

ANGUS COUNCIL

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

30 APRIL 2002

DRAFT FRAMEWORK FOR PROFESSIONAL REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT (JANUARY 2002):
RESPONSE TO SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report is to bring to the attention of the Education Committee the terms of a consultative response prepared by officers of the Education Department and already submitted to the Scottish Executive.

1 RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 It is recommended that the Education Committee:

- (a) notes the terms of this report;
- (b) notes and endorses the terms of the consultative response prepared by officers of the Education Department (see Appendix);
- (c) notes the main elements of the Draft Scottish Executive Framework for Professional Review and Development [the full document is available for perusal in the Members' Lounge];
- (d) notes that the procedures for professional review and development in Angus - which include recently agreed arrangements for the production of annual CPD plans by teaching staff – meet the criteria for Professional Review and Development strategies proposed in the Draft Framework document.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century* introduced a requirement for all teachers to agree an annual continuing professional development (CPD) plan and to maintain a CPD record of all professional development activities which they undertake. The agreement also requires those teachers wishing to undertake the Chartered Teacher programme to maintain a CPD portfolio.

2.2 "A Framework for Professional Review and Development" was drafted by a sub-group of a Ministerial Strategy Committee set up to establish a national CPD strategy and to provide guidance on the CPD implications of the McCrone Agreement. The draft document was issued for consultation to Directors of Education on 31 January 2002, and responses sought by 15 March 2002. The attached response was prepared by officers of the Education Department and submitted to the Scottish Executive by the due date.

2.3 In producing the Draft Framework, the National Strategy Committee sub-group was very clear that the emerging national framework must be sufficiently flexible to enable schools and local authorities to set national guidance **within the context of their own local systems**. The sub-group has clearly taken into account the fact that many local authorities already have in place good quality review and development procedures. It would appear that the Ministerial Strategy Committee believes that such procedures should not be undermined by finalised national guidance.

3 DRAFT CONSULTATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR PROFESSIONAL REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT: KEY ELEMENTS

3.1 The Draft Framework document seeks to:

- set a national strategy for professional review and development in the context of "*A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century*" which requires that "teachers shall have an ongoing commitment to maintain their professional expertise through an agreed programme of continuing professional development"

- emphasise the responsibility which Head Teachers have “to promote the continuing professional development of **all** staff and ensure that all staff have an **annual review of their development needs**”
- stress the importance of professional review and development procedures being managed within a supportive school climate
- provide exemplar formats of a CPD record and of a CPD plan for teaching staff
- highlight the importance of establishing arrangements for professional review and development which are simple, credible and which have minimal bureaucracy
- present a helpful list of CPD activities, with CPD being defined as “anything that has progressed, assisted and enhanced a teacher’s professionalism”
- provide a suggested structure for CPD portfolios for those teachers who enter the Chartered Teacher programme
- encourage a progressive approach to career long CPD for teaching staff which links effectively with emerging professional standards for the teaching profession in Scotland, namely, the Initial Teacher Education Standard, the Standard for Full Registration, the Chartered Teacher Standard and the Standard for Headship

3.2 These simple proposals for the construction of a professional review and development strategy are well considered and unarguable. It is my view that they are wholly in accord with existing procedures in Angus.

4 CURRENT PROFESSIONAL REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES IN ANGUS

4.1 The existing scheme for staff development and review [**NB** this nomenclature is now being replaced by the term “Professional Review and Development”] was amended in February 1998. The scheme is similar to schemes established in other authorities and is predicated upon **triennial** “appraisal/review meetings” with provision for **annual** meetings to review and update personal action plans and now (in the light of the McCrone Agreement) CPD plans.

4.2 It should be noted that arrangements now established in respect of CPD plans and CPD records for teaching staff are the outcome of productive discussions with teachers’ representatives. The arrangements are the subject of detailed guidance - endorsed by the Council’s Joint Consultative Committee for Teaching Staff – which was issued to schools on 19 December 2001.

4.3 The Angus guidelines include proformas to enable teachers to plan their CPD activities and to record the evaluation of those activities including their impact on learning and teaching. The proformas more than satisfy the criteria implied by the exemplar formats included in the Draft Scottish Executive Framework.

4.4 Angus arrangements allow for the production of annual CPD plans which do not necessitate a formal **annual** review meeting. They will, however, ensure that CPD plans respond year on year to teachers’ changing professional development needs. As well as discussions with line managers, teachers’ CPD plans will take close account of ongoing self-evaluation activities which Angus teachers are expected to carry out in accordance with each school’s arrangements to monitor the quality of learning and teaching.

4.5 It should be noted that the attached officer response expresses the hope that there will be no intention on the part of the Executive to require the conduct of formal **annual** review (or appraisal) meetings.

4.6 In expressing that hope, officers have had due regard to the strength of existing arrangements for the formal review of teaching staff described in 4.1 above. These arrangements were the subject of very favourable comment by HM Inspectorate of Education in the Inspection Report on the Education Authority published on 11 April 2002. HMIE noted that “the scheme (of staff development and review) was a strength of the overall approach to monitoring performance improvement at school and education department levels”. [P.27. Para 2 “The Inspection of the Education Functions of Local Authorities - Angus Council”, April 2002]

5 CONCLUSION

- 5.1** The Scottish Executive Draft Framework for Professional Review and Development is a pleasingly concise and accessible document.
- 5.2** It is reassuring to note that the procedures which are in place in Angus, have attracted favourable comment from HM Inspectorate of Education. In terms of the consultative Framework, it is no less pleasing to note that Angus procedures meet the main criteria for effective professional review and development strategies described in 3.1 above. Notwithstanding this view, it will be important to give due consideration to the need to make possible amendments to existing procedures in the light of definitive ministerial guidance which will result from the consultation exercise on the Draft Framework document.

6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications arising directly of this report.

7 HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

There are no Human Rights implications arising directly from this report.

8 CONSULTATION

The Chief Executive, the Director of Law and Administration and the Director of Finance have been consulted in the preparation of this report.

JIM ANDERSON
DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Inspection of the Education Functions of Angus Council: HMIE/Accounts Commission, April 2002

NL/AR

ANGUS COUNCIL – EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

AN OFFICER RESPONSE TO “DRAFT FRAMEWORK FOR PROFESSIONAL REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT” BY THE SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, JANUARY 2002

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The draft is pleasingly concise and accessible. However, neither the covering letter nor the document itself makes explicit whether an annual meeting to discuss development needs constitutes ‘per se’ a formal annual review/appraisal meeting. A number of Education Authorities including Angus Council have set in place satisfactory arrangements based upon **triennial** “appraisal/review” meetings with built in annual meetings to review/update Personal Action and/or CPD plans. Ongoing developments in relation to reflective practitioner approaches - which involve regular self-evaluation with reference to quality indicators - serve to generate a working environment in which **annual** formal review meetings are not seen to be necessary. It is, therefore, our hope that there will be no intention on the part of the Executive to require the conduct of annual (formal) review meetings. In an Angus context, for example, current arrangements for Head Teacher Review, which involve detailed reviewee self-evaluation complemented by evidence/information gathering by reviewers, would not be sustainable on an annual basis. That said, already established procedures for the review of Personal Action Plans and now CPD Plans will ensure that CPD activities are informed by processes designed to identify the professional development needs of individual teachers. The suggestion in Fergus Millan's letter that the "intended national framework should be sufficiently flexible to enable schools and local authorities to set national recommendations within the context of their own local systems" is, therefore, most welcome.

2 Specific comments on the draft framework document

- 2.1 Page 2 - the description of the professional review and development process (para.2) and the rationale underpinning that process (para.4) are wholly endorsed
- 2.2 Page 2/3 - the need to involve **all** staff, teaching and non-teaching, in a school professional review and development process, is well made. The principles of professional review and development enunciated in paragraph 5 are agreed; the importance of ensuring that review and development processes are fully integrated within the overall arrangements for quality assurance cannot be over-emphasised.
- 2.3 Page 3 - the importance of evaluating the impact of CPD activities on the quality of learning and teaching is unarguable; it will, therefore, be important that CPD records being developed in the light of the McCrone Agreement allow for entries which signal the impact of a particular professional development activity sometime (eg 6 months) **after** the activity has occurred; In this regard, it will be important to develop electronic approaches to CPD planning and recording. (Arrangements to that end are currently in place in Angus).
- 2.4 Page 4 - Suggestions for the contents of the overall CPD profile and within this of the CPD record and CPD plan are simple and well considered .
- 2.5 Page 5/6 - The view that “an eligible CPD activity is anything that has progressed, assisted or enhanced a teacher’s professionalism ” is endorsed. However, entries in a CPD plan should relate to activities, which are wittingly undertaken with a view to enhancing a teacher’s knowledge or professional skills. It will be important to avoid too many situations where teaching staff might suggest that routine professional activities should retrospectively be construed to be CPD activities even although when undertaken there had been no CPD intention surrounding such activities. The advice provided on page 5 in relation to the process of professional review and development is straightforward and focused. The emphasis appears, however, to be on the reviewer or reviewee reflecting upon the reviewee’s CPD profile and thereafter agreeing new development needs. The advice of itself does not specifically relate to a formal performance appraisal/review.

In an Angus context, the annual process described on page 5 would relate to a review of a teacher's personal action plan and/or CPD plan with the formal “performance review” occurring **triennially** as indicated in paragraph 1.1 above. The key elements of the proposed CPD portfolio for teachers who wish to engage with the Chartered Teacher programme are well considered. The approach implied is

wholly endorsed.

- 2.6 Page 7 - the general framework encompassing the four national standards is well structured and seen to be helpful. However, the term "new beginnings" is rather pious, needlessly tautological and should perhaps be dropped; if a heading separate from "probation" is required it is recommended that "entry to the profession" be adopted. Equally, "developing still" has an unfortunate resonance and should perhaps be replaced simply by "continuing development"
- 2.7 It is agreed that the exemplar CPD framework will be helpful in assisting schools and the Education Authority to plan and review CPD for the teaching profession in Scotland.
- 2.8 Annex 1 and Annex 2 – simple, straightforward and sufficient to the task .(Local variants which have recently been agreed will be emailed separately for information)
- 2.9 The Checklist for Implementation outlined on page 12 is thoughtful and takes appropriate account of the importance of ensuring that professional review and development requires to have a positive focus and be designed above all (to use the terminology of the exemplar framework provided on page 9) "to build excellence".

3 Conclusion

The draft framework document builds very appropriately on the main quality assurance processes now being promoted in Scottish schools. The framework once in place should make a significant contribution to the effective management and delivery of professional review and development procedures for the teaching profession in Scotland.