

Continuing Professional Development and why it should be abolished

David Frost

This chapter has been published in Portuguese. The reference is:

Frost, D. (2018) Continuing Professional Development and why it should be abolished, in M. A. Flores and A. M. Silva (Ed.s) *Currículo, Avaliação e Desenvolvimento Profissional*, Vreeland: De Facto.

I have been actively involved in the field of CPD since the beginning of the 1980s. In those days I was a practicing school teacher and part of a team which designed and led in-house programmes for the whole staff in my school. Within that team there was a shared assumption that all teachers should be engaged in professional learning as a continuous process although we had not yet begun to understand the complexity of the relationship between teachers' professional learning and school improvement. Our assumption was roughly in line with a government report of a previous era, the McNair Report (Board of Education, 1944) which recommended that teachers should have regular updating and continuous renewal, an idea that still permeates policy on teacher development across the world. However, in many countries such updating is seen largely as a matter of brushing up your subject knowledge which is only one of the domains of knowledge necessary for effective teaching (Shulman, 1987). In any case the McNair Report was limited in that it focused on the teachers themselves – their skills, understanding and knowledge - rather than educational practice and processes of innovation. This was amended in later reports; for example, the James Report (DES, 1972) highlighted the essential link between teachers' development and the review and development particular aspects of practice or curriculum (McBride, 1989). Nevertheless, the view that teachers need to be trained to fulfil the expectations of government or other agencies external to the teachers themselves has persisted.

I suggest that the deficit view of professional development outlined above remains dominant in many policy arenas and continues to underpin government strategies designed to try to improve teacher effectiveness. Teacher unions in contrast have tended, in the past at least, to talk of CPD as an entitlement, a point which was explicitly made in the James Report.

...all teachers should be entitled to release with pay for in-service education and training on a scale not less than the equivalent of one term in every seven years (DES 1972: 72, para 16.6).

This notion of entitlement rests on the assumption that programmes of what James called ‘in-service education and training’ (INSET) would all be of equal worth and value. A further assumption is that release from their professional responsibilities would always be of most benefit.

It is my contention here that these ways of thinking about CPD are standing in the way of real progress in the development of programmes that are transformative; programmes that could have profound impact not only on teachers’ professional learning but also on the development of classroom practice and school improvement. This represents an enormous challenge for education systems globally. Increasingly the international discourse on school improvement focuses on the question of the quality of teachers’ work and its relationship to the reform of educational systems. International comparisons such as those facilitated by PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) and TALIS (Teaching and Learning International Survey) focus policy makers’ attention on the factor that can make the most difference to the success of their education systems, namely teachers’ practice.

In the past 20-30 years, the focus of debate about school improvement has focused on how schools are organised, curriculum and formal school leadership, but finally we see an emerging consensus that brings to the fore the role of the teacher. The research evidence supporting this has been reviewed recently by Caroline Creaby (2016) in her doctoral study. She cites correlational analysis from the US (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010) and evidence from Australian research (Leigh, 2010) to underline the point that it is the teacher that makes the difference. She also cites Wiliam (2013) who argues that policies focusing on attempts to recruit better teachers as the means to improve teacher effectiveness are based on a misinterpretation of the research evidence. Instead what is needed are approaches that increase teachers’ motivation to improve their practice. The McKinsey Report identified this motivation as a key characteristic of highly performing systems (Barber & Mourshed, 2007); teachers who have ‘high expectations, a shared sense of purpose, and above all, a collective belief in their common ability to make a difference’ (p.27) are the ones who will be motivated to improve their practice. The implication is that teacher effectiveness could be improved by mobilising teachers’ moral purpose and enhancing their self-efficacy. So how could continuing professional development help to achieve this?

The terminological muddle

To address the above question, it is important to be clear about the term ‘continuing professional development’ and the various concepts it represents. One of the obstacles to achieving conceptual clarity in this area is that the term ‘continuing professional development’ (CPD) is commonly used within the teaching profession to refer to programmes or activities designed to support teachers’ professional development rather than the actual processes of learning and development that teachers experience. In the UK, the term CPD came into more common usage in the 1990s and for many of us teaching at that time, it was preferable to the term ‘INSET’, the acronym of *Inservice Education and Training of Teachers* used in the James Report (DES, 1972). The inclusion of the word ‘training’ in INSET suggested an approach based on behaviour modification whereas the term ‘professional development’ offered the promise of something more respectful of our sense of purpose and professional autonomy. Writers in the 1990s tended to portray CPD as a more general category with INSET being a sub-set that referred to programmes or strategies that provided opportunities for CPD (e.g. Bolam, 1994) and for others, the terms were simply interchangeable (e.g. Harland & Kinder, 1997). What interests me about this terminological muddle is that it reflects an unfortunate tendency towards constructing professional development as a commodity that is provided for teachers or a programme designed to train them. I want to argue that a more productive construction would be one in which ‘continuing professional development’ refers to teachers’ experience of their professional learning – their actual growth.

This distinction was made in a small-scale study involving 4 schools within the HertsCam Network with which I am associated. A visiting researcher from Romania found that teachers valued the professional learning arising from their participation in team meetings, joint planning sessions and informal discussion with colleagues just as much, and in some cases considerably more than that arising from programmes specifically labelled as CPD (Ostafe, 2014). The term ‘professional learning’ had been used in the New Zealand Best Evidence Synthesis study in which Timperley and her colleagues chose to use the term because it clearly focuses attention on the teacher rather than the provision of programmes designed to support professional learning (Timperley *et al.*, 2007).

Dimensions of professional learning

Teachers' professional learning then could be said to have three dimensions as follows:

- improvements in effectiveness / performance
- growth in personal capacity (knowledge, skills, dispositions)
- re-orientation of professional identity / professionalism

I now consider each in turn.

Improvements in effectiveness / performance

Improvements in the quality of teaching are obviously desirable, but how to achieve this? It might be assumed that the obvious first step is to identify the dimensions of expertise that need to be developed. Hattie's (2002) study of teacher expertise confirms that the teacher effect is a major variable; he then focuses on what constitutes excellence. His analysis of the dimensions of expertise is portrayed in behavioural terms and presented under the headings below.

- can identify essential representations of their subject
- can guide learning through classroom interactions
- can monitor learning and provide feedback
- can attend to affective attributes
- can influence student outcomes

Hattie explains his quest in the following way.

My search is driven by the goal of ascertaining the attributes of excellence – because if we can discover the location of these goal posts, if we can understand the height of the bar of the goal posts, we then have the basis for developing appropriate professional development, the basis for teacher education programs to highlight that which truly makes the difference....

(Hattie, 2002)

This logic is echoed throughout the school effectiveness research literature. One approach - the 'dynamic model' - identifies eight factors: orientation, structuring, questioning, teaching-

modelling, applications, management of time, making the classroom a learning environment and classroom assessment (Antoniou and Kyriakides, 2011). With these approaches it is assumed that professional development can be externally directed and designed to correspond with what experts believe about teachers' needs. It is essentially a training model which focuses attention on behavioural outcomes rather than the nature of the processes through which teachers, both singly and collectively, develop their professional expertise and performance.

This behaviourist approach resonates with the idea of professional standards favoured by governments around the world. Specifications of such standards might include statements such as: 'Manage behaviour effectively to ensure a good and safe learning environment' or 'Make accurate and productive use of assessment'. The difficulty with this approach is that teachers tend not to value it and, in some cases, find it disempowering. Across Europe teacher development tends to be constructed as 'training' in which teachers are 'instructed' without engagement with the underpinning values or principles of what they are now being 'trained' to 'deliver' (Grossman *et al.*, 2007; Koc *et al.*, 2007). This technical approach to professional development does not build teachers' capacity to lead and manage change (Güven, 2008). This delivery model of teacher development is, unsurprisingly, both unpopular with teachers and ineffective in changing practice (Sari, 2006). In many European countries dissatisfaction with outmoded forms of CPD is reflected in the low numbers of teachers attending professional development events (OECD, 2009).

Growth in personal capacity

This dimension of teacher learning is less behaviourist and emphasises longer term growth. A typology of 'INSET outcomes' put forward by researchers at the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) in the UK featured items such as 'Information', 'New awareness' and 'Knowledge and skills' (Harland and Kinder, 1997). In many European countries this is often focused on developments in subject knowledge. However, this kind of 'updating' is of limited value unless teachers are enabled to learn at a deeper level. Fullan, in his commentary about educational change, argued that new materials tend to be useless without the development of new skills, but, even more fundamentally, real change requires a process of orientation to a corresponding set of values and beliefs (Fullan, 1993). Teacher development construed as implementation of predesigned programmes often leads to change which is superficial, tokenistic and inauthentic. As was recognised in the NFER study, the reorientation of values and beliefs is inextricably bound up with dispositional changes. These might include increased

commitment to particular aspects of practice or new programmes as well as more general enthusiasm for teaching.

Linked to the dispositional or attitudinal dimensions of teacher learning is the matter of self-efficacy – the beliefs that human beings have in their own ability and capacity to take action and succeed (Bandura, 1995). Analysis of the outcomes of TALIS (Teaching and learning international study) (OECD, 2009) indicate the importance of self-efficacy for teacher learning and it points to correlations between this and performance measures.

When teachers have a high sense of self-efficacy they are more creative in their work, intensify their efforts when their performances fall short of their goals and persist longer. Teachers' sense of self-efficacy can thus influence the learning and motivation of students

(Scheerens, 2010: 28)

Teachers' professional learning therefore is more than gaining new skills and knowledge; it can also extend to the development of positive dispositions and higher levels of confidence and self-efficacy. The third dimension relates to the matter of professional identity.

Re-orientation of professional identity / professionalism

Perhaps the most superficial interpretation of the idea of professional identity centres on the role within the organisation to which a teacher has been appointed or assigned (Goodson and Cole, 1994). In this case, teacher learning might be seen simply as a matter of a change of role or specialisation such as becoming a Head of Department or changing from being a Physical Education teacher to a Geography teacher. This would not necessarily involve specific preparation or training; more likely it is simply a new challenge which would demand that the teacher thinks differently about her priorities. Research on teacher identity indicates that the phenomenon is far more complex than this however (Beijaard, Meijer and Verloop, 2004; Day, Kington, Stobart and Sammons, 2006).

How a teacher construes what Eric Hoyle used to call their *professionalism* goes to the very heart of what it is to be a teacher (Hoyle, 1975). Although the term 'professionalism' has not been widely adopted it is nonetheless useful in that it enables us to step around the trickier aspects of the idea of professionalism which has been highly politicised and complicated by struggles for status, control and accountability (Evans, 2008). Attempts have been made to put labels on

different constructions of professionalism. In the extract below Hoyle reflected on his own earlier work when he had offered the distinction between the restricted and extended professional.

A restricted professional was construed as a teacher for whom teaching was an intuitive activity, whose perspective was restricted to the classroom, who engaged little with wider professional reading or activities, relied on experience as a guide to success, and greatly valued classroom autonomy. An extended professional was construed as a teacher for whom teaching was a rational activity, who sought to improve practice through reading and through engaging in continuous professional development, who was happily collegial, and who located classroom practice within a larger social framework.

(Hoyle, 2008)

Sarah Lightfoot examined Hoyle's conceptualisation in her research with early years educators and presented a view of professionalism in which the focus is on being collegial rather than individualistic, where the orientation is towards being agential rather than compliant, where the drivers are moral purpose and educational principles rather than inspectors' judgements and standards, where knowledge is created by teachers rather than being a fixed element of initial training, and where teachers exercise leadership instead of simply being led (Lightfoot, 2017)

Another category of professional identity is offered by Judith Sachs who talks of the 'activist identity' (Sachs, 2001, 2003). In the light of phenomena such as 'Occupy London' and the 'Arab Spring' it might be considered melodramatic to talk of teachers as activists, but, particularly in disadvantaged communities, the idea that the teacher seeks to transcend the constraints of the way things are and act for the common good is a credible stance.

What is particularly germane here is the possibility that teachers can change the way they construe their professionalism. It may be the case that some teachers are restricted and some are extended professionals, but my interest lies with the factors that might make a difference to how teachers see their professional identity. Teachers' identities are not stable (Day *et al.*, 2006); they are rooted in previous biographies and experience but shaped continuously by policy and organisational contingencies and circumstances (Creaby, 2016). To this extent the development of identity in response to changing circumstances constitutes an important dimension of professional learning which has consequences for teachers' effectiveness.

Participation and impact

So far in this chapter I have sought to clarify the concept of CPD as being the process of professional learning by whatever means. I have also argued that professional learning can encompass the improvement of effectiveness, the development of personal capacity and the reconstruction of professionalism. As I said at the beginning of this chapter, an important dimension of my own professional life has been the design and provision of programmes of support for continuing professional development for teachers. In addition, as a person with administrative responsibility for CPD in two university departments of education, I have also been involved in the evaluation of CPD. Two issues that have arisen continuously throughout my career have been a) the lack of consistency in the take-up of opportunities for CPD and b) the lack of impact when teachers do participate in CPD programmes.

The issue about take-up of opportunities has been addressed in England at least by the development of school-based professional development activities. Government initiatives in the 1980s put into the hands of schools the financial resources to pay for support for teachers' professional development, with expenditure being tied to criteria set by national government (Morley, 1994). One result of this was that schools became reluctant to release teachers for short courses away from school (Bubb & Earley, 2013). A significant development in 1988 introduced Professional Development Days which are routinely referred to as 'INSET days' or 'Training Days'. These are days when students are not required to attend school but members of staff are required to participate. All schools would have 5 of these days each year in which all teachers would engage in activities to address the school's development priorities. This policy, which remains in place today, ensures a minimum level of participation for all members of staff. However, there are indications that this 'required' participation is often of little value. Teachers can be required to attend, but this is no guarantee that they will actively engage or actually learn anything.

The second issue, the one about impact is more complex. In research, the attempt to demonstrate a reliable causal link between CPD and improvements in professional practice is challenging as illustrated by this comment from the team that undertook a study for a government agency in England.

At a minimum, teachers must learn something as a result of participation; they may also have to undergo a change in beliefs. They must then engage in new practices in their classroom, but doing so may be dependent on the beliefs, practices and relationships with colleagues or systems of support provided by the school itself. The success, or impact, of implementation on students is similarly complicated by students' own orientations to learning as well as other contextual mediators such as peers, other teachers, school supports, etc (Opfer & Pedder, 2010: 414).

It may be difficult to produce reliable quantitative indicators of causal links; it may also be invalid given what Opfer and Pedder have noted, but in my view it is ridiculous to conclude that it is impossible to judge the worth of activities that enable and support teachers' professional learning. Professional acumen and scholarship can be applied to infer value and benefits from activities that contribute to professional learning.

Assessing the impact of CPD

My interest in the question of the impact of CPD came into sharp focus in the year 2000 when a local government official asked me for an account of the impact of a masters programme for I had become responsible. Since this was funded entirely by the local education authority, it seemed a very reasonable question, a matter of value for money. Coincidentally, an inspection of the CPD programme at Cambridge by 'Her Majesty's Inspectors' also demanded evidence of the wider CPD provision for which I was responsible at Cambridge. I responded by launching a small-scale research project, in collaboration with a colleague in another HEI, in which we devised and developed categories that could be used as a basis for planning, analysis and reflection. These emerged from a series of interviews with teachers who identified themselves as leading development work. A summary of the impact framework appears below.

A summary of the impact framework

A. Factors which can affect the impact of development work

The focus, context and process of the development work

B. Impact on teachers

Classroom practice, Personal capacity, Interpersonal capacity

C. Impact on the school as an organisation

Structures and processes, Culture and capacity

D. Impact beyond the school

Critique and debate, Creation and transfer of professional knowledge, Improvements in social capital in the community

E. Impact on pupils' learning

Attainment (& progress), Disposition, Metacognition (learning capacity)

F. Evidence of impact

Evaluation and monitoring, Building capacity

(Frost & Durrant, 2003)

Since then, this framework has underpinned the design of tools and activities to enable teachers to plan, track and evaluate the impact of their development work as it is taking place. This framework and associated tools have been used in a variety of different ways not only by individuals but also by schools wishing to assess the impact of various initiatives as part of their self-evaluation programmes. It should be noted that this research did not assume the validity of any attempt to establish a causal link between a CPD programme and classroom practice or student learning outcomes. In contrast, these categories and tools enabled teachers themselves to make a judgement about the development work they had led having experienced support and facilitation through participation in a programme.

The key insight from this research is that to try to evaluate a CPD programme by asking about its impact is fallacious, or at least very problematic. Of course, such programmes have the potential to impact on the capacity of the participant - at least at the level of their enthusiasm, their knowledge and understanding – but this does not necessarily lead to change and improvement in professional practice. It is simple enough to ask about the impact on the individual participant; post-programme interview data is helpful in this regard, but if we are interested in how to support reform, innovation and improvement, we need to pose questions such as these.

- What did the participants do as a result of their participation in this programme?
- What evidence did the teacher collect about the impact of what they did?
- How has the teacher's school evaluated the impact of what the teacher did?
- What is the nature and extent of the impact of what the teacher did in the short, medium and long term?

Questions such as these should influence the design and operation of programmes which aim to enable teachers to improve practice.

At the time that the question of impact was put to me by Her Majesties Inspectors (see above) – in the early 2000s – my role was to manage the provision at the Cambridge Institute of Education. In that organisation we enjoyed a good reputation for good quality CPD programmes. Most teachers enjoyed their participation in them and found them to be enlightening and personally enriching. The provision of CPD programmes at Cambridge could be distinguished by a number of characteristics which I have discussed in detail elsewhere (Frost, 2013a). Firstly, programmes were responsive, which is to say that they were designed in response to a need identified by representatives of schools or local education authorities. Secondly, they were often based on a partnership of some kind; for example, working in collaboration with a local education authority to run courses focused on a particular initiative. Thirdly, many programmes could be said to embrace criticality through the application of academic literature and discussion. Fourthly, programmes commonly enabled participants to engage in reflection both as individuals and collectively. The concept of the ‘reflective practitioner’ (Schon, 1983) was very influential at the Cambridge Institute. Fifthly, many of the programmes offered by Cambridge assumed some form of inquiry. John Elliott, a well known exponent of action research (Elliot, 1991), was a member of the staff team at the Cambridge Institute in the 1970s and 80s and the works of Lawrence Stenhouse continued to be discussed there long after his early death in 1984.

In short, the outstanding characteristics of the extended professional is a capacity for autonomous self-development through systematic self-study, through the study of the work of other teachers and through the testing of ideas by classroom research procedures.
(Stenhouse, 1975: 144)

Finally, a characteristic that was perhaps more contentious was that of certification. Most of the programmes offered by the Cambridge Institute were ‘award-bearing’ which means that they led to the award of a certificate, diploma or degree. It is often assumed that this facility is one that the university sector is privileged to be able to offer although as explained below I realised that this monopoly could be broken. For many teachers, the award of a certificate of some kind is very motivating although many of those who passed through Cambridge expressed frustration with this, preferring to receive the input of knowledge, as they saw it, and to avoid writing essays about it.

From CPD to teacher leadership

The Cambridge provision of CPD programme as outlined above was highly valued by those teachers who were able to participate and the main point of discussion amongst members of the staff team was the marked decline in the level of participation in the early 2000s. The government's policy of allocating funding directly to schools and shrinking overall budgets meant that teachers could not get permission to attend courses held during the school day and located in Cambridge. While it is true that staging CPD events and activities in schools became a key strategy, it was nevertheless clear to me that a radically different approach was needed if we were to address more effectively the links between teacher development, practice development and the development of professional knowledge. My experience of previous work on 'reflective action planning' and 'teacher-led development work' (Frost, 2000; Frost and Durrant, 2002; 2003,) told me that we really needed to move beyond the professional development support that focuses on the growth of the participant's personal capacity. We needed instead programmes that aimed to enable teachers, and other education professionals to become agents of change, which implies changing the locus of responsibility for agenda setting. It would need to be a model of change in which the individual teacher would be invited to identify a 'professional concern' (Hill, 2014). This is the cornerstone of the teacher-led development work methodology which is a key strategy for enabling 'non-positional teacher leadership' (Bangs and Frost, 2015).

This way of thinking about professional learning, practice development and school improvement was clarified in my own doctoral study which became the basis of a book: *Teacher Led School Improvement* (Frost, Durrant, Holden and Head, 2000). I was then able to apply what I had learned to the development of a teachers' network which ultimately became 'HertsCam'. What follows is an account of the way the network currently operates although it must be borne in mind that this has developed over a period of 15 years or so.

What is HertsCam?

The HertsCam Network is now an independent teacher-led, not-for-profit organisation committed to educational transformation through support for teacher leadership. The network grew out of a partnership formed in the 1990s between the University of Cambridge and the

Hertfordshire local education authority. Over time it became increasingly independent and since 2013 HertsCam's operation and governance has been entirely in the hands of schools and teachers. Core programmes are the Teacher Led Development Work (TLDW) programme and the MEd in Leading Teaching and Learning which are connected through the Networking programme. The International Teacher Leadership (ITL) initiative has enabled HertsCam to work with partners in more than 17 countries around the world to build programmes to support teacher leadership. In addition HertsCam has a successful publications arm. I now outline each of these elements of HertsCam's work.

The TLDW programme enables teachers and other practitioners to initiate and lead projects designed to improve the effectiveness of teaching and learning in their schools (Hill, 2014). The programme uses the teacher-led development work methodology (Frost, 2013b) which enables teachers to effect change through the initiation, design and leadership of development projects. Development work is defined as: strategic, focused and deliberate action intended to bring about improvements in professional practice. It takes the form of collaborative processes featuring activities such as consultation, negotiation, reflection, self-evaluation and deliberation, which take place in planned sequence. TLDW operates through school-based workshops which enable reflection, planning and critical friendship. A collection of tools is drawn from by a team of tutors, experienced teachers who act as facilitators. Certification is based on evidence of participation in the programme, networking and the leadership of development projects which is presented in the form of a portfolio.

The HertsCam MEd in Leading Teaching and Learning is a 2 year, part-time masters degree programme which is both practical and critical, leading to tangible improvements in educational practice and advancements in professional knowledge (Ball, Lightfoot and Hill, 2017). This programme is taught entirely by experienced teachers. The knowledge base for the course is a framework of twelve topics including for example educational leadership, professionalism, organisational science, pedagogy and project design and management. Although the design of the MEd programme and its operation is entirely owned by HertsCam, the degree is awarded by the University of Hertfordshire following a rigorous validation and quality assurance process.

The Networking programme includes a series of six Network Events hosted by schools at the end of the school day, typically 4.30-6.30. These events aim to support 'knowledge building' through dialogue and critical friendship (Anderson *et al.*, 2014). Teachers lead workshops and

contribute posters to a gallery walk as the basis of discussion with fellow network members. An Annual Conference on a Saturday allows for more in-depth seminars, international participants and larger scale celebration.

The ITL initiative began in 2008 when academics from Croatia, Portugal, Turkey and Greece expressed an interest in HertsCam (Frost, 2011). It is of particular note that the first of these enquiries was from Professor Maria Assunção Flores from the University of Minho. The ITL initiative expanded rapidly when Open Society Foundations (OSF) brought their network of NGOs in the Balkans to the project. OSF funded a series of international workshops which supported the founding of teacher leadership groups in 15 countries. Since that time many of those have continued to flourish and new programmes have been founded in Egypt, Palestine and Kazakhstan.

Publication is a key feature of HertsCam's work. Accounts of teachers' development projects and the programmes that support them are published on the HertsCam website and in two books: 'Transforming Education Through Teacher Leadership' (Frost, 2014) and 'Empowering Teachers as Agents of Change' (Frost, 2017) both edited by David Frost. HertsCam has also published stories of teachers' projects in its journal and newsletters and the material published in the Teacher Leadership journal is freely available (www.teacherleadership.org.uk).

Implications for continuing professional development

An overarching insight from my experience of working in this field is that the idea of continuing professional development, as it is typically construed – a commodified provision which is at best *for* teachers and at worst *done to* teachers - has to be abolished or set aside. Instead I suggest that continuing professional development should be seen as just a by-product of a broader strategy for school improvement and educational transformation, one which has teacher leadership at its core. In this scenario, teachers' professional learning may be an outcome of participation in a programme but it does not constitute its *raison d'être*. This is not to diminish the importance of teachers' professional learning; on the contrary, the cultivation of a particular kind of professional identity and professionalism - one in which teachers come to see themselves as agential - is pivotal to the transformation of schools and pedagogical practice. Evidence from HertsCam, from the ITL initiative and the related TEL project (Flores, 2014), tells us that

teachers who are agential are likely to experience an enhanced sense of moral purpose and much greater levels of self-efficacy.

The report on the International Teacher Leadership initiative (Frost, 2011) included a carefully worded statement which was endorsed by participants from the 15 countries involved.

Teachers really can lead innovation; teachers really can build professional knowledge; teachers really can develop the capacity for leadership, and teachers really can influence their colleagues and the nature of professional practice in their schools. However, what is abundantly clear is that teachers are only likely to do these things if they are provided with appropriate support (Frost, 2011: 57).

This raises the question of what would count as ‘appropriate support’. My assumption, based on the arguments above, is that programmes that aim to support teachers’ professional learning should focus on cultivating the type of professionalism in which moral purpose and self-efficacy are enhanced. To achieve this, programmes should:

- adopt a facilitative style which enables teachers to clarify and pursue their own agendas for development
- use the kind of tools, techniques and strategies that good teachers commonly use to facilitate learning in classrooms
- create the conditions for reflection and dialogue through strategies that build a sense of community within which teachers provide each other with mutual support, inspiration and critical friendship
- provide guidance on relevant knowledge domains and sources of literature to support scholarship, not as content to be taught, but as resources to be drawn upon as participants choose
- enable participants to take action by designing, planning and leading their own development projects
- lead to certification based on forms of evidence that correspond with the reality of teachers’ professional lives

I suggest that the people who are best placed to provide programmes based on the above principles are teachers themselves. There are many people within the teaching profession who, by virtue of their experience and resilience, already have enhanced moral purpose and self-

efficacy. They are also likely to have the teaching skills required to facilitate their colleagues' professional learning and agency. Organisations such as universities may have a part to play, but in order to offer any meaningful help, they need to be prepared to enter into genuine partnerships with schools and teachers' organisations and adapt their traditional ways of working to fit the purpose.

References

- Anderson, E., Barnett, P., Thompson, L. , Roberts, A. and Wearing, V. (2014) Teachers are doing it for themselves: knowledge-building in HertsCam, in D. Frost (ed) *Transforming Education Through Teacher Leadership*, Cambridge: LfL the Cambridge Network.
- Antoniou, P. and Kyriakides, L. (2013). A dynamic integrated approach to teacher professional development: impact and sustainability of the effects on improving teacher behavior and student outcomes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 29 (1), 1-12.
- Ball, S., Lightfoot, L. and Hill, V. (2017) A teacher-led masters programme: a breakthrough in school and teacher development, in D. Frost (ed.) *Empowering teachers as agents of change: a non-positional approach to teacher leadership*. Cambridge: LfL the Cambridge Network.
- Bandura, A. (1995) *Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bangs, J. and Frost, D. (2015) Non-positional teacher leadership: distributed leadership and self-efficacy in J. Evers and R. Kneyber, *Flip the System: Changing Education from the Ground Up*, London: Routledge.
- Barber, M. and Mourshed, M. (2007) *How the world's best-performing school systems came out on top (The McKinsey Report)*. New York: McKinsey & Company.
<http://mckinseysociety.com/how-the-worlds-best-performing-schools-come-out-on-top/>
- Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C. and Verloop, N. (2004) Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 107-128.
- Bolam, R. (1994) 'The impact of research on policy and practice in continuing professional development', *British Journal of In-Service Education*, 20 (1), 35–46.
- Board of Education (1944) *Teachers and Youth Leaders (The McNair Report)*, Report of the Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Education to consider the Supply, Recruitment and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Bubb, S and Earley, P. (2013) Better use of training and development days, *Professional Development Today*, 15 (1-2), 13-18.
- Creaby, C. (2016) A study of the relationship between professional development

strategies and teacher professional identities. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Cambridge: University of Cambridge faculty of Education.

Day, C., Kington, A. Stobart, G. and Sammons, P. (2006) The personal and professional selves of teachers: stable and unstable identities, *British Educational Research Journal* 32 (4), 601-616.

Department of Education and Science (1972) *Teacher Education and Training: A Report by a Committee of Inquiry appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme* (London, HMSO).

Elliott, J. (1991) *Action Research for Educational Change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Evans, L. (2008) Professionalism, professionalism and the development of education professionals. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 56 (1), 20-38.

Flores, M. A. (2014) *Profissionalismo e liderança dos professores*. Santo Tirso: De Facto Editores.

Frost, D. (2000) Teacher-led School Improvement: Agency and Strategy, *Management in Education*, Vol. 14 (No. 4, 21-24 & No. 5, 17-20).

Frost, D. (2011) *Supporting teacher leadership in 15 countries: the International Teacher Leadership project, Phase 1 - A report*, Cambridge: Leadership for Learning University of Cambridge Faculty of Education.

Frost, D. (2013a) Developing teachers, schools and systems: partnership approaches in C. McLaughlin, *Teachers learning: professional development and education*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frost, D. (2013b) *Teacher-led development work: a methodology for building professional knowledge*, *HertsCam Occasional Papers April 2013*. HertsCam Publications: www.hertscam.org.uk.

Frost, D. (ed.) (2014) *Transforming Education Through Teacher Leadership*. Cambridge: LfL the Cambridge Network.

Frost, D. (2017) *Empowering teachers as agents of change: a non-positional approach to teacher leadership*. Cambridge: LfL the Cambridge Network.

Frost, D. and Durrant, J. (2002) Teachers as Leaders: Exploring the Impact of Teacher Led Development Work, *School Leadership and Management*, 22 (2), 143-161.

Frost, D. and Durrant, J. (2003) Teacher Leadership: Rationale, Strategy and Impact, *School Leadership and Management*, 23 (2), 173-186.

Frost, D., Durrant, J., Head, M. and Holden, G. (2000) *Teacher-led School Improvement*, London: RoutledgeFalmer.

- Fullan, M. (1993) *Change Forces: probing the depths of educational reform*, London: Falmer Press.
- Goodson, I. and Cole, A. (1994) Exploring the teacher's professional knowledge: Constructing identity and community. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 21(1), 85-105.
- Grossman, G., Onkol, P. and Sands, M. (2007) Curriculum reform in Turkish teacher education: Attitudes of teacher educators towards change in an EU candidate nation. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27, 138–150.
- Guven, I. (2008) Teacher Education Reform and International Globalization Hegemony: Issues and Challenges in Turkish Teacher Education. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3, 1.
- Hanushek, E. and Rivkin, S. (2010) The Quality and Distribution of Teachers under the No Child Left Behind Act. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 24(3), 133-150.
- Harland, J. and Kinder, K. (1997) 'Teachers' continuing professional development: Framing a model of outcomes', *British Journal of In-service Education* 23(1): 71–84.
- Hattie, J.A. C. (2002). What are the attributes of excellent teachers? In *Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence?* (pp. 3-26). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Hill, V. (2014) The HertsCam TLDW programme in D. Frost (ed) *Transforming Education Through Teacher Leadership*, Cambridge: LfL the Cambridge Network.
- Hoyle, E. (1974) Professionalism, professionalism and control in teaching, London Educational Review, 3 (2), 42-54.
- Hoyle, E. (1975) Professionalism, professionalism and control in teaching. In V. Houghton et al. (Eds) *Management in Education: the Management of Organisations and Individuals*. London: Ward Lock Educational / Open University Press.
- Hoyle, E. (2008) Changing Conceptions of Teaching as a Profession: Personal Reflections. In D. Johnson and R. Maclean (Eds.), *Teaching: Professionalization, Development and Leadership*. Netherlands: Springer.
- Koc, Y., Isiksal, M. and Bulut, S. (2007) Elementary school reform in Turkey. *International Educational Journal*. 8 (1), 30-39.
- Leigh, A. (2010) Estimating teacher effectiveness from two-year changes in students' test scores. *Economics of Education Review*, 29, 480-488.
- Lightfoot, S. (2017) Building early years educators' professionalism through non-positional leadership, in D. Frost (ed,) *Empowering teachers as agents of change: a non-positional approach to teacher leadership*. Cambridge: LfL the Cambridge Network.
- McBride, R. (ed.) (1989) *The In-service Training of Teachers*, Lewes: Falmer Press.

Morley, G. (1994) Recent developments in In-Service Education and Training for Teachers: Where have we been and where are we going? in H. Bradley, C. Conner and G. Southworth (Eds.) *Developing teachers developing schools: making INSET effective for the school*, London: David Fulton Publishers.

OECD (2009) *Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments: First results from TALIS*, Paris: OECD.

Opfer, V. D. and Pedder, D. (2010) Access to Continuous Professional Development by teachers in England, *The Curriculum Journal* 21 (4), 453–471.

Ostafe, L. (2014) Continuous professional development policies for teachers in the European context. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Iasi, Romania.: ‘Alexandru Ioan Cuza’ University of Iasi.

Sachs, J. (2001) Teacher professional identity: competing discourses, competing outcomes *Journal of Education Policy* 16 (2), 149-61.

Sachs, J. (2003) *The Activist Teaching Profession*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Sari, M. (2006) Teacher as a researcher: evaluation of teachers’ perceptions on scientific research. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 6 (3), 880-887.

Scheerens, J. (2010) *Teachers' Professional Development: Europe in international comparison. An analysis of teachers' professional development based on the OECD's Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS)*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Union.

Schleicher, A. (2016) *Teaching Excellence through Professional Learning and Policy Reform: Lessons from Around the World, International Summit on the Teaching Profession*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Schon, D. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner - How Professionals Think in Action*. London: Avebury.

Shulman, L. (1987) Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations for the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, 1-22.

Stenhouse, L. (1975) *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London: Heinemann.

Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H. and Fung, I. (2007) *Teacher professional learning and development: Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration (BES)*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

William, D. (2013) The importance of teaching. In J. Clifton (Ed.), *Excellence and Equity: Tackling educational disadvantage in England's secondary schools* (pp. 50-57). London: Institute of Public Policy Research.