elsewhere; nine of the courses were not self-sustaining. Providers also depended on key tutors, making courses vulnerable when staff left.
- Local authorities made a useful contribution to some courses but, in general, the potential for local authority involvement in certificated citizenship courses has not been fully realised.

Recommendations

The Department for Children, Schools and Families and the Training and Development Agency for Schools should:

- consider how to develop courses and routes that are attractive to and reach a far greater number of teachers and schools while maintaining the strengths of the citizenship continuing professional development (CPD) certificate
- ensure that courses have the funding they need to be sustainable and able to recruit.

Local authorities should:

- strengthen their involvement in citizenship CPD provision.

Course providers should:

- provide schools and potential participants with clear information on course components, assessment and accreditation arrangements, so that they know the implications

- use needs analysis more effectively to ensure that elements of the course, particularly self-study, match participants' needs effectively.

Schools should:

- maximise the benefits of teachers' attendance by discussing and supporting the action plans resulting from the training undertaken
- as well as seeking to recruit teachers with an initial teacher education qualification in citizenship, develop the expertise of existing teachers through the citizenship CPD Certificate or Masters level accreditation.

Professional development for citizenship teachers and leaders

The need for trained citizenship teachers and leaders

1. In 2005 the then Department for Education and Skills (DfES) announced a small-scale pilot for a certificated course in citizenship for serving teachers. The course aimed to promote high quality citizenship education by remedying weaknesses in teachers' subject knowledge and pedagogical skills. During 2005, three higher education institutions took up the DfES invitation to provide either taught or distance-learning courses based on a draft set of Standards. Following their experience and the recommendations of an internal report by Ofsted to the DfES, the Standards Framework was revised and further providers were invited to provide courses (see Annex B).
2. In 2006, Ofsted's report, *Towards consensus? Citizenship in secondary schools*, commented on the readiness of teachers to take on what, for most, was a new role.³

Most teachers of citizenship are 'non-specialists'; many work far from their normal comfort zone both in subject knowledge and teaching approaches, especially with regard to controversial and topical issues. Good citizenship teachers use a range of methods to ensure that pupils gain the knowledge and understanding they need to become involved in discussion and debate or to take action in the school or community. If the teaching is perceived by pupils as dull or irrelevant, then citizenship lessons can be counter-productive.

3. Although Ofsted's surveys of citizenship showed evidence of good teaching, more often than not the strengths identified were in teachers' generic skills rather than in their subject knowledge and pedagogy as it related specifically to

³ *Towards consensus? Citizenship in secondary schools* (HMI 2666), Ofsted, 2006; <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Publications-and-research/Browse-all-by/Education/Curriculum/Citizenship/Secondary/Towards-consensus-Citizenship-in-secondary-schools>.

citizenship. Weaknesses in the lessons observed usually derived from teachers' poor subject knowledge. This manifested itself in, for example, a lack of clarity about objectives for citizenship; a dependence on worksheets or other purchased resources; a failure to engage with the controversial issues that lie at the heart of citizenship; and little overt activity in campaigning, participation or change. Assessment and reporting generally remained very weak aspects of the teaching.

4. *Towards consensus?* reported that the leadership of citizenship was good in around two fifths of schools in the sample of schools where citizenship was inspected during 2005/06 and inadequate in a quarter of them.

In the quarter of schools where leadership was inadequate, it was frequently the case that the schools were not aware of weaknesses in the subject. In a small number of the schools inspected, there was no subject leader, or the designated teacher had other priorities... In a few of the other schools inspected, the subject leader had insufficient status to bring about change, for example to win over members of staff resistant to citizenship. A few, too, thought that they were leading the subject well, but mistakenly so, as they had not understood what was required.

5. Ofsted's surveys of citizenship provision, undertaken in 30 different secondary schools each year, show that in these schools a wide gap still exists between the leadership of citizenship and that of other subjects. This manifests itself in a continuing misunderstanding about the intentions and nature of citizenship as a National Curriculum subject. In the schools where inspectors judged citizenship to be inadequate, confusion about citizenship education and its place in the curriculum was still evident. There was a ready acceptance of very diffuse provision, so that the pupils themselves were unable to recognise citizenship education. Many of the schools were still giving the subject insufficient time in the curriculum, for example by not teaching it in particular years or every term, so that the time allocated to it amounted to much less overall than that recommended.
6. Ofsted has also identified other weaknesses:
 - the blurring of citizenship with personal, social and health education, careers and enterprise
 - an emphasis on unstructured discussion
 - teachers' low expectations of students' written work
 - dependency on ill-informed cross-curricular audits that suggested elements of citizenship were covered when they were not
 - a general conviction that a school develops good citizens without an understanding of how well-planned courses develop informed citizens.

School councils can play an important part in students' citizenship education but the extent to which they mirror and demonstrate democratic processes remains very variable.

7. Within such contexts, schools have to deal with changes in the status and detail of citizenship education that arise from revisions to the curriculum and examination specifications. Schools need a subject leader who is able to explain and promote the aim of the revised Key Stage 3 National Curriculum for each subject to develop students as 'responsible citizens'. This leader also has to plan a revised curriculum for citizenship itself and to consider the implications of assessment on an eight-level scale. A full GCSE course and an Advanced level course might also be on a school's agenda.
8. Nationally, the teaching force is still ill equipped to deal with these challenges. Relatively few teachers have come through Postgraduate Certificate in Education training courses as specialists in citizenship and many schools have not yet considered appointing one of these teachers, or indeed managed to do so. A need for in-service training remains in order to raise the knowledge base and develop pedagogical and leadership skills.
9. Against this background, this small-scale survey evaluated training designed to improve teachers' knowledge, pedagogy and leadership skills in citizenship.

The course providers

Recruitment and participation

10. In 2006/07 and 2007/08, 17 higher education institutions offered to run the accredited courses in citizenship. In 2006/07, they offered up to 540 course places and recruited 284 participants. In 2006/07, 10 of the providers recruited fewer teachers than their target. Three failed to recruit; one provider offered the course in 2007/08 only. In eight of the courses some participants dropped out because of pressure of work. Recruitment figures for 2007/08 were similarly low. Such under-recruitment in some areas may be related to lack of access to courses that are sufficiently local for participants. Many local authorities did not have the opportunity to be involved in the citizenship CPD provision.
11. The courses are aimed at teachers and leaders of citizenship but definitions of this and the target groups varied among the providers. Just over half the providers particularly targeted secondary schools; two thirds recruited teachers from all phases, from primary schools to post-16. Most of the providers surveyed had no specific entrance requirements, but one of the two distance-learning courses required participants to have three years' teaching experience, and another provider insisted that citizenship was the main teaching subject for all participants. Participants therefore included teachers from primary,

secondary, post-16, special and independent schools; subject leaders; trainee teachers; local authority advisers; representatives of NGOs; youth and community workers; and middle and senior school leaders.⁴

The location of courses

12. There was a broadly sensible geographical spread of courses: two in each of the south east, south west, north, north west, north east and West Midlands; and one each in the south, east and East Midlands. The distance-learning courses recruited from across the country, but drew mainly from the south east where the providers were based. This suggests that teachers are more likely to participate in distance-learning courses based in their own region, enabling them also to attend any face-to-face sessions.
13. A limited number of higher education institutions offer these courses and they are hard for many participants to reach unless they wish to pursue the course through distance learning. It is likely therefore that the Select Committee's recommendation that every school should have a specialist trained citizenship teacher will be realised in the short and medium term only by opening courses to a wider range of providers.⁵

Quality of the courses

14. Of the 15 courses evaluated in 2007 and 2008 for this survey, three were outstanding, 10 were good and two were satisfactory.

Course structure

15. The DCSF funded the providers to offer five days of direct course delivery. However, four of the providers did not meet the spirit of these funding requirements. The pattern of the use of these days varied considerably, including:
 - five full days
 - three full days with two days of supported self-study
 - two full days and six half-day sessions
 - a mix of full days (in half term and on Saturdays) and twilight sessions

⁴ The DCSF funding applied only to teachers employed in maintained schools. Other participants funded themselves, unless a special agreement had been reached between the provider and the DCSF.

⁵ Citizenship education: Government response to the Committee's Second Report of Session 2006–07, paragraph 21, House of Commons Education and Skills Committee; <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200607/cmselect/cmmeduski/517/517.pdf>.

- two full days with two twilight sessions and individual tutorials.

The two distance-learning courses included some optional face-to-face sessions. Five of the courses included visits to local places of interest for citizenship.

16. Course trainers were often higher education institution tutors who also taught on Postgraduate certificate in education courses for citizenship. Sessions were also taught by officers from local authorities and NGOs. Two providers invited their Postgraduate Certificate in Education citizenship trainees to contribute to or attend sessions.

Needs analysis

17. The good courses had useful systems for analysing participants' learning needs. Trainees were required to audit their subject knowledge against the National Curriculum programme of study for citizenship. These audits were sometimes used to amend the content of the course. One provider, for example, changed a planned half-day training session on assessment to a full day in the light of the needs identified. However, the main purpose of the audits was to inform participants' independent work and discussion in tutorials. The following shows the good use of an audit for planning and review.

Participants complete an initial needs analysis to inform the start of the course. A more detailed, three-stage audit takes place when participants start their first assignment. Participants first evaluate their subject knowledge against the full programme of study, using a five-point scale, with given criteria. Participants who declare 'none' or 'limited knowledge' have to demonstrate the action they have taken to remedy the deficiency. Those who say their knowledge is 'good' or 'excellent' have to provide evidence. The same process is also used to evaluate citizenship pedagogy and 'understanding the development and requirements of citizenship education'.

18. On one third of the courses, the needs analysis, although undertaken, was not used to inform the course planning.

Course content

19. All the courses surveyed met the DCSF's current requirements, aims and objectives for the certification of the teaching of citizenship. The provision on each course was designed to enable participants to achieve the Standards for the Teaching of Citizenship (Annex B).
20. The courses varied considerably in content and approach. The good courses consisted, typically, of the equivalent of five taught days covering:
 - the citizenship Standards and other course assessment requirements
 - the background to citizenship education and statutory requirements

- citizenship pedagogy with examples of good practice
 - the teaching of controversial issues
 - working with outside agencies – including visits to local places of interest
 - the new programme of study for Key Stage 3
 - assessment and the new eight-level scale
 - active citizenship and community involvement, within and beyond the school.
21. The providers used either one- or two-day sessions to introduce the course, explain the arrangements for assessing participants and begin teaching. The better courses provided a handbook, showing the Standards and providing other necessary information, including assessment arrangements and timescales. Providers who had not done this for the first cohort had a handbook available for the next year as a result of feedback from participants.
 22. In the majority of the courses, the emphasis in the teaching sessions was on pedagogy with the expectation that participants would work on the gaps in their knowledge of the subject content in their own time. The remaining courses emphasised the theory basis of citizenship, with less attention to practical application. The strongest courses gave due weight to both these elements.
 23. The best courses were well planned to make the maximum use of the time available in taught sessions and self-study, including written tasks and assignments. The participants gained the greatest benefit from their course when these two components were very well linked, so that they could research, plan, carry out and reflect upon citizenship teaching and learning in their schools.
 24. Three of the 15 providers used a virtual learning environment set up to provide individual online support and a forum for discussions between participants. This was particularly valuable for some distance-learning participants, one of whom described the discussions via the virtual learning environment as ‘thought provoking and stimulating... requiring me to keep making judgements and analyse my thinking and that of others’. However, not all participants found it helpful. In some cases, few participants contributed to the online forums, interest waned and the potential of the resource was lost.

Training sessions

25. Training sessions, both theory and practical, were usually of good quality, including those on courses which were otherwise graded satisfactory overall. Participants undertook work on political literacy; critical thinking; global education; working in partnership with NGOs; pedagogy for citizenship;

progression and assessment; classroom resources; and the teaching of controversial topics.

26. The training sessions were expertly led and gave participants ample opportunity for discussion and debate in whole-group and small-group sessions. The best engaged participants in considering significant issues in citizenship, illuminating them with practical examples of how they might be approached in the classroom and the expected outcomes. Good examples included using story as a stimulus for citizenship discussion and demonstration of a participative voting activity to help pupils understand different perspectives on voting, representation and leadership.
27. Although mixed sessions had some advantages, with teachers from primary, secondary and post-16 sectors drawing on different perspectives on teaching citizenship, such benefits rarely outweighed the overall disadvantages. For example, primary teachers describing their teaching and their pupils' standards provided secondary teachers with food for thought about their own expectations of students in Year 7. However, the objectives and discussion tended to become diffuse, especially where primary teachers wanted to draw on their wider work in personal, social, health and citizenship education. On balance, in the limited time available for taught sessions, teachers really needed to focus on the issues most pertinent to their own phase. This was illustrated by a teacher from a nursery and infant school, who said that the course was not particularly focused on her needs, which she felt would have been met better through individual tutorial support.

Distance-learning courses

28. High levels of academic rigour and greater depth of study were more evident in the distance-learning courses than in many of the taught courses. Examples included a module on 'Citizenship as an aim of mass education in the United Kingdom and other nations' and a task which required participants to read a given text and to 'discuss what virtues, in your judgement, the citizenship curriculum should nurture in the light of this chapter and the values and dispositions set out on page 45 of the Crick report'. Participants said that, initially, they found the materials daunting but appreciated the high quality of the resources and guidance documentation, and that they enjoyed the opportunity to deepen their knowledge and understanding.
29. A key advantage of the distance-learning courses was the flexibility for participants to work at their own pace – described as 'very important for working teachers' by one teacher – and the opportunity for training where there was no provider locally. However, the distance-learning courses focused less than the taught courses on classroom practice and, for this reason, did not always meet participants' needs sufficiently. One teacher said that he had hoped to get more practical ideas for lessons than the course offered and, in reflecting on the courses, many of the teachers recommended that more face-

to-face sessions should be included where they could share practice and resources.

30. A strong advantage of the taught courses was that they enabled participants to explore issues in citizenship together, sharing ideas, resources and good practice. Conversations which began in sessions often continued between them, and beyond the course, as many participants continued to communicate via email. Although distance-learning courses provided opportunities for participants to attend optional face-to-face study days, participants who had not met had less incentive to begin exchanges in the virtual learning environment than those who had shared a lively introductory session. Where the virtual learning environment was used, participants appreciated it as an effective supplement to the training. However, not all found it helpful and, when few were involved, interest waned and its potential was not realised.

Accreditation and levels of demand

31. Teachers who completed the course requirements and assessments gained a certificate. On all the courses it was also possible to gain Credit Accumulation and Transfer points towards a Postgraduate Certificate, Diploma or Masters qualification. Participants welcomed this enhancement, but around one third of the courses surveyed did not explain well, at the start of the course, the relationship between the CPD and the Credit Accumulation and Transfer points at Masters level. The participants on these courses were unclear about the qualification pathways and did not understand the related assessment arrangements or the additional work necessary.
32. Relating the CPD certificate and Masters level accreditation had some benefits, but it also brought with it considerable challenges. In citizenship, the academic background of teachers cannot be taken for granted and some theoretical knowledge is essential. This is addressed by the requirement in the Standards that teachers should demonstrate a secure knowledge and understanding of curriculum policy for citizenship. A clear strength, therefore, was that Masters level work and the related assessment requirements brought an academic rigour to courses. During the survey, however, a significant minority of the teachers regarded the more theory-based approach of study for Masters level as superfluous, even off-putting, when what they wanted from the course was practical and professional training linked to citizenship teaching in schools.
33. Discussion with participants during the survey and observation of sessions suggested that there was a need both for practical application and theory in the CPD certificate course, which could then be extended, for those who wished, at Masters level.
34. Generally, participants found the requirements to undertake assessed tasks and assignments outside the taught sessions very demanding. Not all were able to

find the time to complete them and, as a result, left the course, despite having positive views of the provision.

Quality assurance

35. All of the higher education institution providers assured the quality of their courses in line with the quality assurance regulations for accredited courses within their individual institutions. This included, for example, the second marking of assignments and scrutiny by external examiners. In two cases, reports from external examiners were used well to improve provision.
36. All providers sought the views of participants on the quality of the provision; all undertook end-of-course evaluations and some included interim course and session evaluations. Providers used the data from evaluation to improve the quality of guidance documentation and inform planning.

Impact on teachers and schools

37. Discussions with participants during the training, and in schools with the 12 teachers who had completed their portfolios, indicated that teachers' professional knowledge, understanding and pedagogical practice were enhanced by their participation. Most had:
 - developed their understanding of the background to citizenship in the curriculum, the statutory requirements and the new programme of study for Key Stage 3
 - made lessons more active and participatory
 - developed the confidence to allow pupils to express their opinions in class
 - improved their ability to conduct self-evaluation, plan work, access resources and assess pupils' achievements
 - gained greater confidence in dealing with school leaders about citizenship.

They were also better able to understand how other subjects could contribute to citizenship and how to tackle issues of identity, diversity and community cohesion.

38. Eight of the 12 teachers with whom inspectors held discussions in their schools were subject leaders or senior managers. All the leaders said that, as a result of participating in the course, they were better able to influence their school's senior leadership team and had improved their departmental planning, monitoring and evaluation. There were also examples of those who had taken up opportunities to contribute to departmental, whole-school or local authority in-service training. Comments from participants included:

'I found the CPD course invaluable and I am sure it has had a positive impact both on my personal teaching practice and my understanding of

the ways in which meaningful citizenship teaching and learning can take place.’ (Subject leader, secondary school)

‘I have learnt a lot from this course, both in knowledge and methodology. I am now coordinating a vibrant, enthusiastic team of teachers.’ (Subject leader, secondary school)

‘The work I did towards the certificate has certainly helped me in this role and empowered me in my work as a class teacher. I thoroughly enjoyed the challenge of the course but did not feel it recognised the very different needs of Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2... However, I did get some really exciting active citizenship with my children which we all enjoyed! Got my certificate today and feel proud of my achievements and those of my class of 2007!’ (Subject leader and Year 2 teacher, infant school)

39. However, four of the 12 teachers visited in their schools were unable to put their leadership skills into practice because of the lack of dedicated time for team meetings or opportunities to monitor and evaluate teaching in citizenship. One secondary school subject leader commented:

‘At present there is little dedicated time for classroom observation or for development of the teaching team because they all teach other subjects as well as citizenship and the other departments take precedence.’ (Subject leader, secondary school)

40. In eight of the 10 schools visited, the impact on students’ experience was good or outstanding. Most of the students observed had positive attitudes to citizenship; they enjoyed debate and discussion and took it seriously. They had good opportunities for their views to be heard through the strengthening of the ‘pupil voice’ and took more responsibility within and beyond the school. One student said, ‘We now get listened to more, like on working parties about the environment and tackling anti-social behaviour.... We even get to do lesson observations and help appoint new teachers.’ In a 5–19 special school, for example, a teacher had developed the school council through more regular meetings and an assigned budget and had enabled two students to represent the school at the local youth forum.
41. The impact on the whole school was at least good in nine of the 10 schools visited; in one, the impact of the training was outstanding. Most of the participants felt that citizenship had a higher profile in their school as a result and that curriculum provision had improved. Six of the schools had stronger, more influential student councils and two had introduced accredited citizenship courses. In three of the schools visited, staff from across the school had a better understanding of citizenship as a result of whole-school professional development which the course participants had provided. Two of the schools had appointed additional specialist citizenship teachers. At the time of the

survey, four of the schools thought it was too early to judge the impact of improved citizenship on standards across the school.

42. The impact of teachers' participation was also felt beyond the school. In one case, a teacher became involved in a local community forum, looking at ways to facilitate community cohesion in an area of racial tension. In another case, an advanced skills teacher for citizenship felt she was better able to lead courses on assessment; the new Key Stage 3 curriculum; and diversity and community cohesion for teachers and leaders across the local authority. As a result of links forged during the course, the providers of the training were offered more school placements for their trainees on Postgraduate Certificate in Education citizenship courses.
43. In two of the schools visited, the impact of the course was limited because the teachers taught only a few lessons of citizenship and were not the subject leaders.

The sustainability of courses

44. Two thirds of the providers thought the DCSF funding of £750 per teacher was insufficient. Four were able to offer the course only by requiring all teachers to register at Masters level, thus making it possible to draw on further funding for continuing professional development from the Training and Development Agency for Schools. Three providers supplemented the DCSF funding by charging schools up to £150 as a top-up fee. Most of the providers relied on the goodwill of local authority advisers or officers from non-governmental organisations to provide training at little or no cost. Some partners were able to offer support for training as part of their own separately funded remit for citizenship but this was dependent on their own funding continuing. Ultimately, the viability of the courses depended on good recruitment.
45. Two of the providers were concerned that the time and costs of, often fruitless, recruitment activities were not factored into the funding. Others expressed the view that if the DCSF was to provide additional funding to schools for supply cover, this would help to boost recruitment by enabling schools to release more teachers to attend training.
46. Nearly all of the course leaders were tutors from the higher education institutions. The providers therefore depended on these key individuals being available to teach the courses. When a tutor moved from an institution, the sustainability of the course was threatened.

Notes

During the period January 2007 to May 2008, HMI evaluated 15 courses provided by 14 providers of higher education. These providers represented all those providing the training for the DCSF-certificated course in citizenship and which had recruited

sufficient numbers for their course to proceed. In total, the courses had recruited 284 participants, of whom 273 were teachers, four were Postgraduate Certificate in Education trainees, two were local authority advisers and five represented NGOs. Inspectors held discussions with trainers and participants (individually and in groups), observed training sessions, and scrutinised course documentation and participants' portfolios.

From May to July 2008 HMI visited 12 teachers in 10 schools representing outcomes from five of the providers: seven secondary schools; one primary school; one nursery and infant school; and one special school. This took into account both the taught and distance-learning routes. Evidence was gathered from discussions with the 12 teachers, seven line managers, and six groups of pupils, as well as observation of nine citizenship lessons and scrutiny of three completed portfolios.

Further evidence was derived from course evaluations, as well as individual evaluations by participants.

Further information

Publications

An evaluation of the post-16 citizenship pilot, 2004/05: a report from Ofsted and the Adult Learning Inspectorate (HMI 2440), Ofsted, 2005;
<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications>.

Initial teacher training for teachers of citizenship (HMI 2486), Ofsted 2005;
<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications>.

Leading citizenship in schools (20080007), Ofsted 2008;
<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications>.

T Huddleston, D Kerr, *Making sense of citizenship: a CPD handbook*, Hodder Education, 2006.

Towards consensus? Citizenship in secondary schools (HMI 2666), Ofsted, 2006;
<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications>.

Websites

The new National Curriculum for citizenship;
<http://curriculum.qca.org.uk/key-stages-3-and-4/subjects/citizenship/index.aspx>

The school self-evaluation tool for citizenship education, Department for Education and Skills, 2004;
http://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/top/top_5/downloads/sub/10.

The Association for Citizenship Teaching; ;<http://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/>.

CitizEd is a TDA-funded organisation for providers of teacher education in citizenship;
<http://www.citized.info/>.

Annex A: course providers and schools visited for the survey

Course providers

Anglia Ruskin University
Birkbeck College, University of London
Institute of Education, University of London
London Metropolitan University
Manchester Metropolitan University
Newman University College, Birmingham
University of Bristol
University of Cumbria
University of Huddersfield
University of Leeds
University of Leicester
University of Newcastle
University of Plymouth
University of Winchester

Schools

Cavendish School, Eastbourne
Dosthill Primary School, Staffordshire
Farnborough Grange Nursery and Infant Community School, Farnborough
Frederick Gough Language College, North Lincolnshire
Kingsmead Technology College, Staffordshire
Newman Catholic College, Carlisle
North Leamington School, Leamington Spa
Osborne School, Winchester
Swanmore College of Technology, Southampton
The Friary School, Staffordshire.

Annex B: DCSF Standards for the Certification of the Teaching of Citizenship

Introduction

These standards are intended for use by all teachers who have, or aspire to, responsibility for leading the citizenship curriculum, including citizenship specialists and teachers in other subject areas with significant citizenship components. They are equally appropriate for teachers in primary, middle, secondary and special schools and those in post-16 education settings.

They are appropriate for those teachers who have met and continue to meet the standards for qualified teacher status possessing the knowledge and skills essential for them to be effective classroom teachers. Such teachers demonstrate a high degree of sustained competence in their own subject areas and, through their general experience and expertise, make a significant contribution to the ethos and success of the school, college or education setting (hereafter, school).

The standards are in two parts: Citizenship knowledge and understanding; and Teaching and learning. The standards are followed by advice to providers relating to the content of the continuing professional development (CPD) course, delivered by higher education institutions. Participants will be deemed to have passed the certificate when they have demonstrated their competence in respect of the standards for citizenship through completion of the tasks set out in this advice and any other requirement specified by the course provider. However, all providers of citizenship CPD should endeavour to match their programmes to the standards.

Citizenship Standards

1. Citizenship knowledge and understanding

The teacher demonstrates a secure knowledge and understanding of the citizenship curriculum and policy:

- a. the schools' policy for citizenship education and how this reflects national policy such as Every Child Matters (especially making a positive contribution), the aims of the revised National Curriculum, the duty on schools to promote community cohesion, guidance on pupil participation and how it supports personalised learning, issues identified by Ofsted in recent subject reports on schools, the latest annual report, the school self-evaluation process, statutory and non-statutory guidance
- b. how whole-school policies and ethos underpin citizenship learning in the school or institution and vice versa
- c. the distinctive contribution of citizenship to the curriculum, its aims and purposes, the principles underpinning high-quality citizenship programmes and

the relationship between citizenship and other subjects, especially personal, social, health and economic education and history

d. the content of National Curriculum programme of study for citizenship and national guidelines supporting post-16 citizenship learning, and focusing particularly on the Range and content in respect of political, legal and human rights, the key features of parliamentary democracy and government

e. how the key concepts: Democracy and justice, Rights and responsibilities, Identities and diversity; Key processes: Critical thinking and enquiry, Advocacy and representation, Taking informed and responsible action; Range and content and Curriculum opportunities engage together to meet the aims of the citizenship curriculum

f. understand how the new element of the National Curriculum, Identities and diversity: living together in the UK contributes to the promotion of community cohesion.

g. the law as it relates to the teaching of citizenship including the teaching of controversial issues, confidentiality and child protection;

h. the principles of self-evaluation for citizenship education including, as appropriate, use of the School Self-evaluation Tool for Citizenship Education.

2. Teaching and learning

The teacher:

a. develops clear ground rules with classes to establish a climate of trust and mutual respect; recognises and has strategies to consistently challenge prejudice; and has strategies to promote and manage discussions of sensitive, controversial and topical issues, including spontaneous issues raised by pupils

b. plans lessons and a series of lessons in which active learning plays a major part, maximising pupil participation and engagement and:

- providing opportunities for pupils to engage in critical thinking and enquiry
- providing opportunities for pupils to develop their skills of advocacy and representation
- providing opportunities to take informed and responsible action.

c. researches topical political, moral, social and cultural issues, problems or events in their communities and the wider world; using relevant historical contexts, analysing information from different sources including the media, and ICT-based resources and as a means of communicating ideas.

- d. consults with the students to give them a voice in things that affect them and provides opportunities to participate in decision making
- e. involves an appropriate partner, such as another teacher, or student teacher, or a community representative in the delivery of lessons and evaluates their input
- f. uses voluntary and statutory organisations to plan and resource relevant aspects of the citizenship curriculum across and beyond the school
- g. uses teacher assessments informed by consideration of the 8 level scale, and a range of approaches to assessment for and of learning to assess pupils' progress and achievement in knowledge, understanding and skills
- h. reviews and evaluates own teaching and learning, and pupils' progress, and uses this to inform future planning.

CPD course content

It will be for individual providers and their partners to determine the content that enables teachers to achieve the Citizenship Teaching Certificate and the associated CATS points. However, all courses should ensure that there is an appropriate balance of underpinning theoretical and subject knowledge development as with an emphasis on practical application through planning and teaching. All providers will be expected to include the following tasks and activities in their programmes.

Needs identification

Participants must undertake a needs identification for citizenship. This will include a short personal values statement: 'Why citizenship is important to me and how this is reflected in my teaching.' The needs identification, which should include an evaluation of the depth of their subject knowledge (within the programme of study), should inform a personal implementation plan.

Implementation plan

Each participant will devise and share a personal implementation plan endorsed by the school leadership team in their own school or setting in order to set targets to raise standards of teaching and learning and standards for citizenship across the school.

Self-evaluation action plan

Participants must undertake a school self-evaluation for citizenship in their school with the support of the senior leadership team. This should include an action plan with identified priorities in order to further progress the development of the subject across the school and beyond the personal implementation plan.

Critical analysis

Participants will undertake a critical analysis of the revised National Curriculum programme of study for citizenship (or, as appropriate, the Framework for PSHE and Citizenship in Primary Schools and Post-16 Citizenship Guidance) in demonstrating their subject knowledge.

Scheme of work

Participants will be required to devise a scheme of work (minimum four lessons/maximum of six lessons) relating to their priorities as set out in their personal implementation plan. As well as providing for high-quality lessons and a coherent approach to the topic overall, the schemes should:

- demonstrate a response to controversial issues/topicality
- make use of active learning approaches
- use ICT to add value to the lesson and pupils' involvement in researching a topic
- engage with the wider community and involve an external partner demonstrating an awareness of the need for balance and non-partisanship
- should show progression and include assessment activities that will demonstrate the participant's knowledge of assessment and assessment practice.

Lesson observation

Evidence should include an observation by a peer/head of department/member of SLT/adviser/AST/lecturer of one of the lessons above being taught by the participant. Following feedback and self-reflection with an emphasis on pupil outcomes this would be verified by the observer for inclusion in the participant's portfolio.