

# International perspectives on quality in initial teacher education

An exploratory review of selected international  
documentation on statutory requirements and  
quality assurance

Review conducted by the Initial Teacher Education Review Group

Technical report written by Liz Bills, Mary Briggs, Ann Browne, Helena Gillespie, John Gordon, Chris Husbands, Ellie Phillips, Caroline Still, Peter Swatton

EPPI-Centre  
Social Science Research Unit  
Institute of Education  
University of London

EPPI-Centre report no. 1605T · May 2008

The results of this systematic review are available in four formats:

**SUMMARY**

Explains the purpose of the review and the main messages from the research evidence

**REPORT**

Describes the background and the findings of the review(s) but without full technical details of the methods used

**TECHNICAL  
REPORT**

Includes the background, main findings, and full technical details of the review

**DATABASES**

Access to codings describing each research study included in the review

These can be downloaded or accessed at <http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/reel/>

The EPPI-Centre reference number for this report is 1605T.

This report should be cited as: Bills L, Briggs M, Browne A, Gillespie H, Gordon J, Husbands C, Phillips E, Still C and Swatton P (2008) International perspectives on quality in initial teacher education: an exploratory review of selected international documentation on statutory requirements and quality assurance. In: *Research Evidence in Education Library*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London

© Copyright

Authors of the systematic reviews on the EPPI-Centre website (<http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/>) hold the copyright for the text of their reviews. The EPPI-Centre owns the copyright for all material on the website it has developed, including the contents of the databases, manuals, and keywording and data extraction systems. The centre and authors give permission for users of the site to display and print the contents of the site for their own non-commercial use, providing that the materials are not modified, copyright and other proprietary notices contained in the materials are retained, and the source of the material is cited clearly following the citation details provided. Otherwise users are not permitted to duplicate, reproduce, re-publish, distribute, or store material from this website without express written permission.

## CONTENTS

1. Background	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Policy and practice background	2
1.4 Research background	2
1.6 Aims and rationale for current review	4
1.5 Definitional and conceptual issues	5
1.6 Authors, funders and other users of the review	6
2. Methods used in the review	7
2.1 User involvement	7
2.2 Identifying the documents for inclusion in the review	7
2.3 Characterising included documents	8
2.4 Further selection of documents for review	9
2.5 Detailed description of documents	9
2.6 Synthesis of evidence	9
3. Identifying and describing studies: Results	10
4. In-depth review: Results	13
4.1 Institutional roles	13
4.2 Quality assurance	15
4.3 Conceptual framework for ITE	17
5. Implications	19
5.1 Summary of results of analytic account	19
5.2 Strengths and limitations of this systematic review	19
5.3 Implications	21
6. References	22
6.1 Documents included in the review	22
6.2 Other references used in the text of the report	24
Appendices	26
Appendix 1.1 Authorship of this review	26
Appendix 2.1 Inclusion and exclusion criteria	28
Appendix 2.3 Additional keywords: review specific	30
Appendix 2.4 Reasons for excluding documents on the grounds of trustworthiness	31
Appendix 2.5 Review-specific guidelines for extracting data	32

## **List of abbreviations**

AACTE	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
ESRC	Economic and Social Research Council
HEI	Higher Education Institution
ITE	Initial teacher education
ITT	Initial teacher training
LEA	Local Education Authority
NQT	Newly qualified teacher
OFSTED	Office for Standards in Education
PDS	Professional development school
QA	Quality assurance
QCA	Qualifications and Curriculum Authority
TDA	Training and Development Agency for Schools
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

---

## CHAPTER ONE

# Background

### 1.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the theoretical, policy, practice, and research background to the review, including details of the authors and other users of the review, and the development and aims of the review question. It describes how this review relates to the Review Group's first review 'Structures, management and process in initial teacher education: a systematic review' and how the methods for the current review were developed as a result of experience of the first.

The first review (Bills et al., forthcoming) was designed to support thinking and development in initial teacher education at course, institutional and policy levels. By focusing on the evidential basis for relationships between structural components of initial teacher education (ITE), it sought to provide a starting point for informed action in terms of national and institutional policy. It drew on refereed research papers exploring inter-relationships between, or elements of, the conceptual framework, management and organisational process of ITE as well as unpublished research literature. The review located little robust research which directly addresses the impact of ITE structures on its quality. There are very few short answers to questions that policymakers might legitimately ask about differences in terms of quality of provision between, for example:

- programmes which are offered as undergraduate or postgraduate courses
- programmes which are managed by higher education institutions or by schools
- programmes which involve students in short, frequent, school experiences and those which involve them in single, intensive periods of school placement

This discussion suggests a large number of possible reasons for this paucity of published research. Most importantly, in the context of this review, it argues that the design of research to provide robust answers to these questions is very challenging. On the one hand, to be of use, the research needs to look in great detail at the teaching and learning processes which constitute an ITE programme. It is of little use to know, for example, that undergraduate ITE programmes tend to be of higher quality unless the reasons for this are clear, and in order to be confident that the reasons have been identified, a very detailed look at processes is necessary. On the other hand, in order to be generalisable, the findings need to be robust across a variety of contexts. This means that the research needs to be undertaken on a large scale. These two requirements, for detail and scale, are difficult to reconcile, especially on a limited budget.

The Review Group offered several responses to the lack of clear research evidence. The current review has responded by looking for forms of evidence outside the research literature. Teacher education has been a focus of state-initiated reform in many countries and, in different ways, governments have sought to define, prescribe and audit the components of effective teacher education. This takes a variety of forms. In several countries (for example, New Zealand, the USA, Turkey, Brazil and Australia), federal or state governments have attempted to define expectations of teacher education in accreditation criteria. In these and other countries, teacher education institutions have developed frameworks for self-evaluation and audit. In some places, following the UK example, formal inspection arrangements have been established.

In this review, therefore, the Review Group developed a methodology for reviewing and evaluating international quality assurance and standards documentation which casts light on structures, management and processes of initial teacher education. This material includes documents

which discuss, explain and justify standards and quality assurance procedures as well as reports on the outcomes of these procedures. While this material is in many cases based on peer or expert review of teacher education, and its procedures are subject to iterative scrutiny based on formalised methodologies, it is not, in conventional academic terms, peer-reviewed. It is extensive and has, in many cases, been influential in shaping processes and practices in ITE. Using similar sifting techniques to the EPPI procedures for finding relevant reports and developing quality criteria, it is possible to gain a sense of which aspects of effective management and processes in teacher education have been widely identified as impacting on quality and of the similarities and differences in approaches to these issues in different polities.

## 1.2 Policy and practice background

In many parts of the world, policy interest in initial teacher education is dominated by teacher supply issues. In the USA and UK, this has resulted in new forms of ITE designed to be appropriate for more mature students making a career change into teaching. These new forms have typically been different in length, intensity and nature of school experience. The interplay between the political imperative to find new pools of candidates for ITE and the conceptual shift which was largely completed in the 1990s to a competence-based view of preparedness to teach has led to some confusions and conflicts over evaluation of these new programmes. In less affluent countries (for example, China), the concern has been to improve the basic academic qualifications of the teaching force. This ambition is intimately connected with decisions about forms of ITE: for example, whether they are undergraduate or postgraduate programmes. In sub-Saharan Africa, UNESCO is supporting an ambitious project to increase capacity for preparing teachers to provide the four million extra teachers that would be needed to meet the aim of universal primary education.

In countries with large numbers of remote rural communities, development of distance learning approaches to teacher education is a priority. ITE providers and government alike are engaged in addressing the obvious challenges of providing high quality professional education by this method.

A further common concern internationally is to match the education of teachers to the perceived demands of the classroom. Existing forms of teacher education are in many cases seen as insufficiently driven by the requirements of the tasks that new teachers will need to perform.

One of the drivers that make this survey worthwhile is potential increased workforce mobility. The interest in comparability of qualifications that this has spawned has led to both sharing of information about ITE structures and programmes (e.g. through INCA, the QCA-funded International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks Internet

Archive, KIPUS, the UNESCO-funded Teacher Network of Latin America and the Caribbean and EURYDICE, the information network on education in Europe), and to increased motivation to publish quality assurance frameworks and judgements.

The move to publication of policy, planning and quality assurance documentation is also driven by an interest in evidence-informed policy, and this has been accompanied by a number of government-funded research reviews, some of which form the research background to this review.

## 1.3 Research background

The structure and organisation of ITE is a very broad topic and it is not possible in this short introduction to do justice to the many traditions and strands that have developed in research into ITE, even within one country. This section is therefore restricted to describing a small number of influential studies with particular relevance to this review.

Thinking about the organisation of ITE, in particular the role of schools and the nature of partnership, has been very strongly influenced by two studies undertaken in the late eighties and nineties. Furlong, et al (1988) completed an ESRC funded study of 'The role of the school in initial teacher training', which explored the conceptualisation of school-based work in initial teacher training in four programmes of teacher training. The study provided an overview conceptual clarification of the limits and potential of school-based teacher education in terms of the types of knowledge typically deployed by higher-education and school-based teacher educators (Booth, Furlong and Wilkin, 1990, Furlong and Smith, 1996). Furlong, Whitty et al in the Modes of Teacher Education (MOTE) study (1999) developed the concern of the 1989 study in terms of the conceptions of teacher education which were developing in England and Wales, developing what they called a "topography" of initial teacher education, charting the tensions between the standards-methodology which was underpinning school-based teacher education and the reflective practitioner model which was broadly current in articulated aims for programmes. These studies mapped the development of new structures in ITE and provided ways of analysing them, but they stopped short of making claims about quality of ITE provision, except in relation to student and employer satisfaction.

In the USA, there has been a stronger tradition of research focusing on measurable outcomes of ITE and this, together with governmental support for review of research evidence, has resulted in a series of research review studies on effective ITE. These have addressed a range of broad questions of policy interest, a subset of which bear on the Review Group's interest in structures, processes and conceptual framework. Two of these were particularly influential in the design of the first review.

Wilson et al. (2001) undertook a research review which was confined to empirical research meeting their criteria for rigour and undertaken in the USA. It addressed the type of preparation needed in terms of subject matter, pedagogic knowledge and student teaching practice. The review also looked at means of programme improvement and alternative certification practices. An overall conclusion of this review (p ii) is that 'the research base concerning teacher preparation is relatively thin. The studies found, however, suggest that good research can be done, but that it will take the development of more refined databases, measures, and methods, as well as complementary research designs that collect both qualitative and quantitative data'.

This summary finding is reflected in more detailed conclusions that the relationship between subject knowledge and teacher effectiveness is not well understood, and that there is a wide variety of practice described as pedagogical coursework, with no firm evidence about its quality. This finding offers an example of the difficulty faced by researchers in addressing the review question. Since the nature and quality of these elements of teacher preparation programmes is poorly understood, studies concerning the relationship between these elements are likely to be few and weakly conceptualised.

The Wilson review looked for evidence about the impact of state and national policy on teacher preparation, asking particularly about the effect of improvement programmes, but the researchers found the evidence to be thin. The move in the USA, since the early 1990s, to provide alternatives to undergraduate programmes of teacher preparation has given rise to a great many small scale research studies which compare these alternative programmes with traditional pre-service programmes. The wide variety in structure and organisation of the alternative programmes, and the local nature of most of the evaluation projects means that these studies form only the beginning of a serious enquiry into the relationship between structure and quality in ITE. Wilson et al. (2001, p iii) conclude that 'Future research will need to include more detailed descriptions of the various alternative route program structures and content before conclusions can be drawn about characteristics that make for high-quality programs'.

Wideen et al. (1998) undertook a review of papers addressing perceptions and developing beliefs and practices of beginning teachers related to pre-service education. The review highlights a general lack of impact of teacher preparation programmes on new teachers' beliefs. Programmes which were more successful in this respect featured systematic and consistent long-term support in a collaborative setting. Thus, although the studies reviewed in most cases did not set out to draw conclusions about the structures of programmes,

the combined weight of the studies reviewed points to a generalisation which is very much related to the structure of the programme. This points to two difficulties which faced the Review Group in undertaking the first research review. In the first place, the aspects of ITE in which the Group is interested are, by their nature, large scale. They concern the way in which a programme is designed and managed rather than features of individual teaching approaches and assessment mechanisms, etc. These issues are difficult to address through small scale empirical studies, which are much more numerous than large scale empirical studies. Secondly, an individual study - but still more so, evidence gathered from a number of studies - may draw conclusions related to the structure of an ITE programme, although it did not set out to study structural issues. Both these difficulties, in different ways, have meant that it was not straightforward to locate the studies which provide evidence for the review.

The MOTE study offered a means of analysing the organisation and conceptual framework for ITE, but did not offer a basis for making claims about their impact on quality. Two major US reviews (Wideen et al.; Wilson et al.) concluded that the design and quality of reporting in existing research left us unable to draw firm conclusions about the relationship between structures and quality.

The first review (Bills et al., forthcoming) found few studies which addressed the review question directly and satisfactorily. Those which came closest to this ideal (Draper et al., 1997; Gormley et al., 1993; O'Hara and Cameron, 1997; Powney et al., 1993) made comparisons of two or more ITE programmes and, in some cases, found significant differences in outcomes. However, none of the studies was able to take account of characteristics of the entrants to the programmes, and Draper et al. concluded that training route cannot be considered to be a distinct variable, but is rather part of a package of variables.

Two more recent projects have addressed the review question more directly. Firstly, Smith and Gorard (2004) undertook a statistical analysis of several large data sets concerning ITE in England and Wales which were available from government statistical sources and involved no extra collection of data. The researchers were therefore unable to go beyond those indicators which had already been identified. One of the questions that the study asked was whether there was any evidence of differential effectiveness of institutions providing ITE; no data was found to support any such conclusion. In terms of the review question, this analysis and conclusion illustrate very well the difficulties of undertaking quantitative studies in this area. These difficulties include lack of sensitivity in measures of success in ITE, the difficulty of linking individual success with quality of provision, and the lack of agreement on what constitute measures of trainees' baseline

competence or ability to benefit from undertaking ITE. Further, the poor level of information available about individual providers makes it difficult to link a provider's success with characteristics of the provision. These problems illustrate the difficulty of addressing the quality issue by collecting summary data on a large scale, but being unable to access the detail of ITE processes.

Secondly, in a report commissioned by the Victorian Institute of Teaching as part of the Future Teachers Project, Ingvarson et al. (2004) undertook a large scale survey of newly qualified teachers (NQTs) and their employers. The main research instrument was a questionnaire prepared for NQTs and adapted for employers. This questionnaire incorporated a number of scales which were used to measure respondents' opinions about the quality of their preparation to teach. The information independently available to the researchers about the ITE programmes undertaken by the NQTs was restricted to their type (i.e. undergraduate, postgraduate or double degree) and the organisation of the practicum (e.g. length, roles undertaken by students). However, the use of these scales allowed the researchers to draw some limited conclusions about the features of effective programmes. The main conclusion is that positive ratings for 'opportunity to learn' were strongly related to overall course satisfaction. This was strongest in the case of 'opportunity to learn the content they were expected to teach and how to teach it'. Features of the practicum were not associated with the perceived effectiveness of the course.

The positive conclusions of this report do not have direct relevance to structures and organisation of ITE, and the conclusions themselves are open to the criticism that data on the nature of courses are taken from the NQTs rather than from any independent source; for example, the assessment of opportunities to learn on the course is made by the same people who have been asked to judge the overall effectiveness of the course. However, this study goes substantially further than many others in that the use of scales gives some confidence in the interpretation of constructs, such as 'opportunity to learn'.

Although there has been progress in moving towards techniques that allow researchers to tackle questions about the quality of ITE in relation to its structures, processes and frameworks, it was clear at the time of beginning this review that there was not yet a corpus of robust research in this area. Rather than undertake a further review of research studies, therefore, the Review Group chose to look at what was being said on these issues by those who were setting regulatory or quality assurance frameworks for ITE or advising on these frameworks. Two significant initiatives to collect and compare information about ITE internationally (by INCA and EURYDICE) proved very helpful to us in the work. However, the review has gone much further in examining the relevance of a variety of documentation to the review question.

## 1.4 Aims and rationale for current review

### 1.4.1 Aims

This review aims to inform both the policy and the research debates about the relationship between the organisation, management and framework for initial teacher education and its quality. It aims to inform the policy debate by providing an analytical, but accessible, international review of the evidence about and approaches to the impact of structures on quality. Further, it aims to support the development of practice by offering a systematic survey of international perspectives on the relationship between structures and quality.

It does so by surveying the ways in which institutions offering ITE, local and national government and non-governmental organisations make assessments and judgements about the structures of ITE in relation to its quality. The survey samples from the international literature available to produce an analytic account of issues, trends and assumptions about ITE structures and quality.

### 1.4.2 Rationale

The review examines relevant material available through the websites of institutions offering ITE, local and national government and non-governmental organisations involved in the accreditation or quality assurance of ITE. The claims that can be made about the nature of the evidence available from these sources are different from those made about the research literature included in the first review.

These differences relate to the following:

- *Generalisation and specific context:* Many research studies make claims to generalisability beyond the context of the empirical work undertaken. On the other hand, the material available for this review by its nature addresses a particular institutional, local or national context. It has the potential, therefore, to provide more specific information about the relationship between that context and the conclusions drawn about effective ITE structures.
- *Grounds of claims to knowledge:* Much of the material reviewed draws its authority from the experience and standing of its authors, or from its development and refinement through practice. This too results in the inclusion of greater detail in those areas of most interest to policymakers and practitioners, rather than those with a research interest only.
- *Bias and the political need to support particular conclusions:* The material which is included in the current review is open to the charge of political bias from one of several sources. Some material has been published on the authority of individuals



who stand for re-election and who owe allegiance to a party policy. Some has been published by institutions needing to attract students. In most cases, it will be difficult for the authors to admit to uncertainty. These concerns are not completely absent in the case of research studies, of course.

- *Forms of evidence presented:* Not all the documents included in this review report empirical evidence.

These differences mean that this is altogether a different kind of review from that of refereed research studies. This is reflected in the methodology as detailed in Chapter 2 of the Technical Report, and also in the form of the conclusions of the review. The Review Group has been able to report on the issues, trends and assumptions rather than the findings of the material reviewed. Readers will find a survey of international perspectives on quality in ITE as evidenced in statutory requirements and quality assurance procedures at all levels.

### 1.4.3 Review question

The review question agreed by the Review Team is as follows:

*What does the literature produced by government and non-government institutions involved in regulation or provision of initial teacher education tell us about official and professional views on the impact of institutional roles, quality assurance and conceptual frameworks on quality in initial teacher education?*

### 1.4.4 Type and approach of review

This is a limited search scoping review. Although the question is broad, the type of evidence considered is narrow. Given the nature of the sources of evidence, only an analytic account has been provided, rather than a synthesis of the evidence located by the search.

Since the review sought evidence in grey literature, standard forms of search using electronic search engines on academic databases were not appropriate. The Review Group therefore undertook what was essentially a detailed handsearch of selected internet locations. This meant that the search was narrow, focused on a particular kind of literature and sampled from the sites through which it is available internationally. The question that the review addressed, however, is broad. The Review Group wanted to be able to get a sense of the extent and nature of evidence available from this source across the full range of possible foci within the topic.

The search process included an initial screening on the basis of title and abstract (where available) and a second screening for relevance was undertaken on the basis of full documents. Since the search

was internet-based, there were no documents that could not be retrieved. The sources of evidence used in this review are very varied and documents frequently touch on a number of aspects of the question guiding the review.

## 1.5 Definitional and conceptual issues

This review explores work in **initial teacher education (ITE)**. Initial teacher education refers to pre-service/pre-employment professional education and training, that is, programmes of ITE which lead explicitly to accreditation and certification. In some polities, the relationship between academic qualification and professional accreditation is confused and poorly articulated, but the essential concern here is with professional education and training in the context of teaching and teacher development. ‘Teacher education’, however, is not a conceptually clear structure. In some cases, there is an explicit concern with formal arrangements which address skill and competence development; in others, skills and competence development are implicit in or embedded in academic programmes. For the purposes of this review, the Review Group is concerned with programmes which are explicitly concerned with the certification of teaching, or career entry programmes.

**Quality** is a contested educational concept (Elliott, 1993). This is particularly so in the case of ITE, where, Wideen et al. (1998) argue that research consistently highlights differences in expectation between student teachers and their tutors. The notion of ‘quality’ on which this review is based therefore needs to reflect the perspectives of different ‘stakeholders’. Wilson et al. (2001) focus on student outcomes and teacher performance as measures of the quality of teacher preparation, but recognise that the studies available to them rarely use these kinds of measures in a rigorous way. In the first instance, it is necessary to define what is meant by quality very broadly, so that as many studies as possible are included.

‘Quality’ in the following three ways in this report:

- The first is an internal and largely self-referential view of quality, and relates to the extent to which ITE is found to conform to internal, provider-defined measures of quality in terms of self-evaluation processes. In line with the finding by Wideen et al’. (1998) that programmes which were successful in changing student teachers’ beliefs tended to offer consistent long-term support, this interpretation of quality includes the notion of consistency or conceptual coherence. In other words, one criterion for judging quality is the extent to which the programme is consistent with the conceptual framework that underpins it.
- The second is a consumer-defined view of quality and relates to the extent to which there is evidence from stakeholders that ITE provision

meets stakeholder expectations. Stakeholders in this sense are student teachers who have experienced the ITE whose quality is being interrogated, schools and teachers who employ new students, and managers in ITE institutions.

- The third meaning is a compliance model of quality and relates to the extent to which ITE meets external, normally funder-defined expectations of delivery. Also included in this category are measures of quality which are based on judgements of graduates' teaching quality against criteria derived from statutory or research-based instruments.

The term **conceptual framework** refers to the underlying model of teaching and teacher education which is deployed in ITE. This will be exemplified in programme aims and definitions.

The term **organisational structure** refers to the form which ITE takes: its location in higher education or schools, its length, the balance and relationship between different elements, and the relationship between subject based and general professional work.

The term **management processes** refers to the structures which operationalise the conceptual framework in the organisational structure, including roles and responsibilities, methods and forms of selection and assessment.

## 1.6 Authors, funders and other users of the review

The authors of the review are named at the beginning of the report. Ellie Phillips has broad experience of research in the humanities and social sciences, and acted as research assistant for the team. Each of the other authors has research expertise in education and is an experienced tutor for initial teacher education, with responsibility for development and management of ITE programmes.

The review has been funded by the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA), with contributions from the institutions involved via core institutional research funding from the Higher Education Funding Council for England.

Guidance on the direction of the review has been provided by representatives of the TDA and by other review teams working in similar areas. The review users are expected to be ITE tutors and managers as well as the TDA.

---

## CHAPTER TWO

# Methods used in the Review

### 2.1 User involvement

To be of interest to the ITE community, on completion the review needed to address questions that are relevant to the decisions that users want to make. It was therefore important therefore that users were able to influence the formation of the review question and the search strategy. Users' views in this respect were represented by all members of the Review Group and by members of other TDA-funded Review Groups, as well as by TDA staff who acted as advisors. There are a number of audiences likely to be interested in the outcomes of this review, including ITE course tutors and leaders, institutional managers and ITE policymakers. The Review Group itself includes staff from university Departments of Education with an interest in the management of ITE at all levels from individual course leaders to institutional managers. The review was commissioned by the TDA, which plays a key role in ITE policymaking for England and Wales. A member of staff from the TDA acted as advisor throughout the review process.

### 2.2 Identifying the documents for inclusion in the review

The principal source of material was the professional literature which forms part of governance and accountability system for ITE in a sample of countries. The Review Group have accessed documents which are available on internet sites and in English. The documents retrieved include accountability frameworks and legislation, policy guidance, and reports by and about individual providers. Within this literature, the Group has examined those documents which explore the relationship between the conceptual framework, organisational structure and management process of ITE and its quality.

The review was designed to be representative of international policy, thinking and evidence on ITE structures in relation to quality. However,

within the resource available, it was not possible to be comprehensive in terms of international coverage. The first stage of identification of possible documents, therefore, was to select a sample of countries from which to seek evidence. The Review Group aimed to include all countries in which there was both a strong intellectual tradition in teacher education and a useful quantity of publications in English. In addition, they included representatives of different areas of the world and stages of development. The exclusion of documents not published in English has produced a strong bias towards the Anglophone world, but this was unavoidable within the budget available. The list of countries included in the review is given in Figure 1.

**Figure 1:** Countries included in the search

Australia  
Austria  
Chile  
China  
Egypt  
England  
Greece  
Guyana  
Hungary  
India  
Ireland  
Kenya  
Korea  
Malaysia  
Nigeria  
Northern Ireland  
Norway  
Scotland  
South Africa  
Spain  
USA  
Wales

Having identified the countries to be included, each country was 'scoped' in the following way.

1. Using materials provided by INCA, EURIDYCE, OECD and/or UNESCO, or by other forms of search, answers were identified for the following questions:

A. What kind of institutions offer teacher education programmes?

B. What kind of local or national government body sets the regulatory framework?

C. How are providers accredited, or otherwise approved for public funding?

D. What are the overarching bodies that have a role in accreditation / approval / quality assurance?

E. If sub-national divisions play a part in regulation, accreditation or quality assurance of ITE provision, what are they and which, if any, appear to have greater potential for our purposes (for example, because there is more information about them or because they appear to be developmentally ahead of other states/regions)?

F. What information is available about current initiatives related to quality and/or structures (e.g. reports or reviews commissioned by national or regional government, representative bodies or policy units)? (Answers to this question were used to check the comprehensiveness of answers to questions A-E for search purposes.)

2. Where appropriate, the Review Group made a pragmatic choice about how many individual regions/states it was possible and necessary to explore (usually two or three within each country). They recorded their choice and the rationale, based on the number of individual states, the amount of material available from them, and the level of their involvement in ITE organisation.

3. The Review Group visited the websites for each of the public bodies identified under B, C and D above, but with sub-national bodies restricted to those identified in 2. From each website, the Group retrieved documents which had been produced by or for the organisation, and which might include evidence or opinion about the impact of ITE organisational structures, management processes or conceptual framework on quality. Each website was searched systematically and the form of search recorded.

4. Within each country, the Review Group visited a small number of websites of institutions providing ITE. They looked for course specifications, self-evaluation documents, and external examiners' reports or the equivalent.

5. Finally for each country, the Review Group asked a personal contact with experience of ITE within the country to check the answers to the questions in item 1 and to add to the search if appropriate.

The documents that retrieved in this way were then checked to see that they met a number of criteria:

- Published after 1984
- Written in English
- Addressing initial/pre-service teacher education of school pupils in the 5-19 age range
- Addressing the quality or improvement of initial teacher education
- Addressing the discharge of responsibilities by tutors and/or mentors at course or team level
- Addressing:
  - o the conceptual framework for ITE as expressed through the programme aims, definitions and design, or
  - o the organisational structure or management processes for ITE, or
  - o the organisation and management of partnerships between schools and providers for initial teacher education

In the case of England, very large numbers of inspection reports for individual ITE programmes were available from the Ofsted website. In addition, summary reports based on the outcomes of these individual reports were available. In order to avoid overwhelming the set of documents for review with these individual reports, the Review Group chose to include only the summary reports.

## 2.3 Characterising included documents

The full text documents found were keyworded, using the EPPI-Centre Core Keywording Strategy (EPPI-Centre, 2002a); see Appendix 2.4. Additional keywords specific to the context of this review were added to those of the EPPI-Centre and are given in Appendix 2.3. All the keyworded documents were added to the larger EPPI-Centre database, REEL, for others to access via the website.

Key-wording began with a moderation exercise at a team meeting during which review-specific keywords were developed and trialled. Subsequently, each document was keyworded by two members of the Review Group, working separately. Results were compared and agreed. A sample of ten keyworded studies was moderated by Carole Torgerson, representing the EPPI-Centre.

## 2.4 Further selection of documents for review

At this stage, documents were further categorised on the basis of trustworthiness. The documents within this review have not been located from academic databases and have a wide range of forms, purposes and bases for authority. The Review Group felt that it was therefore important to make an analysis of the basis of trust in these documents, rather than leave this judgement until the final review stage. The aim of this screening process was to exclude those documents that had no claim to represent a view, based on collection of evidence or on consensus. In order to reach a judgement about trustworthiness, the following were considered:

- *Authorship and provenance of the document:* Documents published by government departments were assumed to have undergone an internal moderation process and to represent a considered view. These were included; documents written by a named committee of experts were also included.
- *Evidence of collaboration and moderation:* Documents which had been produced collaboratively by groups with a claim to expertise, or which had been subject to a documented consultation process, were included.
- *Transparency and robustness of method:* Documents which included a description and justification of method were included.
- *Nature of vested interests:* The document was excluded where there was a clear vested interest inherent in the purpose of the document which was likely to distort the conclusions.

The detailed reasons for exclusion of those documents which were not taken forward are given in Appendix 2.4.

## 2.5 Detailed description of documents

Studies identified for inclusion in the final review were data-extracted, using Guidelines for Extracting Data which were developed by the Review Group specifically for this review. These were based on the EPPI-Centre Guidelines for Extracting Data, adapted to suit the different kind of literature being addressed in this review. The review-specific Guidelines for Extracting Data are given in Appendix 2.5.

## 2.6 Synthesis of evidence

The review-specific data-extraction tool was used by team members to extract from the documents included in the final review those sections which gave evidence about issues, trends and assumptions relevant to the review question. During data-extraction, these sections were categorised according to their relevance to aspects of organisational structures, management processes and conceptual framework of ITE. Within these categories, a number of themes were identified. These themes were chosen by considering the number of times they were addressed in different documents and the strength of consensus or range of difference in the different documents. An analytic account was produced, organised around these themes. This account was preferred to an exhaustive account of the themes which might over-represent issues referred to by only one document. It was also preferred to any attempt to make a synthesis of evidence since this would assume a status for the 'evidence' used which it cannot claim.

## CHAPTER THREE

# Identifying and describing studies: results

Of the 143 documents found, four were duplicates and a further 74 were excluded because they did not match the criteria imposed. This left 65 documents which were keyworded as described in section 2.3 of the Technical Report. Eleven were then removed because they did not meet the criteria for trustworthiness described in section 2.4. This chapter describes the characteristics of the 54 remaining documents.

**Table 3.1** Source of documents (N=54)

Source of document	Number
Government department of education website - national	21
Government department of education website - regional	4
Other government sponsored website - national	17
Other government sponsored website - regional	3
Other	9

The majority of these 54 documents were retrieved from government department or government sponsored websites. It was possible to retrieve far fewer documents from the websites of individual providers than had been hoped for, and none of those that were retrieved were included in the in-depth review. It is not yet common practice for providers to publish material which reports on the outcomes of their quality assurance processes (as opposed to the processes themselves), nor for them to make available inspection reports even when these are in any case in the public domain.

Examples of other websites from which documents were retrieved include the Australian Council of Deans of Education, the General Teaching Council for England, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers.

**Table 3.2** Purpose of document (N=54)

Purpose	Number
Report commissioned to inform government policy	17
Statement of government policy or official guidelines	20
Report on provider or course for quality assurance purposes - by consultant (commissioned by the provider)	1
Report on provider or course for quality assurance-purposes - by inspector (commissioned independently of provider)	11
Other	5

The set of documents is dominated by government (national or regional) publications either to inform or to explain policy.

**Table 3.3** Authorship of documents (N=54)

Authorship	Number
Government officials, unnamed - national	4
Government officials, unnamed - regional	3
Government-related officials, unnamed - national	21
Government-related officials, unnamed - regional	1
Government-commissioned author or committee, named - national	11
Government-commissioned author or committee, named - regional	4
Consultant commissioned by provider	1
Person employed or commissioned by non-government body	3
Other	6

Most of the authors of these documents were directly employed or commissioned by government in one form or another. By far the majority of the documents were multi-authored.

**Table 3.4** Funding of writing and production of the document (N = 54)

Funder	Number
Government - national	41
Government - regional	8
Non-governmental umbrella body	3
Other	2

Given the provenance and authorship of these documents, it is not surprising to find that the production of most of them was funded by government. Non-governmental umbrella bodies were mostly self-funding groups of providers.

**Table 3.5** Kind of evidence drawn on (N = 54, not mutually exclusive)

Evidence type	Number
Primary empirical research evidence	13
Literature, possibly including research reports, and/or secondary data	18
Inspection evidence	21
Argument, opinion or anecdote unsupported by any of the above	3
Description without resort to argument or evidence	12

Since these documents are not, on the whole, reports of research studies, it is important to be aware of the kind of evidence that is drawn on. Many documents draw on more than one form of evidence. Where primary empirical research evidence is used, it is often supported by other forms.

**Table 3.6** Moderation processes applied to the production of the document (N = 54, not mutually exclusive)

Attribute	Number
Peer review	2
Produced by named committee	19
Public consultation	5
Right of reply	13
Other	22

The form of moderation or collaboration applied to the production of the document was very important because it was a good indicator of the nature of the consensus represented by the document. Forms of moderation mentioned under 'Other' were mostly consultations of specific constituents.

**Table 3.7** Definition of quality (N = 54, not mutually exclusive)

Definition of quality	Number
Internally defined	10
User-defined	11
Externally defined	45

The Review Group's understanding of different definitions of quality is given in section 1.5. Most of the documents made implicit use of more than one understanding of quality. Since many of the documents were concerned with inspection or regulation of ITE programmes, the externally defined understanding of quality dominated.

**Table 3.8** Aspect of ITE structures considered in the document (N = 54, not mutually exclusive)

Attribute	Number
Organisational structure	46
Management processes	39
Conceptual framework	28

Most of the documents included addressed a wide range of issues within the area of ITE, including material relevant to all three of the aspects of ITE included in the review question.

**Table 3.9** Phase of ITE (N = 54, not mutually exclusive)

Phase of ITE	Number
Primary	13
Secondary	12
Cross phase	38
Other	2

The documents analysed were distributed evenly between the different phases of schooling for which teachers were being prepared. 'Cross-phase' means that the document reached conclusions which related to both primary and secondary teacher education courses; some documents made separate conclusions about primary and secondary teacher education and these were categorised as 'primary' and 'secondary', rather than 'cross-phase'.

**Table 3.10** Curriculum area (N = 54, not mutually exclusive)

Curriculum area	Number
Art	2
Business Studies	1
Design and technology	3
ICT	2
Literacy - first language	2
Literacy - further languages	1
Maths	5
Music	1
Religious education	1
Science	4
Vocational	1
Other curriculum	2
The material does not focus on curriculum issues.	47

The majority of documents did not focus on specific curriculum issues. Most of the documents selected for inclusion concentrated upon general, rather than subject-specific, aspects of teacher education.

**Table 3.11** Date of publication (N = 54)

Year of publication	Number of documents
1990	1
1991	0
1992	0
1993	0
1994	0
1995	2
1996	2
1997	0
1998	4
1999	0
2000	4
2001	2
2002	12
2003	14
2004	7
2005	4
2006	2

Two-thirds of the documents were dated between 2002 and 2006. Since the search strategy used the internet, this bias towards recent documents is unsurprising.

**Table 3.12** Country from which the document originated (N = 54)

Country	Number
Australia	12
England (or England and Wales)	10
India	1
Kenya	1
Malaysia	1
Northern Ireland	2
Norway	1
Scotland	5
South Africa	1
USA	7
Wales	13

Just over half the documents originated in the United Kingdom and approximately a quarter more came from Australia. This distribution is largely a reflection of the search strategy, including the decision to consider only documents published in English. It is also, however, an indication of the degree of attention to quality in ITE in the public domain, and the extent to which the internet has become the vehicle for communication in the countries included.

**Table 3.13** Number of documents including material on aspects of ITE structures (N = 54, not mutually exclusive)

Aspect of ITE structures		Number
Organisational structures	Nature of programme	25
	Structure of course	26
	Institutional roles	27
	Other	10
Management processes	Selection processes	18
	Roles of tutors and mentors	18
	QA processes	32
	Other	15
Conceptual framework		26

The three main themes which attracted most comment are discussed in section 4. Material on these themes was found under Organisational Structures (institutional roles); Management Processes (QA processes) and Conceptual Framework.

The remaining material addressed a very wide range of issues, with little by way of common ground. The exceptions to this were as follows:

- the remuneration received by schools for the part they play in ITE
- comparisons between undergraduate and postgraduate teacher preparation
- preparation



---

## CHAPTER FOUR

# In-depth review: results

This chapter presents the outcomes of the in-depth review of 54 documents. The material extracted from the review documents was extensive and varied. It is neither possible nor desirable to give a comprehensive account of the conclusions from the documents which touch on ITE structures. Instead, the following three themes were selected which are well represented in the evidence reviewed: the nature of partnership between institutions in providing ITE, modes of quality assurance, and the nature and role of conceptual frameworks for ITE. In each case, there is a unifying general approach along with some interesting differences between and within countries.

### **Analytic account of evidence**

This section examines three themes which were common to a large number of the documents.

#### **4.1 Institutional roles**

The first of these is the roles of different institutions involved in teacher preparation. Ofsted surveys of ITE provider inspections (Ofsted 2003a, b) assert that quality of partnerships between HEIs and schools are an important factor in determining the quality of provision. This conclusion had been foreshadowed by Furlong and Kane (1996) in their survey of primary ITE inspections which was undertaken in the absence of an Ofsted overview publication. Moon (1998, p.36) claims that the ‘model of partnership between schools and teacher education institutions is now increasingly structurally established’ and that literature around the theme in the UK context is ‘widely read in other parts of the world’. The focus on effective partnerships between HEIs and schools is enshrined in the Handbook for Inspection of ITT (Ofsted, 2005, p 10), with an emphasis on ‘active agreement of schools’ and ‘partnership agreements(s) [which are] well constructed, clearly understood and implemented effectively’.

Similar stipulations form part of the framework for ITE in Scotland. The 1998 guidelines (Scottish Executive, 1998, paragraph 4) stress the principle that ‘good partnership arrangements take full account of the partners’ mutual aims and their respective priorities and responsibilities’, while the

2003 framework for accreditation (General Teaching Council for Scotland, 2003) takes a more detailed and operational line in recommending that ‘clear guidance is given to school staff on the expectations of school placement...practising teachers have a role in the design and planning of the programme (p.2)... staff in HEIs provide quality support for schools... there is a formal partnership in place (p.4)’.

In Wales, two overview reports by Estyn echo the theme, stressing the importance of a multi-faceted partnership between HEIs and schools. Estyn (2002b) recommends that HEIs ‘involve mentors and partner schools more in planning, managing, monitoring and evaluating courses’ and Estyn (2003a) advocates the effective contribution of serving teachers to all aspects of the course and the continuing development of partnerships between HEIs, schools and LEAs. It also recommends that HEIs contribute to the development of serving teachers’ research skills as well as CPD more generally, and describes an effective partnership as one in which there are opportunities for the partners to contribute their expertise.

In the UK, then, there is a well established concern about partnership with schools as a key element in high quality ITE, and expectations of strong involvement of schools and teachers in many aspects of ITE programmes are mainstream. Bodies responsible for inspection of ITE stipulate that formal partnership arrangements are in place, with clear documentation of the partners’ roles and responsibilities.

Documents from Australia adopt a less uniform approach to partnership. In 1998, the Australian Council of Deans of Education published a report, *Preparing a Profession*, which recommended national guidelines and standards for ITE. It called for 'partnerships with the teaching profession, school authorities and individual schools, which recognise and respect the rights, responsibilities, expertise, perspectives and interests of the parties' (p 21) and advocated 'all-encompassing relationships with schools and their communities so that an understanding of their complex realities can be integrated with all elements of the program' (p 22). This report, however, was not adopted as part of a national framework, and Australian states continue to work to different guidelines and accreditation procedures for ITE, although there is now a common framework for professional standards for teaching (MCEETYA, 2003).

The evaluation framework for ITE courses currently used in the state of Victoria (Standards Council of the Teaching Profession, 1999) adopts a more differentiated approach. It offers the possibility of an 'internship' model for some school experiences on some courses (usually in the later periods of graduate courses). In this model, the school takes almost sole responsibility for the organisation and assessment of the placement. For more traditional school experience placements, involvement of school teachers in assessment is required and partnership arrangements are encouraged.

Two documents set a more aspirational tone. Smith et al. (2003, p 26) suggest the 'extension of conjoint appointments' but recognise that 'boundary spanning across two significantly different cultures presents its own difficulties for the incumbent'. A report for the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment Training and Youth Affairs (Skilbeck and Connell, 2004, p 12) recommended that 'the strongest possible operational partnerships with schools and with employers be developed by university providers with solid inputs from employers'. Perhaps more controversially, the following directions for action were given: 'Selected schools and consortia of schools would make excellent centres for more school-based or school-focused programmes of initial teacher education. In continuing partnerships with universities there should be further shifts in the balance of responsibilities for initial teacher education, towards schools' (p 12).

In Australia, there is therefore a strong consensus on the importance of close institutional links and the centrality of professional experience in initial teacher education, but the requirements on providers of traditional programmes are some way distant from the innovative aspirations expressed in forward-looking reports for national government.

In the USA, much of the writing about development of institutional roles concerns the notion of the professional development school (PDS). For

example, Maryland State Department of Education (1995, p 16) describes the PDS as follows: 'PDSs will model the best in teaching and learning for pre-K-12 students, teacher interns, experienced teachers, other school personnel, and university and college faculty. Analogous to a teaching hospital, these sites will reflect the most current research and best practices in education. College and university faculty will work with practising teachers to develop new methods of instruction and innovative curricula - for both the school and the college classroom'. The report goes on to stress the role that the PDS might play in the professional development of university and college faculty. This concern for engagement of faculty in schools is echoed in the US government report, *A Highly Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom*, in a call for 'a university wide commitment to ensure that adequate resources are made available to maintain faculty skills at the highest level and to enable active participation in field experiences' (US Department of Education, 2002, p 21). The PDS model envisages a very close partnership between higher education institution and school which goes far wider than collaboration for the purpose of initial teacher education.

In looking at these recommendations for models of partnership, a distinction needs to be made between requirements (imposed by governmental or umbrella bodies for purposes of accreditation or funding) and aspirations or descriptions of best practice. Requirements are usually fairly general and modest, although UK requirements go further than most in demanding that a formal partnership agreement exist. On the other hand, some of the aspirations are remote from what is current common practice and, in some cases, it is difficult to see how they could become mainstream. The PDS as a model, for example, makes the kinds of demands on its partner HEI that it is difficult to envisage being met in relation to all the schools that a typical HEI has as partners.

Finally, a commissioned report on the future of ITE in Wales (Furlong et al., 2006) recommended the creation of professional learning and development schools. These are 'schools that can demonstrate that they have a culture of professional learning' and are granted 'additional funding to undertake outreach work with other schools in their regional partnership' (p 13). Such schools are envisaged as having a role in developing capacity in other schools to train teachers. Although the title is similar, the emphasis here is very different from the PDS. The PLDS has more in common with the notion of the 'Training School', established in England in the late 1990s. Furlong et al. (2006, p 13) also recommend that 'where possible HEIs should aim at developing a deeper relationship with a smaller number of schools'. This suggestion follows the trend of many other recommendations in hoping for a 'deeper relationship' but it is unusual in offering a practical means of moving towards this, that is by reducing the size of the partnership.

In summary, there is widespread agreement that effective school experience and, by extension, the strength of the partnership between the provider and the schools is central to the quality of initial teacher education. The main differences are in the uniformity of approach to this issue. In the UK, through inspection agencies, stringent operational requirements are in place for all ITE partnerships. In Australia and the USA, expectations are differentiated. Very strong and pervasive forms of partnership exist for some schools and some providers, but these are seen as innovative or aspirational, rather than mainstream. UK requirements on the length of time that student teachers must spend in schools during their programmes are greater than in either Australia or the USA, and it may be that the more uniform requirements for partnership reflect the need to involve most UK schools in initial teacher education placements rather than a small number of selected schools.

## 4.2 Quality assurance

The second theme on which there is a good deal of evidence is that of quality assurance processes. As might be expected, there is strong agreement that effective monitoring and evaluation is important for the quality of ITE. There is very little disagreement on the purposes of evaluation which are described variously as follows:

*The primary purpose of program development and monitoring procedures is to ensure high quality educational outcomes from the point of view of initial teacher education students, school authorities, the teaching profession, universities and other significant stakeholders. The procedures should also ensure the accountability of initial teacher education providers to stakeholders and the general public. (Adey, 1998, p.16)*

*Management and self-evaluation procedures ... (should be) rigorous enough to identify important issues for action and effect improvement. (Estyn, 2003c, p.4)*

*[Evaluation] leads to improvement in quality for current and future trainees ... (moderation and performance data are used) to identify ways in which the quality of training can be further improved. (Ofsted, 2005, p 15)*

*Candidate outcomes... must be used to identify areas of programmatic strength and needed growth. The institution must be able to show how it has used these data to plan for the improvement of its programs. (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2002, p 10)*

*Processes for review are directed at enhancing and improving provision, the quality of learning opportunities, the attainment of student teachers and the quality of the school placement...Arrangements are in place to detect the need for change and respond appropriately...Arrangements are in place to enhance the growth and development of the programme. (GTCS Evaluation Framework, 2003, p.10)*

All these statements centre on *improvement* as an aim of evaluation. The first purpose is almost uniformly the identification of need for improvement. A few include identification of strengths as an additional purpose, and there is also a sense of accountability in both the Australian Council of Deans and the Wisconsin publications.

On the other hand, the extent and type of recommendation about procedures for quality assurance varies a good deal. UK inspectorates are keen to emphasise 'rigour' in QA processes. The Handbook for the Inspection of ITT (Ofsted, 2005, p 11) includes the following aspects of good quality=assurance practices:

- Managers monitor the quality of provision and set improvement targets, employing appropriate data.
- Progress is reviewed against the targets set.
- Performance is benchmarked over time.
- The assessment procedures, in the range of programmes provided, are appropriate, clear, accurate and effective.
- Moderation procedures are understood, carried out well, and quality issues raised by external examiners or others involved in moderation are investigated and acted upon.
- Training programmes are evaluated against clear criteria.

Ofsted (2002) recommended that graduate teacher programmes should set in place rigorous monitoring and evaluation procedures. Estyn (2005a) encourages the provider to make use of grades and overall judgements in making their self-evaluation. The approach is characterised by an insistence on clarity, accuracy, targets and benchmarking.

Two Australian sources are keen to emphasise the involvement of partners external to the provider: Skilbeck and Connell (2004, p 12) recommend that 'judgements from within the profession should be taken more seriously' and the Australian Council of Deans (Adey 1998, p 16), having required that the 'development and monitoring of initial teacher education programs should therefore be conducted within a broadly consultative framework', goes on to list eleven different classes of stakeholders who should be involved.

Several US documents regard data collection as an important part of the evaluation and quality assurance processes. The NCATE (2002) guidelines go further than most in requiring that evaluation data are publicly reported and suggesting that information technologies are required for the systematic gathering and evaluation of data. NCATE also looks for providers to 'systematically study the effect of any changes to assure that the intended programme strengthening occurs and that there are

no adverse consequences' (p 22). Evaluations should evolve from the provider's conceptual framework and programme goals. NCATE is more detailed in its prescription of quality assurance methods, requiring that evaluations must be 'comprehensive, including measures related to faculty, the curriculum and instruction, as well as assessments of what candidates know and can do' (p 23). Data should also be collected about diversity, unit governance and leadership, as well as faculty qualifications and professional activity.

US sources in general place emphasis on using assessment of student performance in evaluation of programmes. For example, the Legislative Research Commission of Kentucky (2000, p 5) recommends that the state should 'use the standards and student performance to monitor and assess the quality of teacher preparation programs'. This is part of a series of recommendations which are in response to the perception that 'the lack of state-wide, consistent data makes it difficult for policymakers to assess the quality of teacher preparation' (p 4). These considerations are present but less explicit in UK requirements for the use of 'benchmarking'.

Furlong et al. (2006) recommend the development of a set of national performance indicators for ITT in Wales and that the Welsh Assembly ask the General Teaching Council for Wales to carry out an annual survey of newly qualified teachers. Set alongside the move in Kentucky to establish a means of comparing institutions for their effectiveness in preparing new teachers, these recommendations are a demonstration of political concern with evaluation by comparison with peers.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (2002, p.8) handbook for programme approval demands that evaluation be 'research-based; within the rationale for the development of the performance tasks, assessments and evaluation of program performance and outcomes; includes follow-up studies of program graduates'.

So, although there is strong consensus on the purposes of monitoring and evaluation, there is less agreement on the nature and content of requirements for the conduct of QA procedures. There are differences in terms of advice on the need for or nature of a conceptual framework to underpin evaluative procedures, the sources of data to be used and the parties to be involved in its collection, interpretation and use.

One of the issues which arises from a consideration of these differences is that of the relationship, in terms of QA, between the provider (and its partners) and the body or bodies responsible for accrediting or inspecting the provision. Broadly speaking, providers have to respond to the requirements or recommendations of a supra-institutional body and these include concern for the providers' self-evaluation.

Some cases were found of this kind of relationship under construction. For example, revisions to the organisation of teacher education in India resulted in the establishment of a National Council for Teacher Education 'with the objectives of...regulation and proper maintenance of norms and standards of teacher education' (Department of Education, India, 1995). Secondly, plans for strengthening the role of teachers in Malaysia (Ministry of Education, Malaysia, 1996) included a new emphasis on inspection of teacher education.

In parts of the world where these relationships are already well established, there is evidence of a difference of approach. Moon (1996) claims that the form of inspection used in England at this time under Ofsted was unique to the English context and was 'far more instrumental in approach' than others. A response to the consultation for the new Inspection framework for ITE (Ofsted, 2002a) reported that almost all the responses to the relevant question welcomed a greater role for self-evaluation by ITT providers in the inspection process. There was, however, little consensus on the form that self-evaluation should take and an overall preference for a flexible format. This revision to the inspection framework was the first to introduce a specific focus on the provider's quality assurance processes. The emphasis on rigour exemplified above (in Ofsted, 2005) can be seen as a continuation of this theme. Providers are expected to employ demonstrably effective methods, but are not required to make explicit the rationale for their choices.

On the other hand, in Australia, the proposed guidelines for ITE from the Council of Deans are much more prescriptive about the directions for course development, including the following requirement (Adey, 1998, p16):

Procedures for course development should ensure:

- the overall coherence of the program, developing a pathway for learning throughout the course (including the practicum), progressively building conceptually and experientially on what has gone before
- that within particular curriculum studies there is adequate development of cross-curricular attributes (such as language and literacy or Indigenous perspectives)
- that programs are responsive to developments in schools and society, and to emerging and changing roles for teachers
- that relevant research findings, current policies (of, for example, school authorities or teacher organisations), and reports are taken into account and critiqued as appropriate

This list of directions for course development carries within it the tension inherent in requiring self-evaluation. While the provider is required to

prioritise a number of objectives selected by the state (in this case, progression in learning, cross-curricular imperatives and societal change), it is also required to respond critically to research findings, policies and reports (presumably including this one).

The Wisconsin handbook for approval of ITE programmes (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2002, p 10) states that ‘the conceptual framework establishes the mission, goals and structure of the program and the assessment system assesses candidate performance in meeting Wisconsin’s performance-based standards’. This nicely summarises the paradox involved in external prescription of evaluation strategies. Although the evaluation should evolve from the provider’s conceptual framework, one of the key elements of the evaluation must be based on assessment against an externally prescribed set of standards.

In summary, there is widespread agreement on the purposes of QA but differences in the extent to which processes are prescribed. In addition, there is a difference between the UK and US in terms of the expectations regarding providers’ own rationale for evaluation procedures. In the USA, there is a strong expectation that providers have developed their own rationale, although there are some tensions inherent in this assumption. In the UK, there is an apparent indifference to rationale and methods, with an emphasis rather on clarity and rigour. It is, of course, possible to argue that this emphasis in itself represents a position on the nature and purpose of evaluation.

### 4.3 Conceptual framework for ITE

The third area of general concern for the documents reviewed was that of a ‘conceptual framework’ for ITE. The documents reviewed included two main interpretations of this idea. The first was in terms of a conceptual framework for effective teaching: in other words, the authors were attempting to provide answers to the question, ‘What makes an effective teacher?’ This question was frequently answered by the provision of lists of desirable or required attributes of a beginning teacher, often described as ‘standards’. In some cases, these lists were justified by reference to a theoretical framework, but more often by reference to the experts and varied interest groups who had contributed to their construction.

The second interpretation was in terms of a conceptual framework for effective teacher education. In this interpretation, authors were attempting to answer questions, such as ‘How do student teachers learn?’ and ‘What makes an effective teacher education programme?’. Although ideas about effective teaching may be seen to be logically prior to those about effective teacher education, they are not of central concern here and the Review Group has concentrated rather on the second interpretation. Since their interest is in aspects of the structure of ITE which influence its quality, they have focused on what authors are

saying about how the nature of the conceptual framework underpinning the ITE programme influences the quality of that programme.

Again, very broadly, there are two approaches to this question, represented by the USA and the rest of the world. The US National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education in its Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education (2002) places very strong emphasis on the conceptual framework which the provider sets out for its courses and demands that this be clearly and explicitly expressed in the accreditation documentation. The purposes, nature and scope of the conceptual framework are laid out by NCATE. Purposes include ‘establishing a shared vision for a unit’s efforts in preparing educators’ and ‘providing direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service and unit accountability’ (p 12). The scope of the conceptual framework is expressed in this list of structural elements to be covered:

- the vision and mission of the institution and unit
- the unit’s philosophy, purposes, and goals
- knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and education policies
- candidate proficiencies aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards
- the system by which candidate performance is regularly assessed

These requirements represent a very broad interpretation of ‘conceptual framework’ which includes not only the rationale for the design of the ITE programme, but also the details of some aspects of the operation of the programme (for example, the system for assessing candidate performance).

The extensive influence of the NCATE guidelines is indicated by their incorporation in each of the state accreditation guidelines that formed part of this sample, so that the requirement to submit a conceptual framework in this form is a core element of the accreditation process.

Outside the USA, the emphasis is much less on requiring providers to articulate their own conceptual framework and more on specifying what the aims of the programme should be. For example, the Scottish Executive (1998, p 1) Guidelines for ITE Courses require that ‘the overall aim of courses of initial teacher education is to prepare students to become competent and thoughtful practitioners, who are committed to providing high quality teaching for all pupils’.

Smith et al. (2003) report for the Australian Department of Education, Science and Training on the implications for teacher education of a

constructivist view of learning. They conclude (p 27) that ‘a teacher education program that can foster the principles of constructivist learning must have learning and fostering a community of learning practice as the centre of all its work. It must be an essential part of its vision and underpin all of the practices by management and teaching staff with all of the implications this has. There must also be a conceptual coherence that emanates from this vision and links together every course unit and experience by the student teacher’. Here and elsewhere in the paper, there is concern for the conceptual coherence of the programme, but this is coherence around a particular set of understandings of the nature of learning, rather a general concern that the conceptual framework should be both apparent and well developed.

*Preparing a Profession* (Adey, 1998) includes a requirement that “there should be coherence between the program’s conceptual framework and intended student outcomes, courses, practical experiences, and assessment” (p19) but makes no other mention of the role, function or form of a conceptual framework. This document is not yet reflected in an agreement on national guidelines for ITE in Australia.

In England and Wales, the statutory requirement which concerns the design of programmes (DfES, 2002, p 18) states that providers must ‘design the content, structure and delivery of training to enable trainee teachers to demonstrate that they have met the standards for the award of QTS’. Beyond this, there is no stipulation that the design of the programme be based on any expressed principle. The guidance for providers goes no further in setting out how, or whether, the design should be informed by a conceptual framework. In fact, the Handbook for Inspections of ITT in England (Ofsted, 2005, p 39) contains a statement that ‘inspectors will assess the effectiveness of the training programme in terms of its impact on trainees; they will make no assumptions about a particular model of course structure’. Although there is a requirement for coherence, there is no indication of any foundation for this coherence: ‘Similarly, [inspectors] will assess the extent to which school-based and centre-based training are coordinated so that trainees are given a coherent experience that helps them to progress’ (ibid, p 39).

In Scotland, the General Teaching Council (2003) Evaluation Framework for the Accreditation of Programmes of ITE requires the design and content of the programme to be ‘effective in encouraging achievement of the intended learning outcomes’ and the HEI to ‘have adequate procedures to ensure that the content, design and organisation of the curriculum are effective in promoting student learning’ (p 2), but there is no presumption that the provider has articulated the design principles.

The Standards for ITE in Scotland (Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, 2000), however, include a set of key principles which might be thought to contribute to a theoretical underpinning for the process of teacher education: for example, programmes should ‘draw on a wide range of intellectual resources, theoretical perspectives and academic disciplines to illuminate understanding of education and the contexts within which it takes place; encourage students to engage with fundamental questions concerning the aims and values of education and its relationship to society; provide opportunities for students to engage with and draw on educational theory, research, policy and practice; encourage professional reflection on educational processes in a wide variety of contexts; develop in students the ability to construct and sustain a reasoned argument about educational issues in a clear, lucid and coherent manner; and promote a range of qualities in students, including intellectual independence and critical engagement with evidence’ (p 5).

While this apparent indifference to the theoretical underpinning of ITE programmes is widespread, there is also evidence of some concern that there is room for improvement in the overall design of courses; in particular, in the way in which theoretical and practical elements of the course interact. For example, Skilbeck and Connell (2004, p 12) propose that ‘there should be a national review or action research study focused on how the academic components of initial teacher education can more effectively interrelate with the professional requirements of teaching. This could include studies of alternative ways of conceptualising and teaching educational theory in the context of initial teacher education, and with reference to the intellectual foundations of practice in cognate professions where related issues have been raised’.

In summary, there is a starkly different approach to conceptual framework for ITE in documents from different countries represented in this review. Whereas in the USA, influenced strongly by the NCATE guidelines, the provider’s own conceptual framework for the provision is seen as a core element of quality, in other countries, particularly the UK, the regulatory framework and official discourse is almost silent on the subject. Implications of this difference of approach are discussed in Chapter 5.

---

## CHAPTER FIVE

# Implications

### 5.1 Summary of results of analytic account

Three themes were represented by a substantial body of material within the documents reviewed.

- There is widespread agreement that effective school experience, and by extension, the strength of the partnership between the provider and the schools, is central to the quality of initial teacher education. In the UK, through inspection agencies, stringent operational requirements are in place for all ITE partnerships, but, in Australia and the USA, expectations are differentiated. There are very strong and pervasive forms of partnership for some schools and some providers, but these are seen as innovative or aspirational, rather than mainstream.
- There is widespread agreement on the purposes of QA, but differences in the extent to which processes are prescribed. There is also a difference between the UK and USA in terms of the expectations regarding providers' own rationale for evaluation procedures. In the USA, there is a strong expectation that providers have developed their own rationale, although there are some tensions inherent in this assumption. In the UK, there is an apparent indifference to rationale and methods, with an emphasis rather on clarity and rigour.
- There is a starkly different approach to conceptual framework for ITE in documents from different countries represented in this review. In the USA, influenced strongly by the NCATE guidelines, the provider's own conceptual framework for the provision is seen as a core element of quality; in other countries, particularly the UK, the regulatory framework and official discourse is almost silent on the subject.

### 5.2 Strengths and limitations of this systematic review

This review differs from other EPPI-Centre systematic reviews in a number of ways.

The first departure from convention is in the means of searching for documents. The Review Group used the internet, rather than electronic databases as their source, and set about their search, initially, by identifying categories of websites to search. A 'handsearch' of each website was conducted and the retrieved documents were then screened for relevance using inclusion and exclusion criteria. The Group deliberately limited their search to a small number of countries and regions within those countries, as is appropriate for an exploratory review.

Following screening for relevance, the Review Group undertook a second screening for 'trustworthiness'. An underlying principle of the process of systematic review is that the studies included in the in-depth review are appraised to establish whether they meet rigorous standards of research design and reporting. Given the nature of the document being reviewed, this type of appraisal was not appropriate. However, the Group was concerned to establish some grounds for trust in the documents to be included and, in order to do this, the Review Group identified four criteria for trustworthiness based on the following:

- Authorship and provenance of the document
- Evidence of collaboration and moderation
- Transparency and robustness of method
- Absence of vested interests

Documents which did not meet these criteria were not included in the review. There was no further assessment of the quality of the work represented in the documents.

Finally, in place of a synthesis of evidence, an analytic account was constructed, sorting the evidence into themes and commenting on the similarities and differences between countries.

The reasons for the influence exerted by the documents in the review and the claims that the authors or publishers make, usually implicitly, about the grounds for trust in their conclusions, have been an important element in the reasons for undertaking this review and the decisions made during its course. The evidence presented in this review is very far from being the same kind of evidence as that available from the generalisable outcome of the ideally rigorous research study. However, the world in which policy and practice decisions about the organisation of ITE take place is one in which practical, political and resource considerations exert a very strong influence. In these circumstances, decontextualised generalisable research findings are considered to be at best unhelpful and, more than likely, unachievable. The evidence that has been consulted in the form of the documents reviewed has the potential to answer the following question: What is being recommended as good practice or required as standard practice in terms of ITE structures and organisation by informed and influential writers around the world? In order for the answer to this question to be of use to practitioners and policymakers in their own practical, political and resource context, one needs also to answer the question: Why are these recommendations being made? In most cases, there is not enough evidence in the documents themselves to answer this question.

In this scoping review, the Review Group has begun to answer the first question and attempted some answers to the second question. Their answers to the first question are limited by the extent of the domain from which the evidence has been drawn. Their answers to the second question are limited by the extent of the additional evidence to draw on.

Part of the purpose of the review was to scope the documents available from the grey literature sources that had been identified. One outcome of this scoping is that there is very much less material available on individual providers of initial teacher education than had been hoped for or expected. It is still very unusual for providers to publish any outcomes of quality assurance processes, although publication of quality assurance frameworks is becoming more common. The Review Group found three forms of exception to this general rule. Firstly, they found that some providers in the USA have published the self-evaluation report which they had prepared as part of the accreditation process through NCATE. Although these documents were of interest, they did not appear in the final review due to concern about the vested interest of the provider in their production; this meant that the Review Group was unable to judge them as trustworthy. Secondly, the Group found a small number of providers who published data on student evaluation

of courses. These had to be excluded from the review on grounds of relevance, since there was no means of linking these judgements on quality to any structural aspect of the course. Thirdly, in the UK, the Group were able to access very large numbers of inspection reports on individual courses and providers. Several of these are included in the final review. However, there was no equivalent form of published report outside the UK.

The review draws little on the grey literature produced in connection with individual providers and much more on documents produced for local and national government, especially in relation to the regulatory framework for ITE. These documents provided a very rich source of commentary on the characteristics of ITE that national and local governments perceive to be effective and therefore represent a possible avenue for further exploration.

A second outcome is that, although the Review Group was keen for the review to be representative in this way, they were able to find very little material that could be included in the review from less affluent parts of the world. One reason for this is that they were restricted to searching for documents in English. Another reason is that use of the internet for circulation of grey literature is less well developed in these countries. It is also the case that sometimes the quality assurance processes which gives rise to most of the grey literature is less well developed. The first two of these reasons are unavoidable limitations of the search procedures, while the third is an outcome of the scoping. It has, however, been impossible to disentangle the three reasons within the budget available.

Having chosen to try to include a range of countries representing different stages of development, the Review Group excluded from the review some Anglophone countries where there has been considerable academic and policy attention to ITE, notably New Zealand and Canada. The Group also sampled from sub-national bodies rather than aimed to be fully comprehensive. This leaves a large number of US states and Australian states and territories unexplored. A review which aimed to be exhaustive rather than scoping would need to take this into account.

What the Review Group has been able to do in this limited review is to identify a number of themes on which there is an accumulation of opinion from the representative documents that have been examined. Within these themes, there are some areas of consensus and some interesting differences of approach. These outcomes could be followed up by extending the geographical reach of the review with a tighter review focus or by using additional forms of evidence to pursue the rationale for or influences on these conclusions.



### 5.3 Implications

There are three main areas in which the Review Group has been able to draw conclusions from the review of documents. The consensus that the quality of partnerships between schools and providers is crucial to successful ITE will surprise few. Recent investment in supporting partnership is testimony to the Training and Development Agency's concern for this quality. What is rather more complex is the nature of partnerships which are perceived to generate strength. The differences between countries in perspectives on partnership suggest that professional development schools or internships may provide models worthy of attention in the UK. The most radical proposals are for a clearly symbiotic relationship between school and HEI partners, with opportunities for staff from both institutions to be involved in teaching of school pupils, research projects and CPD as well as activities which are directly part of the ITE programme. The review also highlighted a number of comments about the need to make adequate remuneration to schools and teachers for their role in ITE. This suggests that a resource model which properly reflects the roles of the two partners is a necessary, perhaps central, element in the construction of an effective partnership, rather than something which can be dealt with as an afterthought.

Agreement was also found on the importance and purposes of the provider's own quality assurance processes, and thus the importance for providers of paying specific attention to the relationship between quality assurance processes and the structures for the delivery of ITE. There was widespread support for the use of a wide range of data and engagement of a number of interested parties in the evaluation process. The range of data currently available to support evaluation of ITE in the UK is much more restricted than that which is available to schools. All those involved need to develop broader and more meaningful data-capture tools in order to support the development of data-rich collaborative evaluation and improvement processes.

Differences were noted, however, between US and UK requirements, with the former requiring providers to have a developed rationale for their evaluation processes in terms of the overall conceptual framework for the provision.

This difference between the two countries goes well beyond the area of the provider's own quality assurance processes. In the USA, influenced strongly by the NCATE guidelines, the provider's own conceptual framework for the provision as a whole is seen as a core element of quality, underpinning all other aspects. However, this is complex territory. Local and national government and their agencies exert a strong hegemonic influence on practice in initial teacher education; regulatory frameworks impact directly on, and over time strongly shape, the provision that they seek to regulate. In some UK instances, there is suggestive evidence that the rationale for initial teacher education is wholly and explicitly compliant, and the lack of interest of regulatory agencies (such as Ofsted) in the nature of rationale for structures, actions and processes has produced some institutional reluctance to engage in such a rationale. Nor is it the case that the US model circumvents the issue of compliance. A close reading of the NCATE guidelines reveals many areas in which compliance is required, even within the requirements for the conceptual framework itself. For example, values in the area of diversity and intentions for the exploitation of IT are laid down as essential parts of the rationale. So, although the NCATE guidelines require providers to declare their own conceptual framework, there is still a high degree of prescription. It can be argued that the existence of requirements or guidelines in itself necessarily gives rise to a compliance culture. There is scope for providers to improve the coherence of their programmes by focusing on the conceptual framework for their provision.

The conceptual framework requirement in the NCATE guidelines is as much about coherence of curriculum, pedagogy, assessment and evaluation, and about common understanding among partners in the delivery of ITE, as it is about giving providers the freedom to set their own priorities. Regulators can encourage providers to pursue this route to coherence by expecting quality assurance procedures to be based on a rationale. To make this effective, there would need to be some genuine scope for difference in rationale and practice and safe routes for innovation.

---

## CHAPTER SIX

# References

### 6.1 Documents included in the review

*All papers are available on the internet and were accessed by reviewers in 2006.*

Adey, Kym (Chair) (1998) Preparing a profession. Report of the National Standards and Guidelines for Initial Teacher Education project. Canberra: Australian Council of Deans of Education (<http://acde.edu.au/assets/pdf/PreparingaProfession.pdf>).

Department of Education, India (1995) Revised Scheme of Teacher Education for 10th Plan. ([http://www.education.nic.in/htmlweb/teacheredu\\_scheme.htm](http://www.education.nic.in/htmlweb/teacheredu_scheme.htm)).

DfES (2002) Qualifying to teach: professional standards for qualified teacher status and requirements for initial teacher training. London: DfES Publications (<http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/q/qualifying-to-teach.pdf>).

DfES (2006) Handbook of Guidance: 2006 Edition (with Qualifying to Teach: Professional Standards for Qualified Teacher Status and Requirements for Initial Teacher Training). London: DfES Publications (<http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/g/guidancehandbook2.pdf>).

Education and Training Inspectorate for Northern Ireland (2000) Report on a Survey of Teacher Education Partnerships. Bangor, Co. Down: Education and Training Inspectorate ([http://www.deni.gov.uk/inspection\\_services/inspection\\_reports/2000\\_05/uu.doc](http://www.deni.gov.uk/inspection_services/inspection_reports/2000_05/uu.doc)).

Education Commission of the States (2000) New Imperatives for Teacher Preparation. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States (<http://www/ecs.org/clearinghouse/22/38/2238>).

Estyn (2001a) Inspection report: Trinity College, Carmarthen. Cardiff: Estyn ([http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection\\_reports/trinity.pdf](http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection_reports/trinity.pdf)).

Estyn (2001b) Inspection report: University of Wales, Aberystwyth. Cardiff: Estyn ([http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection\\_reports/AberITTE.pdf](http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection_reports/AberITTE.pdf)).

Estyn (2002a) Inspection report: Swansea Institute of HE. Cardiff: Estyn ([http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection\\_reports/SIHE\\_03.pdf](http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection_reports/SIHE_03.pdf)).

Estyn (2002b) ITT in Wales, 1996-2002. Cardiff: Estyn ([http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/ITT\\_summary\\_HEFCW.pdf](http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/ITT_summary_HEFCW.pdf)).

Estyn (2003a) Excellence and Innovation in ITT. Cardiff: Estyn (<http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/excellenceininnovation.pdf>).

Estyn (2003b) Information and communications technology in ITT courses. Cardiff: Estyn (<http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/ICTinITTSecPhase.pdf>).

Estyn (2003c) Inspection report: North East Wales Institute. Cardiff: Estyn ([http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection\\_reports/NEWI\\_03.pdf](http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection_reports/NEWI_03.pdf)).

Estyn (2004a) Inspection report: North East Wales institute Reinspection. Cardiff: Estyn ([http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection\\_reports/ITT\\_NEWI\\_reinspection.pdf](http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection_reports/ITT_NEWI_reinspection.pdf)).

Estyn (2004b) Inspection report: University of Wales, Cardiff. Cardiff: Estyn ([http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection\\_reports/UWIC.pdf](http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection_reports/UWIC.pdf)).

Estyn (2004c) The graduate teacher programme: a new route into teaching. Cardiff: Estyn ([http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/GTP\\_New\\_Route\\_Teaching\\_ITT.pdf](http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/GTP_New_Route_Teaching_ITT.pdf)).

- Estyn (2005a) Inspection report: University of Wales, Bangor. Cardiff: Estyn ([http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection\\_reports/UoW\\_Bangor\\_ITET\\_05.pdf](http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection_reports/UoW_Bangor_ITET_05.pdf)).
- Estyn (2005b) Inspection report: University of Wales, Newport. Cardiff: Estyn ([http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection\\_reports/UoW\\_Newport\\_ITET\\_05.pdf](http://www.estyn.gov.uk/inspection_reports/UoW_Newport_ITET_05.pdf)).
- Furlong J, Kane I (1996) Recognising quality in primary ITE. UCET Occasional Paper No. 6. London: UCET (<http://www.ucet.ac.uk/op6.html>).
- Furlong J, Hagger H, Butcher C (2006) Review of ITT provision in Wales. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly (<http://www.learning.wales.gov.uk/pdfs/itt-provision-wales-e.pdf>).
- General Teaching Council for Scotland (2005) Evaluation framework for accreditation of programmes of ITE. Edinburgh: GTCS ([http://www.gtcs.org.uk/gtcs/it\\_education.aspx?MenuItemID=54&selection=2](http://www.gtcs.org.uk/gtcs/it_education.aspx?MenuItemID=54&selection=2)).
- Ingvarson L, Beavis A, Kleinhenz E (2004) Teacher education courses in Victoria. Melbourne, Victoria: Victorian Institute of Teaching ([http://www.vit.vic.edu.au/files/documents/382\\_FTP\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://www.vit.vic.edu.au/files/documents/382_FTP_final_report.pdf)).
- Lawrance GA, Palmer DH (2003) Clever teachers: clever science. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training (<http://infocat.dest.gov.au/IE/ViewEntry.asp?ID=2441>).
- Legislative Research Commission (2000) Teacher quality issues in Kentucky. Frankfort, Kentucky: Legislative Research Commission (<http://www.lrc.ky.gov/lrcpubs/RR297.pdf>).
- Maryland State Department of Education (1995) Teacher education: task force report. Annapolis, Maryland: Maryland State Department of Education ([http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/2C7FFCC4-3F21-4B62-9406-311B06CDF2DB/1496/Redesign\\_Teacher\\_Ed.pdf](http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/2C7FFCC4-3F21-4B62-9406-311B06CDF2DB/1496/Redesign_Teacher_Ed.pdf)).
- Maryland State Department of Education (2003) Maryland Institutional Report Guide. Annapolis, Maryland: Maryland State Department of Education (<http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/2C7FFCC4-3F21-4B62-9406-311B06CDF2DB/2933/NCATEMARYLANDREPORTGUIDECOMPLETEDOCUMENT1.pdf>).
- McGettrick B (2002) Benchmark information on standards for ITE in Scotland. Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive (<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations/education/qait.pdf>).
- Ministerial Council on Education, Employment Training and Youth Affairs (2003) A national framework for professional standards for teaching. Carlton South, Victoria: MCEETYA ([http://www.mceetya.edu.au/verve/\\_resources/national\\_framework\\_file.pdf](http://www.mceetya.edu.au/verve/_resources/national_framework_file.pdf)).
- Ministry of Education and Research, Norway (2004) The development of education 2000-2004: national report of Norway. Oslo: Ministry of Education and Research (<http://odin.dep.no/filarkiv/225897/ICE-rapport.pdf>).
- Ministry of Education, Malaysia (1996) Strengthening the role of teachers in a changing world. Paris: UNESCO (<http://www.ibe.unesco.org/International/Databanks/Dossiers/rmalaysi.htm>).
- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Kenya (2003) Report on the National Conference on Education and Training. Nairobi: Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (<http://www.education.go.ke/MOESTDocs/Validated%20Conference%20Report%20Feb%2027,%202004.pdf>).
- Moon B (1998) The English Exception? International Perspectives on the Initial Education and Training of Teachers. UCET Occasional Paper No. 11, London: UCET (<http://www.ucet.ac.uk/op11.html>).
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (2006) Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges and Departments of Education. Washington DC: NCATE ([http://www.ncate.org/documents/standards/unit\\_stnds\\_2006.pdf](http://www.ncate.org/documents/standards/unit_stnds_2006.pdf)).
- Ofsted (2002a) Inspection arrangements for ITT from 2002/3 onwards. London: Ofsted Publications (<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/index.cfm?fuseaction=pubs.summary&id=2291>).
- Ofsted (2002b) Survey of the graduate teaching programme. London: Ofsted Publications (<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/index.cfm?fuseaction=pubs.summary&id=1269>).
- Ofsted (2003a) The initial training of further education teachers: a survey. London: Ofsted Publications (<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/assets/3425.pdf>).
- Ofsted (2003b) Quality and standards in primary ITT. London: Ofsted Publications (<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/index.cfm?fuseaction=pubs.summary&id=3309>).
- Ofsted (2003c) Quality and standards in secondary initial teacher training. London: Ofsted Publications (<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/index.cfm?fuseaction=pubs.summary&id=3308>).
- Ofsted (2005) Handbook for the inspection of initial teacher training for inspections from September 2005. London: Ofsted Publications (<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/index.cfm?fuseaction=pubs.summary&id=3941>).
- Quality Assurance Agency for HE (2000) Standards for ITE in Scotland. Glasgow: Quality Assurance Agency Scotland (<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/benchmark/iteScotland/introduction.asp>).

Queensland Board of Teacher Registration (2002) Professional standards for graduates and guidelines for pre-service teacher education programmes. Toowong, Brisbane, Australia: Queensland Board of Teacher Registration (<http://www.btr.qld.edu.au/pdf/standard.pdf>).

Queensland Board of Teacher Registration (2003) The multiple faces of internships: report of Phase One of a BTR Project on Internships in preservice teacher education. Toowong: Brisbane, Australia: Queensland Board of Teacher Registration (<http://www.btr.qld.edu.au/pdf/phaseone.pdf>).

Ramsey G (1990a) Teacher education in Australia. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service (<http://infocat.dest.gov.au/IE/ViewEntry.asp?ID=1031>).

Ramsey G (1990b) The shape of teacher education: some proposals. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service (<http://infocat.dest.gov.au/IE/ViewEntry.asp?ID=1033>).

Samuel M, Pillay D (2002) Face to face initial teacher education degree programme at the University of Durban-Westville, South Africa. MUSTER Discussion Paper No 31. Sussex: Centre for International Education, University of Sussex (<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/usie/muster/sa.html>).

Scottish Executive (1998) Guidelines for ITE courses in Scotland. Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive (<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library/documents-w3/git-00.htm>).

Scottish Executive Review Group (2005) "Review of ITE stage 2", Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive (<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/920/0012210.pdf>).

Skilbeck M, Connell H (2004) Teachers for the future. Canberra: MCEETYA (<http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/54722/20051209/www.mceetya.edu.au/pdf/teachersforthefuture.pdf>).

Smith D (2003) Learning, teaching and innovation: a review of literature on facilitating innovation in students, schools and teacher education with particular emphasis on mathematics, science and technology. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training (<http://www.dest.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/D4511076-4200-4257-8B47-B78E4A78A38A/1660/innovation.pdf>).

Standards Council of the Teaching Profession (1999) Guidelines for the evaluation of teacher education courses. Melbourne, Victoria: Victorian Institute of Teaching (<http://www.vit.vic.edu.au/pdfs/Guide99.pdf>).

Tasmanian Educational Leaders Institute (2002) An ethic of care: effective programmes for beginning teachers. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training (<http://www.dest.gov.au/archive/schools/publications/2003/BeginningTeachers.pdf>).

Taylor D, Usher R (2004) Aspects of ITT in Northern Ireland. Belfast: Department for Employment and Learning, Northern Ireland (<http://www.delni.gov.uk/index.cfm/area/information/page/Study%20of%20Initial%20Teacher%20Education>).

US Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education (2005) A highly qualified teacher in every classroom: the Secretary's fourth annual report on teacher quality. Washington DC (<http://www.title2.org/TitleIIReport05.doc>).

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (2002) Handbook of Standards, Procedures and Policies for the Approval of Professional Education Programs in the State of Wisconsin. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (<http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/pdf/tprhndbk.pdf>).

## 6.2 Other references used in the text of the report

Barrett E, Barton L, Furlong J, Galvin C, Miles S, Whitty G (1992) *Initial Teacher Education in England and Wales: a topography*. London: Modes of Teacher Education Project, Goldsmiths' College

Bills L, Briggs M, Browne A, Gillespie H, Gordon J, Husbands C, Shreeve A, Still C, Swatton P (2007) Structures, management and process in initial teacher education: a systematic review. In: *Research Evidence in Education Library*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.

Booth M, Furlong J, Wilkin M (eds) (1990) *Partnership in initial teacher training*. London: Cassell.

Draper J, Fraser H, Raab A, Sharp S, Taylor W (1997) *Routes into primary teaching*. Edinburgh: Moray House Institute of Education.

Elliott J (1993) 'Are performance indicators quality indicators?' In: J Elliott (ed) *Reconstructing Teacher Education*, London and Washington DC: Falmer Press.

Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre) (2002a) *Core Keywording Strategy: Data Collection for a Register of Educational Research*. Version 0.9.7. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit.

Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre) (2002b) *Review Guidelines for Extracting Data and Quality Assessing Primary Studies in Educational Research*. Version 0.9.7. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit.

Furlong J, Smith R (eds) (1996) *The role of higher education in initial teacher training*. London: Kogan Page.

Furlong, VJ, Hirst PH, Miles S, Pocklington K (1988) *Initial teacher training and the role of the school*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Gormley K, Hammer J, McDermott P, Rothenberg J (1993) *An investigation into the influence of classroom practice experiences on student teachers thoughts about teaching*. Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Educational Research Association: Ellenville, NY, USA

Ingvarson L, Beavis A, Kleinhenz E (2004) *Teacher education courses in Victoria: perceptions of their effectiveness and factors affecting their impact*. Melbourne, Australian Council for Educational Research.

O'Hara P, Cameron Jones M (1997) Comparisons of newly qualified primary teachers past and present. Research note. *Scottish Educational Review* 29: 76-79.

Powney J, Edwards S, Holyroyd C, Martin S (1993) *Monitoring the pilot: the Moray House Institute PGCE (secondary)*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Scottish Education Department.

Smith E, Gorard S (2004) *Factors supporting high quality in initial teacher training*. Cardiff University School of Social Sciences, Occasional Paper 63.

Wideen M, Mayer-Smith J, Moon B (1998) 'A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach'. *Review of Educational Research* 68: 130-178.

Wilson SM, Floden RE, Ferrini-Mundy J (2001) *Teacher preparation research: current knowledge, gaps and recommendations*. Seattle: University of Washington Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy (for the United States Department of Education).

---

## Appendix 1.1: Authorship of this report

This work is a report of a systematic review conducted by the English Review Group.

The authors of this report are:

Liz Bills (Department of Education, University of Oxford)  
Mary Briggs (Institute of Education, University of Warwick)  
Ann Browne (School of Education and Lifelong Learning, University of East Anglia)  
Helena Gillespie (School of Education and Lifelong Learning, University of East Anglia)  
John Gordon (School of Education and Lifelong Learning, University of East Anglia)  
Chris Husbands (Institute of Education, University of London)  
Ellie Phillips (School of Education and Lifelong Learning, University of East Anglia)  
Caroline Still (School of Education and Lifelong Learning, University of East Anglia)  
Peter Swatton (School of Education, University College Northampton)

They conducted the review with the benefit of active participation from the members of the review group.

For further information about this review, please contact:

Liz Bills  
Department of Education,  
University of Oxford,  
15 Norham Gardens,  
Oxford  
OX2 6PY  
Tel: +44 (0)1865 611003  
E-mail: [liz.bills@education.ox.ac.uk](mailto:liz.bills@education.ox.ac.uk)

For further information about the work of the EPPI-Centre, please contact:

EPPI-Centre  
Social Science Research Unit  
Institute of Education, University of London  
18 Woburn Square

Tel: +44 (0)20 7612 6397  
Fax: +44 (0)20 7612 6800  
E-mail: [EPPIAdmin@ioe.ac.uk](mailto:EPPIAdmin@ioe.ac.uk)

## **Review group**

Initial Teacher Education Review Group

## **Advisory group membership**

Marilyn Leask (Teacher Training Agency)

## **Conflict of interest**

There were no conflicts of interest for any members of the Review Group.

## **Acknowledgements**

The review was undertaken with the guidance and support of the EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London, with specific advice and support from Carole Torgerson and David Gough on behalf of the EPPI-Centre. It was funded mainly by the Teacher Training Agency, with support from the University of East Anglia, University of Warwick and University College, Northampton.

---

## Appendix 2.1: Inclusion and exclusion criteria

To ensure that only papers focusing on the review question were selected for mapping, an explicit list of inclusion and exclusion criteria was developed to exclude inappropriate papers. No geographical limitations were placed on the location of studies.

### 1. Date

- *Included* (1) Papers that were published after 1984. *Rationale:* The establishment of CATE in 1984 represented a very significant change in thinking about the management of ITE in England and Wales. Much of the policy background against which ITE providers operate is shaped by changes that began in this period. The twenty-year period of the review presents a manageable timeframe which nevertheless is likely to include all studies that are set against a comparable policy background.

- *Excluded* (1) Not published after 1984

### 2. Language

- *Included* (2) Papers written in English. *Rationale:* The timescale was limited and the first (and main) language within the URT was English.

- *Excluded* (2) Not written in English

### 3. Focus on teacher education

- *Included* (3) Papers that focused on the education of teachers

- *Excluded* (3) Papers that focused on education more generally

### 4. Focus on initial teacher education

- *Included* (4) Papers focusing on initial/pre-service teacher education

- *Excluded* (4) Papers focusing on in-service rather than pre-service teacher education

### 5. Age range and institutional setting of pupils taught

- *Included* (5) Papers focusing on education of teachers of school pupils in the 5-19 age range

- *Excluded* (5) Papers focusing on the education of teachers for other settings and age ranges

### 6. Focus on quality

- *Included* (6) Papers focusing on the quality of initial teacher education

- *Excluded* (6) Papers focusing aspects of initial teacher education without central concern for its quality

### 7. In considering papers which focused on the role of tutors and mentors in ITE, the Review Group:

- *Included* (7) Papers focusing on the discharge of responsibilities by tutors and/or mentors at course or team level

- *Excluded* (7) Papers that focused on the roles adopted by individual tutors and mentors rather than on roles defined at course or team level

### 8. In considering papers which focused on the conceptual framework for ITE, the Review Group:

- *Included* (8) Papers focusing on the conceptual framework for ITE as expressed through the programme aims, definitions and design

- *Excluded* (8) Papers that focused mainly on the outworking of the conceptual framework through content, curriculum, teaching methods or assessment



## 9. Focus on structural aspects of ITE

- *Included* (9) Papers focusing on the organisational structure or management processes for ITE
- *Excluded* (9) Papers that focused on content, curriculum, teaching methods or assessment in ITE rather than on the organisational structure or management processes

## 10. In considering papers which focused on partnership in ITE, the Review Group:

- *Included* (10) Papers focusing mainly on the organisation and management of partnerships between schools and providers for initial teacher education
- *Excluded* (10) Papers that focused mainly on the effectiveness of partnership between schools and providers rather than on the organisation and management of the partnership

## 11. In considering papers which focused on quality in ITE, the Review Group:

- *Included* (11) Papers focussing mainly on the quality of initial teacher education provision

- *Excluded* (11) Papers that focused mainly on methods of quality assurance, inspection or evaluation of ITE provision rather than on the provision itself

## 12. Duplicates

- *Excluded* (12) Papers that were duplicates. *Rationale:* Allowance had to be made for human error during the searching, screening and data-entry stages of the review process. Identifying duplicates early on was one way in which the budget could be more effectively utilised. These papers were excluded.

## 13. Digests

- *Excluded* (13) Papers that were digests from the ERIC database. *Rationale:* These texts were reviews and were therefore secondary research. The work which they drew on was already included in the ERIC database and therefore was assumed to be included elsewhere in the review. These papers were excluded.

## APPENDIX 2.3 Additional keywords: review specific

### 1. What is the source of document?

- Government department of education website (e.g. DfES)
  - National
  - Regional
- Other government sponsored website (e.g. TDA, Ofsted)
  - National
  - Regional
- ITE provider
- Other (e.g. UCET) (Please specify.)

### 2. What is the authorship of the document?

- Government officials, unnamed (e.g. White Paper)
  - National
  - Regional
- Government related officials, unnamed (e.g. Ofsted report)
  - National
  - Regional
- Government-commissioned author or committee, named
  - National
  - Regional
- Employee of provider
- Consultant commissioned by provider
- Person employed or commissioned by non-governmental body (e.g. John Furlong, writing for UCET)
- Un-commissioned named researcher(s)
- Other (Please specify.)

### 3. What is the purpose of the document?

- Report commissioned to inform government policy
- Statement of government policy or official guidelines
- Report on provider or course for quality assurance purposes
  - By provider
  - By consultant (commissioned by the provider)
  - By inspector (commissioned independently of provider)
- Un-commissioned report, including journal articles
- Other (Please specify.)

### 4. Who funded the writing and production of the document?

- Government
  - National
  - Regional
- Non-governmental umbrella body (e.g. NCATE)
- Individual provider
- Charitable foundation or international aid programme
- Other (Please specify.)

### 5. What kind of evidence is drawn on?

- Primary empirical research evidence
- Literature, possibly including research reports, and/or secondary data.
- Inspection evidence
- Argument, opinion or anecdote unsupported by any of the above
- Description without resort to argument or evidence

### 6. What moderation processes were applied to the production of the document?

- Peer review
- Produced by named committee
- Public consultation
- Right of reply
- Other (Please specify.)

### 7. What is the nature of the political influence on the production of the report? (Take into account your answers to questions 1-4.)

### 8. Give a brief description of the methodology used to produce the report as far as this information is available. (Take into account your answers to questions 5 and 6.)

### 9. What understanding of quality is implicit in the paper? (Choose more than one if necessary and give details.)

- Internal and largely self-referential view of quality, and relates to the extent to which ITE is found to conform to internal, provider-defined measures of quality in terms of self-evaluation processes. We include in this interpretation of quality the notion of consistency or conceptual coherence.
- User-defined view of quality and relates to the extent to which there is evidence from stakeholders that ITE provision meets stakeholder expectations. Stakeholders in this sense are student teachers who have experienced the ITE whose quality is being interrogated, schools and teachers who employ new students, and managers in ITE institutions.
- Externally defined: a compliance model of quality and relates to the extent to which ITE meets external, normally funder-defined expectations of delivery. We also include in this category measures of quality which are based on judgements of graduates' teaching quality against criteria derived from statutory or research-based instruments.

### 10. What aspect of ITE structures' does the paper focus on? (Choose more than one if necessary and give details.) In its recommendations/ findings/conclusions about quality, does it focus on:

- Organisational structures.* By 'organisational structure', we refer to the form which ITE takes, its location in higher education or schools, its length, the balance and relationship between different elements, the relationship between subject based and professional education.
- Management processes.* By 'management processes', we refer to the structures which operationalise the conceptual framework in the organisational structure, including roles and responsibilities, methods and forms of selection and assessment.
- Conceptual framework.* By 'conceptual framework', we refer to the underlying model of teaching and teacher education which is deployed in ITE. This will be exemplified in programme aims and definitions.

### 11. Phase of Initial Teacher Education

- Primary
- Secondary
- Cross-phase
- Other
- Not known

### 12. Curriculum covered in Initial Teacher Training

- Art
- Business studies
- Citizenship
- Cross-curricular
- Design and Technology
- Environment
- General
- Geography
- Hidden
- History
- ICT
- Literacy - first language
- Literacy - further languages (EAL/ESOL)
- Modern Foreign Languages
- Literature
- Maths
- Music
- PSE
- Physical Education
- Religious Education
- Science
- Vocational
- Other curriculum (Please specify.)
- The material does not focus on curriculum issues.

## Appendix 2.4: Reasons for excluding documents on the grounds of trustworthiness

Adams C (2004) Teaching the teachers: what should teachers know?	Excluded. This document seemed to represent the views of an individual and there was no information about method, collaboration or moderation.
Australian Council of Deans (2002a) Inquiry into the suitability of pre-service teacher training courses	Excluded. This document was prepared for the Australian Council of Deans in response to a consultation and is approved by the Council president, but there is no information about the process of producing the response, or of collaboration, moderation or authorship.
Australian Council of Deans (2002b) Response to the Commonwealth Review of Teaching and Teacher Education	Excluded. This document was prepared for the Australian Council of Deans in response to a consultation and is approved by the Council president, but there is no information about the process of producing the response, or of collaboration, moderation or authorship.
Australian Council of Deans (2003) Young people, schools and Innovation: towards an action plan for the school sector	Excluded. This document was prepared for the Australian Council of Deans in response to a consultation and is approved by the Council president, but there is no information about the process of producing the response, or of collaboration, moderation or authorship.
Shitu Lawal, Hauwa (2003) Teacher education and the professional growth of the 21st century Nigerian teacher	Excluded. Individual publication with no explicit collaboration or consultation and no transparent method
Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (1994) Developing partnerships in initial teacher education	Excluded. These papers are not published by a government department, nor authored by a named group of experts. There is no information about how they were produced, either in terms of collaboration, moderation or method.
Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (1997) The role of universities in the education and training of teachers	Excluded. These papers are not published by a government department, nor authored by a named group of experts. There is no information about how they were produced, either in terms of collaboration, moderation or method.
Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (2001) Improving schools: the contribution of education and training	Excluded. These papers are not published by a government department, nor authored by a named group of experts. There is no information about how they were produced, either in terms of collaboration, moderation or method.
University of Maryland (2005) NCATE Institutional Report	Excluded. Report written as part of the NCATE accreditation process; deemed likely to be influenced by vested interest
Victoria Institute of Teaching (2005) Summary of Future Teachers Project Stage One	Excluded. No detail of authorship or method
Wilkin M (1999) The role of higher education in initial teacher education	Excluded. Individual author's view (although checked for accuracy by commissioning body, UCET) with no explicit collaboration or consultation and no transparent method

## Appendix 2.5: Review-specific guidelines for extracting data

### Section A: Administrative details

A.1 Name of the reviewer	A.1.1 Details
A.2 Date of the review	A.2.1 Details
A.3 Please enter the details of the document which is used to complete this data extraction	A.3.1 Unique Identifier
	A.3.2 Authors
	A.3.3 Title
	A.3.4 Source (website owner)
	A.3.5 Status (published or unpublished)
	A.3.6 Language
A.4 If the study has a broad focus and this data-extraction focuses on just one component of the study, please specify this here.	A.4.1 Not applicable (whole study is focus of data extraction)
	A.4.2 Specific focus of this data extraction ( <i>Please specify.</i> )

### Section B: Aim(s) and rationale

B.1 What are the broad aims of the document?  <i>Please write in authors' description if there is one. Elaborate if necessary, but indicate which aspects are the reviewers' interpretation.</i>	B.1.1 Explicitly stated ( <i>Please specify.</i> )
	B.1.2 Implicit ( <i>Please specify.</i> )
	B.1.3 Not stated / Unclear ( <i>Please specify.</i> )
B.2 Why was it published at that point in time, in those contexts and with those people or institutions? <i>Please write in authors' rationale if there is one. Elaborate if necessary, but indicate which aspects are the reviewers' interpretation.</i>	B.2.1 Explicitly stated ( <i>Please specify.</i> )
	B.2.2 Implicit ( <i>Please specify.</i> )
	B.2.3 Not stated/unclear ( <i>Please specify.</i> )
B.3 Was the study informed by, or linked to, an existing body of empirical and/or theoretical research, or to a project or policy initiative?  <i>Please write in authors' description if there is one. Elaborate if necessary, but indicate which aspects are reviewers' interpretation.</i>	B.3.1 Explicitly stated ( <i>Please specify.</i> )
	B.3.2 Implicit ( <i>Please specify.</i> )
	B.3.3 Not stated/unclear ( <i>Please specify.</i> )

B.4 Which of the following groups were consulted in working out the aims of the study, or issues to be addressed in the study?	B.4.1 Researchers <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.4.2 Funder <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.4.3 Head teacher / Senior management <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.4.4 Teaching staff <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.4.5 Non-teaching staff <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.4.6 Parents <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.4.7 Pupils/Students <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.4.8 Governors <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.4.9 LEA / Government officials <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.4.10 Other education practitioner <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.4.11 Other <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.4.12 None / Not stated B.4.13 Coding is based on: Authors' description B.4.14 Coding is based on: Reviewers' inference
B.5 Do authors report how the production of the document was funded?	B.5.1 Explicitly stated <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.5.2 Implicit <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.5.3 Not stated / Unclear <i>(Please specify.)</i>
B.6 Over what period was the document produced? <i>If the authors give a year, or range of years, then put that in. If not, give a 'not later than' date by looking for a date of web publication.</i>	B.6.1 Explicitly stated <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.6.2 Implicit <i>(Please specify.)</i> B.6.3 Not stated / Unclear <i>(Please specify.)</i>

### Section C: Conclusions, requirements and aspirations

C.1 What form do the main outcomes of the document take?	C.1.1 Conclusions / Recommendations C.1.2 Requirements C.1.3 Aspirations / Plans
<p><i>Where the outcomes of the document relate quality of ITE programmes to their organisational structures, management processes and conceptual framework, do these outcomes take the form of</i></p> <p><i>(i) conclusions or recommendations for practice?</i></p> <p><i>(ii) requirements imposed on programmes by accreditation processes?</i></p> <p><i>(iii) aspirations or plans for improvements to programmes?</i></p>	
C.2 What are the outcomes of the study as regards organisational structures in relation to quality?	C.2.1 Nature of programme <i>(Please specify.)</i> C.2.2 Structure of course <i>(Please specify.)</i> C.2.3 Institutional roles <i>(Please specify.)</i> C.2.4 Other <i>(Please specify.)</i>
<p><i>Examples of organisational structures include</i></p> <p><i>(i) nature of programme (e.g. UG or PG, entry requirements, overall length)</i></p> <p><i>(ii) structure of course (e.g. length, nature and timing of school experience; main course elements)</i></p> <p><i>(iii) institutional roles (e.g. nature of involvement of schools in the organisation of the programme)</i></p>	

34 International perspectives on quality in initial teacher education: an exploratory review of selected international documentation on statutory requirements and quality assurance

<p>C.3 What are the outcomes of the study as regards management processes in relation to quality?</p> <p>Examples of management processes include</p> <p>(i) selection processes</p> <p>(ii) roles of tutors and mentors</p> <p>(iii) QA processes</p>	C.3.1 Selection processes (Please specify.)
	C.3.2 Roles of tutors and mentors (Please specify.)
	C.3.3 QA processes (Please specify.)
	C.3.4 Other (Please specify.)

<p>C.4 What are the outcomes of the study as regards conceptual framework in relation to quality?</p> <p>Conceptual frameworks may include theory about the qualities of a good teacher, the nature of learning to teach ,or about appropriate teaching and learning activities. Outcomes relevant to this data extraction will link the existence or quality of such a conceptual framework with the quality of the ITE programme.</p>	C.4.1 Details
---	---------------

**Section D: Quality and scope of the study**

<p>D.1 What is the authorship and provenance of the document?</p> <p>Which individuals or organisations were responsible for commissioning, writing and publishing the document?</p>	D.1.1 Details
--	---------------

<p>D.2 What evidence is there of collaboration or moderation in the production of the document?</p> <p>Was the document peer reviewed, produced by a committee, subject to public or professional consultation, subject to right of reply?</p>	D.2.1 Details
--	---------------

<p>D.3 How transparent and robust is the method of production of the document?</p> <p>How much can we tell from the document about the methods used?</p>	D.3.1 Details
--	---------------

<p>D.4 Are there any groups with a vested interest who may have influenced the outcomes in the document?</p> <p>Take into account the funding/commissioning of the document, the editorial rights and the nature of the interest of influential parties.</p>	D.4.1 Details
--	---------------

<p>D.5 What details are given about the type of evidence on which the document draws?</p>	D.5.1 Details
---	---------------

<p>D.6 What is the domain of applicability or relevance of the outcomes reported in the document?</p>	D.6.1 Details
---	---------------

**Section E: Reviewing record**

*This section provides a record of the review of the study*

<p>E.1 Questions not completed</p> <p><i>Please note here any questions which have not been answered.</i></p>	E.1.1 Details
---	---------------

The results of this systematic review are available in four formats:

**SUMMARY**

Explains the purpose of the review and the main messages from the research evidence

**REPORT**

Describes the background and the findings of the review(s) but without full technical details of the methods used

**TECHNICAL REPORT**

Includes the background, main findings, and full technical details of the review

**DATABASES**

Access to codings describing each research study included in the review

These can be downloaded or accessed at <http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/reel/>

First produced in 2008 by:

Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre)  
Social Science Research Unit  
Institute of Education, University of London  
18 Woburn Square  
London WC1H 0NR

Tel: +44 (0)20 7612 6367

<http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/>

<http://www.ioe.ac.uk/ssru/>

The **Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre** (EPPI-Centre) is part of the Social Science Research Unit (SSRU), Institute of Education, University of London.

The EPPI-Centre was established in 1993 to address the need for a systematic approach to the organisation and review of evidence-based work on social interventions. The work and publications of the Centre engage health and education policy makers, practitioners and service users in discussions about how researchers can make their work more relevant and how to use research findings.

Founded in 1990, the Social Science Research Unit (SSRU) is based at the Institute of Education, University of London. Our mission is to engage in and otherwise promote rigorous, ethical and participative social research as well as to support evidence-informed public policy and practice across a range of domains including education, health and welfare, guided by a concern for human rights, social justice and the development of human potential.

The views expressed in this work are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the EPPI-Centre or the funder. All errors and omissions remain those of the authors.

This document is available in a range of accessible formats including large print. Please contact the Institute of Education for assistance:

telephone: +44 (0)20 7947 9556 email: [info@ioe.ac.uk](mailto:info@ioe.ac.uk)