PARTNERSHIP IN INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION IN SCOTLAND 1990–2005: UNRESOLVED TENSIONS

IAN SMITH, ESTELLE BRISARD AND IAN MENTER

ABSTRACT

The Second Stage Review of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) in Scotland leaves unresolved fundamental issues about 'partnership' within ITE. These have been sources of tension facing Scottish Higher Education (HE) providers attempting to develop models of partnership with schools and education authorities. This paper seeks to demonstrate a significant body of opinion among Scottish HE providers from the early 1990s wishing to progress innovation on partnership. It is suggested that the main barriers to innovation were the resistance of Scottish schoolteachers to accepting formalised, enhanced roles and responsibilities within partnership, and the failure of Scottish Ministers and administrations to place sustained discussion of underlying issues of partnership sufficiently high on the political agenda. The paper concludes that it will be essential to return to more fundamental discussion of the respective roles and responsibilities of HE staff and school staff within ITE partnership, and that the perspectives of research must be applied in such discussion.

INTRODUCTION: THE CURRENT CONTEXT FOR PARTNERSHIP IN SCOTLAND

The Second Stage Review of Initial Teacher Education

At the time of writing, the much awaited Scottish Executive's Second Stage Review of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) in Scotland has just been published (Scottish Executive, 2005a; b). This Second Stage Review was preceded by a First Stage Review of ITE conducted on behalf of the Scottish Executive by Deloitte and Touche (Deloitte and Touche, 2001). The First Stage Review had considered partnership developments. It had recommended the establishment of more formal partnership agreements on ITE, both nationally and locally, between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), schools and local authorities. These were to be called Teacher Development Partnerships (TDPs), and a specific Action Plan was produced by the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) for their implementation from November 2001 (Scottish Executive, 2001b). However, no specific progress was actually made in implementing the TDPs between the publication of the Action Plan and the Second Stage Review of ITE. Therefore, although the terms of reference for the Second Stage Review focused on aspects of ITE other than partnership (Scottish Executive, 2003), progress on partnership itself was likely to depend on the general approach to ITE taken by the Second Stage Review.

Certainly, the newly published report of the Second Stage Review, together with the accompanying Ministerial response, (Scottish Executive, 2005a; b) refer to partnership issues, especially under the heading 'Relationships'. The report emphasises that it is desirable to establish 'a clear understanding among stakeholders of their roles and relationships' in relation to ITE. In particular, there is a positive stress on the need for 'new effective and pro-active partnership' between local authorities and universities 'with local authorities being more actively engaged in ITE'. There is a specific call for local authorities to apply this more active engagement to the arrangements for student placements, and to the support and assessment of students during placements.

The same emphasis on the need to develop clearly the respective roles and responsibilities of stakeholders can be found in the report's sections on 'Accountability' and 'Competences and Values'. On 'Accountability', the report calls

for local authorities to develop more formal feedback mechanisms on the quality of student placements within ITE. On 'Competences and Values', it is suggested that education authorities and universities could be involved in more specific discussion of feedback from the authorities to the universities, with this influencing the curriculum and learning experiences for student teachers within ITE.

Broadly, the Ministerial response picks up on these themes. For example, the Ministerial statement, in discussing 'Competences and Values', emphasises the need for local authorities to develop standardised procedures for providing feedback to the universities on the effectiveness of ITE courses in preparing teachers to work in their schools. Stakeholders are also urged to consider further developing the mentoring capacity in individual schools or clusters of schools to support ITE students as well as induction teachers. The Ministerial statement generally calls for greater engagement between universities and local authorities over accountability for ITE. On 'Relationships' specifically, the Ministerial statement tends to concentrate upon the operational organisation of student placements, with its emphasis on local authorities taking a more strategic co-ordinating role in identifying student placement opportunities and maximising the capacity for student placements.

However, while at the time of writing it is too early to evaluate fully the overall impact of the Second Stage Review on such issues, the particular emphasis on the largely operational dimensions of placement in the Ministerial response on 'Relationships' can perhaps be used to make a general comment on the Second Stage Review at this point. In relation to partnership over ITE, while there is a clear stress on strengthening the formal role of local authorities within partnership as a future development, there is much less discussion of the underlying roles and responsibilities of the wider schoolteaching profession within ITE, especially on the respective roles and responsibilities of school staff and HEI staff in partnership. In this sense, the Second Stage Review can be suggested to leave unresolved fundamental issues which have been a source of tension in attempts to develop models of partnership within ITE in Scotland for at least the last 15 years.

PARTNERSHIP AND SCOTTISH INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION:
THE BACKGROUND (1990–2003)[1]

Views from Scottish Higher Education (HE) Providers in the Early 1990s

Entering the 1990s, there is clear evidence of concern among HE providers of Scottish ITE that the models of partnership practices then prevalent within Scotland required significant progressive development. For example, in the major Scottish research report on partnership produced in the early 1990s, Elder and Kwiatkowski (1993) stressed their aspiration to move beyond a 'simple apprenticeship model' of ITE to seeing 'craft knowledge' as part of a 'theory-led reflection process often formalised into an evaluation and planning cycle' (p.9). In contrast to this aspiration, they found teachers, although generally with a strong commitment to ITE, broadly unaware of the programme model to which the HEI providers aspired. During school placements, teachers followed a strong 'apprenticeship model'. With limitations in the assessment responsibilities being assumed by school staff, HEI tutors were very much driven into an 'assessment oriented role'. The report regarded this as narrowing, given that progression of a student's professional development should be central to ITE programmes. As a preferred alternative, it was suggested that HEI staff should find more time for negotiating the nature of placement student experience with school staff, probably by reducing the 'external assessor' assessment role.

Similar arguments to Elder and Kwiatkowski on the need to move models of partnership in ITE forward in Scotland can be found in Cameron-Jones and O'Hara (1993: 37) who described the relationship between HEI providers and schools prior to the 1990s as 'duplication'. In such an approach, the types of roles and responsibilities assumed by HEI tutors were seen as overlapping with those which could be assumed

by teachers in partner schools. For example, this led to HEI tutors visiting schools simply to assess student teachers' classroom practice, when staff in schools were being asked to observe this on an ongoing basis as part of general school experience placement. In contrast to duplication, Cameron-Jones and O'Hara located their preferred partnership approach as developing the idea of 'complementarity'.

Elsewhere, Cameron-Jones and O'Hara (1994a) highlighted the increased emphasis on student experience in schools as having important implications for the development of ITE programmes. They linked this to researchers' interest in the nature of teachers' knowledge and what it contributes to the development of student teachers. Drawing upon writers like Hagger, *et al*. (1993), they supported the assumption that 'the school influenced part of the student curriculum is worthwhile, is legitimate and merits a formal status alongside the "equally important contribution necessary from higher education institutions"' (p.140).

In terms of partnership, Cameron-Jones and O'Hara (1994a) argued that the crucial question is what students can best learn from schools and from HEIs respectively. They suggested that this question is most appropriately answered by stressing complementarity, based on differences 'in width of range' of what schools and HEIs can offer. Again, drawing on Hagger, *et al*. (1993), they suggested 'what students can learn from teachers in schools is contextualised, whereas what they can learn from staff in HEIs is able more widely to be generalised' (p.140). Elsewhere, we find Cameron-Jones (1995:25) urging that there should be 'complementarity' between schools and HEIs, a partnership in which each contributes 'its own distinctive knowledge and authority'.

Of course, in stressing the desirability of moving towards complementary models of partnership, the thinking of Scottish HEI providers such as Cameron-Jones in the early 1990s clearly reflected important developments in approaches to partnership within England. In a sense, the approach to partnership described by Cameron-Jones as 'duplication' corresponded to the approach to partnership entering the early-1990s in England which writers such as Furlong, *et al*. (2000) have described as 'HEI-based' approaches to professional relationships, also somewhat confusingly described by these writers as 'integration'. This referred to the idea that HEI staff attempted to 'integrate the students' training experience in college or university with the world of the school' (p.76). This is seen as almost not a form of partnership at all. In this approach, school staff had little real responsibility for developing course provision. HEI tutors based their campus teaching upon their students' practical needs for the placement school classroom, modelling school classroom teaching within their campus teaching approaches. HEI tutors took the overall responsibility for course planning and assessment of student practical teaching competence (with minimal formal responsibilities for schoolteaching staff) (p.76–77).

This is contrasted with the 'complementary' model of partnership which writers such as Furlong, *et al* (2000) saw as the next stage of development within England in the 1990s. The 'complementary' model was based on a clear separation of distinctive roles and responsibilities for HEI staff and school staff. For example, to remove duplication, HEI staff no longer made visits to assess all students' classroom practice; rather, only 'trouble shooting' visits were made, or none at all.

The Failure of the Mentor Teacher Initiative and other Constraints on Partnership: Mid-1990s

Certainly, there was a significant attempt in Scotland in the early 1990s to move towards partnership developments which reflected the English emphasis on the need for complementary arrangements clarifying distinctive roles for HEI staff and school staff, and in particular requiring more formalised enhanced roles for partner school staff within ITE. This was the Moray House Pilot of Mentoring within the PGCE Secondary (Kirk, 2000: 40–43). This initiative was proposed and led by the Scottish

Office Education Department (SOED) as a clear attempt to develop complementary partnership approaches, by identifying a formal role for school staff in supporting and assessing student teachers. These staff would receive specific training for their roles, and the schools involved would be allocated a specific financial resource to support the time spent by staff with particular responsibilities for mentoring student teachers. The Mentor Teacher Initiative was piloted at Moray House Institute of Education in 1992–1993 and 1993–1994 with the Institute's PGCE Secondary course. A SOED National Steering Group for Mentor Training, including representatives from all the other Scottish HE providers of PGCE Secondary courses, also worked during 1994 and 1995 to produce extensive training materials which were intended for use in the national rolling-out of the Mentor Teacher Initiative beyond its initial pilot.

There were positive academic evaluations of the Mentor Teacher Initiative (Cameron-Jones and O'Hara, 1993; 1994b; Powney, *et al.*, 1993). Especially in their second evaluation report, Cameron-Jones and O'Hara (1994b) found that pilot students had 'statistically significant' differences in their 'school-minded' attitudes and in their overall attainment. Interestingly, Cameron-Jones and O'Hara were quite guarded in their general conclusions. For example, they noted 'that the pilot/non-pilot differences are not sufficiently large to make a cast-iron case in favour of the pilot. They are, however, clearly apparent and they are consistently in line with the objectives for the pilot' (summary p.*iii*).

Powney, *et al.*, found that the various stakeholders participating in the Mentor Teacher Pilot favoured the changed pattern of school placements which was involved. Their findings suggested that future developments stemming from the Pilot were likely to involve an increased desire from school staff to influence partnership. They also envisaged an enhanced role for education authorities in ITE. On the other hand, these authors also argued that there would be a continued emphasis on the distinctive contribution of HE in teacher education. Indeed, it was noted that local authority staff themselves specifically recognised this. The report also emphasised that there would be resource issues in taking forward the Mentor Teacher approach, with most informants estimating that the proposed new model of ITE would cost more, especially because diverting resources from HEI to school was not seen as appropriate.

Although using some qualifying language, in general terms writings about the Moray House Pilot of the Mentor Teacher Initiative depicted a positive effort to move forward on the development of complementary partnership, while at the same time recognising the potential challenges in achieving significant change. However, in the broader political context, the Mentor Teacher Initiative became embroiled in a political impasse. Essentially, the new scheme was abandoned by Scottish Ministers in October 1995 in the face of resistance from Scottish schoolteachers. The dominant professional association, the Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS), argued against the additional workload implications of extending formal mentoring of student teachers by school staff, although there was also evidence of educational and professional arguments to resist the transfer of responsibilities for ITE from HEIs to staff in schools (Kirk, 2000: 43). Brown (1996: 41) quotes at length George McBride, then the Education Convenor of the EIS, indicating no real enthusiasm for any initiative such as the Mentor Initiative without a 'national open debate' on the aims of teacher education. Brown also suggested there was General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) concern that the Initiative carried two threats to the 'essentially egalitarian' Scottish teaching tradition: the threat that ITE would be narrowed to elite 'training schools'; the threat that mentors would become 'privileged teachers'.

There was also other academic writing at this time stressing the Scottish constraints upon the development of complementary models of partnership. For example, Brown (op.cit) referred to earlier work by Stark (1993) on Primary ITE at the University of Strathclyde, which indicated that Scottish schoolteachers strongly supported the retention of the major responsibility for Scottish ITE with the HEIs

(p.40). This position was not based simply on workload considerations, but on underlying arguments of educational and professional rationale. White (1994) argued that, in the early 1990s, other pressures on school staff had actually 'reversed' some partnership developments which HEIs had been progressing with school staff over ITE (the particular pressures which White referred to were the implementation of the 5–14 National Guidelines and the development of Standard Grade courses). White argued that the results of the Moray House Pilot had been 'disappointing' and that additional resources were required for the further development of partnership. Reporting on a small scale project undertaken with the PGCE Primary at the University of Strathclyde, he suggested that within partnership school staff showed no 'strong desire to assume a greater role' in the learning process for ITE students (p.150).

More generally, Brown (op. cit) had also argued for further discussion within the Scottish ITE system of the meaning of 'mentoring', the concept of 'training' mentors and the nature of 'partnership'. She suggested that such further discussion was required partly because the approaches involved in the Mentor Teacher Initiative still seemed to be based on higher education 'taking the lead role'. Of course, even if the Mentor Teacher Initiative had been successful, Brown's point perhaps emphasises that such complementary developments would still have been open to the type of critique which Furlong, *et al.* (2000) subsequently produced on complementary models of partnerships in England.

These authors characterised complementary approaches as in a sense 'separatist'. While there were distinctive contributions from HEI and school aspects of programmes, the student was left to integrate this essentially separate higher education work and school-based work (pp.78,79). Furlong and colleagues then introduced the notion of HEI-led partnership as perhaps an empirically more accurate way of describing the further development of complementary models of partnership in England moving towards the late-1990s. In HEI-led partnership, the HEI now made sustained efforts to provide overall leadership for both the HEI-delivered and the school-delivered elements of programmes, taking clear responsibility for overall planning and defining of approaches to school placement learning and assessment (Furlong, *et al.*, 2000:117). Of course, this HEI-led approach still differed from the 'integration' model of HEI-based approaches to partnership, as described earlier by Furlong and colleagues, because under HEI-led approaches school staff now agreed formally to accept specified roles and obligations within partnership (Furlong *et al*: 116–118). In the Scottish context, this would have been the crucial point. Even if complementary models had been established in Scotland, and subsequently developed into HEI-led models, the formal acceptance of enhanced roles and responsibilities by school staff within such models would have moved Scottish partnership approaches from a 'duplication' model.

Certainly, in terms of desirable models of partnership, HEI-led models are seen by writers like Furlong, *et al.* (2000) as remaining far short of the collaborative models which they present as an 'ideal-type' partnership, drawing upon seminal earlier work within England such as the Oxford Internship Scheme for the PGCE (Secondary) (Benton, 1990). Such collaborative models of partnership were based upon 'shared understandings' about how the contributions of universities and schools to ITE should be inter-related and 'brought to bear on every element of the agreed curriculum'. These contributions were identified as 'research and theory-based knowledge and perspective' from the universities and 'situated knowledge of teaching and schooling and practical perspectives from schools' (McIntyre, 1997:5). Crucially, these different forms of professional knowledge contributed by staff in higher education and staff in schools were seen as equally legitimate. As highlighted in the next section, there is clear evidence of HEI staff within Scottish ITE providers engaging fully with the aspirations involved in such collaborative models of partnership.

Continuing Commitment to Partnership Development from Scottish HE Providers:
The mid-1990s

While the Mentor Teacher Initiative was formally abandoned in October 1995, and while writers like Brown (1996) and White (1994) were emphasising the contextual constraints upon the development of such complementary models of partnership, other figures within Scottish HEI provision continued to emphasise their aspirations towards complementary, and indeed collaborative, models of partnership in ITE. Interesting examples are two keynote addresses delivered in 1996, both by senior figures from the Moray House Institute of Education.

Frank Adams, then the Institute's Director of Teacher Education, delivered a keynote address to the Australian Teacher Education Association Conference in July 1996 (Adams, 1996). Adams recognised the practical constraints upon the development of complementary roles and responsibilities within partnership demonstrated in the failure of the Mentor Teacher Scheme. His interpretation of the rejection of the Scheme was based on 'the combination of an increasingly common resentment to the previous "anglicisation" of Scottish education' and 'concerns by teachers about increasing workloads' (p.11). However, Adams then moved positively to advocate a more collaborative approach to partnership between HEIs and schools. Significantly, he broadened the concept of such partnerships to argue that they must move beyond ITE to encompass subsequent stages in teacher professional development. With this broader approach, these partnerships were to aspire to be 'communities of professional development' (p.14).

A wider example of the continuing commitment within Scottish HEI providers to developing complementary and collaborative forms of partnership is the keynote address at the Annual Conference of the Association for Teacher Education in Europe (ATEE) delivered in 1996 by Gordon Kirk, then the Principal of the Moray House Institute of Education (Kirk, 1996). Drawing on earlier writings by Scottish and English academics, Kirk positioned himself clearly with complementarity leading to collaborative forms of partnership. In a wide-ranging address, Kirk advocated twelve features for future partnership. These features included the idea that there should be parity, that is to say a sense of shared power, between partners, rather than an acceptance of established status differences. The partnerships should cover multiple activities rather than simply ITE. Theory and practice were to be 'integrated' rather than 'divorced' within partnership, and there was to be complementarity rather than duplication of function. He also stressed that there should be joint mechanisms for managing such collaborative partnership.

Examples such as these confirm that, after the abandonment of the Mentor Teacher Initiative, there continued to be a body of academic writing within Scottish HEI providers, indicating an openness to developing models of partnership based on fuller complementarity of roles between HEIs and schools, with a clear emerging aspiration to collaborative models of partnership.

It is perhaps appropriate to place the attraction throughout the 1990s of complementary and collaborative models of partnership for Scottish HE providers of ITE in the context of the merger process with the universities which the providers were experiencing at this time. Beginning with the merger of Jordanhill College of Education and the University of Strathclyde in 1992, the former monotechnic Scottish colleges of education were all to complete mergers with universities in under a decade (Kirk, 2000:5). As the former colleges became fully embedded as Faculties/Schools of Education within universities, pressure rose on staff to give an increased emphasis to research activity. In this context, complementary models of partnership offered the potential for school staff to take greater responsibility for the assessment of student performance on placement, removing the need for HEI 'assessor' tutor visits, or at least reducing these to 'troubleshooting' or 'sample' visits. With a reduction in commitments to placement assessment visiting, more staff time could be available for research.

If genuinely collaborative models of partnership were to develop, this emphasis on research could still involve significant time spent in schools, for example as HEI staff engaged in joint action research with teaching staff in schools. More generally, HEI staff involved in delivering ITE programmes within a university environment were likely to be increasingly attracted to a broader research-informed approach to their campus ITE teaching, as opposed to campus teaching which more narrowly emphasised practical preparation for placement. Again, this would be consistent with a move from 'duplication' to 'complementary' models of partnership.

On the other hand, the academic writing of Scottish HEI providers also showed an awareness that contextual issues would have to be addressed if enhanced models of partnership were to be achieved, such as issues associated with the attitudes of staff in schools and the resource context for partnership. In other words, just as the withdrawal of the Mentor Teacher Initiative had been a public policy response to broader attitudes of the teaching profession, so too any further developments of partnership models in Scotland became dependent upon how the public policy context itself progressed.

The GTCS Working Group on Partnership, 1995–1997

Much then rested upon the outcome of the Working Group on Partnership in Initial Teacher Education, which the General Teaching Council for Scotland was asked to establish in 1995. This Working Group had been set up at the request of Scottish Ministers as their strategy for resolving the 1995 political impasse over the Mentor Teacher Initiative. The Working Group first met in December 1995, and its Report was published in March 1997 (GTCS, 1997).

Certainly, there was an attempt in this Report to develop an underlying rationale for partnership, with the term complementarity being used to suggest the distinctive contributions which could be made by education authorities, schools and HE providers. For example, the education authorities were assigned an essentially strategic role, teachers in schools were identified as being capable of 'offering knowledge and feedback and supporting and assessing student teachers' and the contribution of HE providers was identified as 'providing a range of expertise including educational research and development in relation to teaching, learning and the curriculum'. The overall concept of the learning community was used to describe the potential partnership between education authorities, schools and teacher education institutions (see Section 3 of the Report).

In its recommendations, the Report called for a national framework for partnership, which was to act as a point of reference for strategic partnership committees for each individual partnership involving an HE provider and local authorities. The involvement in ITE was seen as a general responsibility of the teaching profession, which all schools should ideally have the opportunity to participate in. The Report emphasised that this involvement of the teaching profession should not only be in supporting students on placement, but should also be in contributing to the design, validation, accreditation and approval of courses. On the other hand, the Report recommended that the current balance in ITE courses between time spent by student teachers on campus course elements and school placement course elements should remain unaltered (see Section 6 of the Report).

However, a key element of the GTCS Report related to resources to underpin partnership. Some of the Report's comments referred to resources for staff development of the school staff who would be supporting student teachers, as well as for HEI staff development. More particularly, the Report tried to give some indication of the specific amount of time for which schools should be resourced to cover the work their staff undertake with student teachers (see Section 7 of the Report).

More fundamentally, the Report did not develop fully the concepts of complementarity of roles between HE providers, local authorities and staff in schools,

in particular not providing full descriptions of the precise respective contributions which HEI and school staff should make to the professional development of student teachers, for example on aspects such as the assessment of student teachers on placement. Therefore, while the GTCS Partnership Report appeared to move the national agenda forward by indicating that the teaching profession had a general professional obligation to be involved in partnership over ITE, this position was severely constrained by the insistence that additional resources would be required for this purpose.

The 1997 Partnership Report perhaps illustrates the essential Scottish paradox on the role of its GTC and the limited development of ITE partnership in Scotland. Generally, where for most of the period under discussion there has been no GTC in England, there has been significant innovation there in ITE partnership, especially in developing complementary models of partnership. In contrast, despite having a strong, early-established GTC throughout this period, Scotland has seen much less innovation in ITE partnership. Indeed, it could be argued that the GTCS has reflected the extreme reluctance of the Scottish schoolteaching profession to recognise unconditionally that a greater role in working with student teachers within ITE partnerships is part of its essential professional responsibilities. Yet, the GTCS has worked to retain its undiminished powers of accreditation over the HE providers of ITE programmes.

The Role of the Scottish Administration since 1997

The GTCS Report of 1997 did not immediately unblock the political impasse of the mid-1990s which had prevented further development of partnership in ITE. Following the publication of the Report, the new Scottish administration engaged in a number of internal exercises over partnership in ITE, some of which produced documents in the public domain (at least in the sense of documents mounted on the Scottish Executive website, or the associated HMIE website).

The first of these Scottish administration internal exercises was a review of the cost of partnership undertaken by Deloitte and Touche, jointly commissioned by the Scottish Office and GTCS. This exercise produced a report in 1999, which indicated that there were significant costs in sustaining the overall partnership over ITE, including significant costs both in schools and in HEIs (Deloitte and Touche, 1999).

There was no immediate public response by the Scottish Executive to the Deloitte and Touche report. At this point, public activity within Scottish education became dominated by the McCrone Committee of Inquiry (Committee of Inquiry into Professional Conditions of Service for Teachers), whose Report was published in May 2000, and the discussions leading to the subsequent agreement on teachers' pay and conditions published in January 2001 (Scottish Executive, 2000; 2001a).

The McCrone Report and the subsequent settlement covered a very broad range of fundamental issues for teachers' pay, conditions and the employment structure of the profession. The McCrone settlement introduced a number of important innovations within Scottish school education, such as a resourced, guaranteed one-year induction experience to ensure that all graduating ITE students completed the new Standard for Full Registration (SFR) (GTCS, 2002) within one session (see the paper by Draper and Sharp in this issue). Previously full probation was granted after a minimum of two years, often taking much longer when newly qualified teachers had to move through a series of short-term supply posts during their probationary period.

While the McCrone Report (Scottish Executive, 2000) did not systematically address ITE as one of its main areas of investigation, it did include some provocative generalisations about ITE within Scotland, suggesting that a review of aspects of ITE should be undertaken. In subsequent consultation meetings and responses to Scottish Executive officials, Scottish HEI providers expressed considerable disquiet about the

lack of an evidence-base for some of the statements about teacher education made within the McCrone Report, especially perhaps negative assumptions about the need for HEI teaching staff to return to school classrooms to update their professional experience. However, without necessarily highlighting any such particular comments, the Scottish Executive moved forward with the proposal for a review of ITE, identifying a number of particular areas for immediate focus. These areas included partnership arrangements. The Executive again commissioned Deloitte and Touche to conduct this First Stage Review of Initial Teacher Education. In a very short timescale Deloitte and Touche produced their Report of the First Stage Review of Initial Teacher Education in June 2001 (Deloitte and Touche, 2001). In discussing partnership, the Report emphasised the extent to which existing partnerships operated essentially on the basis of goodwill, and lacked formal arrangements. The Report also noted that no specific funding was allocated to the HEIs or local authorities for partnership *per se*.

The First Stage Review Report certainly advocated a more pro-active role from education authorities within ITE partnerships. As already noted in the Introduction to this paper, the Report moved on to recommend that a common framework should be established nationally for partnership agreements across Scotland, and that these should be more formal and consistent. On the issue of specific resources to support schools involved in placements, the Report did not reach any final positions, but recommended that there should be further research and consultation on this matter once partnership frameworks had been established (see Section 5 of the Report). The Report did not itself devote much space to defining any precise views of the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders within partnership, instead simply referring back to the definitions of roles and responsibilities produced by the 1995–97 GTCS Working Group on Partnership (GTCS, 1997). However, while the Report did not analyse extensively the roles and responsibilities of HEI and school staff respectively within partnership, it did indicate, in anticipation of the Second Stage Review of Initial Teacher Education, that such underlying matters should be addressed. For example, the Report talked about the possible general use of the new Chartered Teachers (Scottish Executive, 2002) to contribute the perspective of 'recent relevant experience' within ITE programmes (see Section 6 of the Report).

As also mentioned in the Introduction to this paper, shortly after the Deloitte and Touche report of the First Stage Review of Initial Teacher Education was made public, an Action Plan was released which contained specific actions, timescales and responsibilities for taking forward the recommendations put forward in the First Stage Review. However, there had been no conclusive outcomes to this process by the time the Scottish Executive announced the Second Stage Review of Initial Teacher Education in September 2003.

Finally, an intermediate document produced by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (HMIE) for the Scottish Executive was included within the public policy context in the period between the First Stage and Second Stage Reviews. This was an HMIE Scoping Review of Initial Teacher Education produced after an October 2002 request of Scottish Ministers, with the Scoping Review undertaken by HMIE between November 2002 and February 2003 (HMIE, 2003). The HMIE Report on this Scoping Review was mounted in full on the HMIE website, although it has to be commented that there was no specific public announcement drawing attention to this fact.

In this wide-ranging Report, attention was given to partnership issues, with a range of limitations on the development of partnership being noted. HMIE commented on the very limited involvement to date of local authorities in partnership over ITE, contrasting this with the very proactive role which local authorities had recently assumed within the new Induction Scheme. HMIE also commented on the major tensions in finding the appropriate quantity and quality of school placements

for ITE programmes. The Inspectorate also highlighted the absence of dedicated financial resources to support students in schools, and the absence, post-McCrone, of any particular reference in an unpromoted teacher's contractual duties to an obligation to support student teachers (in contrast, there had been such a reference in the previous Scottish Joint Negotiating Committee [SJNC] conditions of service). HMIE commented on the need to ensure consistency in the quality of school placements experienced by students across ITE programmes. More generally, the Inspectorate also commented on the need to develop the teaching profession's 'sense of ownership' within ITE and called for 'fundamental reappraisal to provide clear definitions of interrelated roles and responsibilities in ITE and a strategy to deliver them' (see Section 6 of the Scoping Review).

CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that there is clear evidence from the early-1990s that a significant body of opinion within the Scottish HE providers of ITE favoured progressive attempts to move towards more complementary, and ultimately collaborative, models of partnership practices in ITE. Such opinion showed full awareness of the thinking on partnership models being developed elsewhere, especially in England, and a willingness to engage with the issues which would be involved in implementing these models.

However, initial evidence from the early-1990s suggested much work would have to be done in achieving similar engagement from the Scottish teaching profession in any more fundamental debate about formalising and enhancing teachers' roles and responsibilities for working with student teachers within ITE partnership. This challenge for the HEIs was compounded by the negative resistance of Scottish schoolteachers to the Mentor Teacher Initiative, the one specific, resourced initiative by Scottish Ministers in this period to move forward from 'duplication' models of partnership. Entrenched positions adopted by Scottish schoolteachers to this initiative of an unpopular pre-devolution government remained as longer-term barriers to HEIs revisiting innovation in partnership models.

Since the publication of the GTCS Partnership Report in 1997, Scottish Ministers and their administrations have developed and implemented many initiatives for Scottish schools and the schoolteaching profession, which have been generally well-received by the broad range of relevant stakeholders. However, frustratingly for HE providers of ITE, it has not proved possible to raise sufficiently high up a crowded political agenda the sustained and focused concentration on underlying issues necessary, if the unresolved tensions over ITE partnership are to be addressed.

This absence of resolution remains, even with the publication of the Second Stage Review of Initial Teacher Education. Some of the Second Stage Review's more practical emphases, for instance on the role of local authorities in securing placements, will help progress the operational aspects of partnership. Certainly, this emphasis on the role of local authorities in securing placements reflects significant progress made during 2004–5 in HEIs developing regional partnership arrangements for finding placements with newly-identified local authority co-ordinators. Of course, in a sense, to achieve this type of progress it took the 'near panic' concern that significant numbers of the greatly-increased 2004 and 2005 ITE intakes might remain unplaced for school experience. Such a 'panic' illustrated the underlying fragility of the current models of partnership.

However, as they currently stand, the Second Stage Review Report and the accompanying Ministerial Response do not in themselves return the debate to the more fundamental discussion which is required on the respective roles and responsibilities of HE staff and school staff within ITE partnership. For example, the radical 'switch in the role of the visiting tutor' advanced by Kirk is not considered (Kirk, 2000: 49–50). As the current authors have demonstrated more extensively elsewhere (Brisard, Menter and

Smith, 2005), part of what is important to progressing this more fundamental discussion is that the Scottish teacher education community applies the perspectives of research to these issues of partnership in ITE. This will include comparative research which considers the processes of policy-making and policy implementation elsewhere, thus achieving 'mutual learning from the policy process others have followed…' (European Commission, 2003:3). It is hoped that the present article can be a contribution to applying research perspectives to these issues.

NOTES

1   This section of the paper is informed by Chapter 3 of a GTCS commissioned Report 'Models of Partnership in Programmes of Initial Teacher Education: Full Report of A Systematic Literature Review' (Brisard, Menter and Smith, 2005).

REFERENCES

Adams, F. (1996) 'Making the connection: theory, practice, competence and partnership – the Scottish experience'. Keynote Address: Australian Teacher Education Association Conference: 'Making the Connection', Launceston, Tasmania, July, 1996.

Benton, P. (ed) (1990) *The Oxford Internship Scheme: Integration and Partnership in Initial Teacher Education*, London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Brisard, E., Menter, I. and Smith, I. (2005) *Models of Partnership in Programmes of Initial Teacher Education*. Full Report of a Systematic Literature Review Commissioned by the General Teaching Council for Scotland, GTCS Research, Research Publication No. 2, Edinburgh: General Teaching Council for Scotland.

Brown, S. (1996) 'School-Based Initial Teacher Education in Scotland: Archaic Highlands or High Moral Grounds?' in McBride, R. (ed.) *Teacher Education Policy: some issues arising from research and practice*, London: The Falmer Press, 36–48

Cameron-Jones, M. and O'Hara, P. (1993) *The Scottish Pilot PGCE (Secondary) course 1992–1993,* Edinburgh: Moray House Institute/Heriot-Watt University.

Cameron-Jones, M. and O'Hara, P. (1994a) 'Pressures on the Curriculum of Teacher Education', *Scottish Educational Review,* 26, 2, 134–142

Cameron-Jones, M. and O'Hara, P. (1994b) *The Second Year (1993–1994) of the Scottish Pilot PGCE (Secondary) Course,* Edinburgh: Moray House Institute/Heriot-Watt University

Cameron-Jones, M. (1995) 'Permanence, Policy and Partnership in Teacher Education', in Kirk, G. (ed) *Moray House and Change in Higher Education*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, pp.21–35.

Deloitte and Touche (1999) *Costs of Partnership in Initial Teacher Education,* final report to the Scottish Office Education and Industry Department and the General Teaching Council Scotland, Edinburgh: Deloitte and Touche.

Deloitte and Touche (2001) *Report of the 'First Stage' Review of Initial Teacher Education,* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Elder, R. and Kwiatkowski, H. (1993) *Partnership in Initial Teacher Education,* Edinburgh: Scottish Education Department/General Teaching Council Scotland Research Report.

European Commission (2003) *Implementation of 'Education and Training 2010' Work Programme*. Progress report of Expert Group A 'Improving Education of Teachers and Trainers: Educating teachers for changing roles, an exchange of policy practice', Brussels: European Commission.

Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C. and Whitty, G. (2000) *Teacher Education in Transition – Reforming Professionalism?,* Buckingham: Open University.

General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) (1997) *The Report of the Working Group on Partnership in Initial Teacher Education,* Edinburgh: GTC Scotland.

General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) (2002) *The Standard for Full Registration*, Edinburgh: GTC Scotland.

Hagger, H., Burn, K. and McIntyre, D. (1993) *The School Mentor Handbook*. London: Kogan Page.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (HMIE) (Scotland) (2003) Scoping Review of Initial Teacher Education, 2002–2003. Edinburgh: SEED. Available online at www.hmie.gov.uk (accessed 6 July 2005).

Kirk, G. (1996) 'Partnership: the sharing of the cultures?' Keynote address at 21st Annual Conference of the Association for Teacher Education in Europe (ATEE), University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, August, 1996.

Kirk, G. (2000) *Enhancing Quality in Teacher Education*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.

McIntyre, D. (ed) (1997) *Teacher Education Research in a New Context: The Oxford Internship Scheme,* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Powney, J., Edwards, S., Holroyd, C. and Martin, S. (1993) *Monitoring the Pilot: Moray House Institute PGCE (Secondary),* Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Scottish Executive (2000) *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century,* Volume 1&2: Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Professional Conditions of Service for Teachers, (the McCrone Report), Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2001a) *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century,* Agreement reached following recommendations made in the McCrone Report (the McCrone Settlement), Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2001b) *First Stage Review of Initial Teacher Education: Action Plan,* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive, with General Teaching Council for Scotland, Educational Institute of Scotland and Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (2002) *The Standard for Chartered Teacher,* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2003) 'Next steps in teacher training reform', press release, 22/09/2003, available online at: www.scotland.gov.uk/News/Releases/2003/09/4153 (accessed 21 January 2005).

Scottish Executive (2005a) *Review of Initial Teacher Education Stage 2,* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2005b) *Review of Initial Teacher Education Stage 2, Ministerial Response,* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Stark, R. (1993) *School Experience in Initial Primary School Teacher Training,* Glasgow: University of Strathclyde.

White, G.R. (1994) 'Partnership, mentoring and competences in teacher education', *Scottish Educational Review,* 26, 2, 143–150.

The Second Stage Review of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) in Scotland leaves unresolved fundamental issues about â€˜partnershipâ€™ within ITE. These have been sources of tension facing Scottish Higher Education (HE) providers attempting to develop models of partnership with schools and education authorities. This paper seeks to demonstrate a significant body of opinion among Scottish HE providers from the early 1990s wishing to progress innovation on partnership. Initial teacher education vs. continuing training: there is a certain complementary between both phases of the education continuum. Initial teacher education could be shortened, and the resources economized could be used to strengthen continuing training, based in schools. For many countries, this. 9. EDU/WKP(2010)11. change is worth consideration, but would need careful assessment.Â Changes in initial teacher education - although necessary and important â€“ cannot, by itself, raise teacher quality in Mexico. Continuing training represents a tool that is fundamental in the case of low quality initial teacher education: research shows that continuing training has a positive impact on teachersâ€˜ knowledge and skills, and on student performance. The Scottish Education Department in London took over from the Church of Scotland. Burgh as well as parish schools now came under School Boards run by local committees, many new Board schools were built, and larger School Boards established "higher grade" (secondary) schools as a cheaper alternative to the burgh schools.Â Education in Wales. Education in the United Kingdom. List of further and higher education colleges in Scotland. v â€¢ d â€¢ e. Topics on Scotland. Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education_in_Scotland". Categories: Articles with unsourced statements since February 2007 | All articles with unsourced statements | Education in Scotland | Secondary education by country.