LSHTM Research Online

https://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk

Developing a Programme of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) in Citizenship

Ian Warwick, Kim Rivers and Peter Aggleton
with Abigail Knight, Stuart Watson and Maria Zuurmond

Thomas Coram Research Unit
Institute of Education, University of London

department for
education and skills
creating opportunity, releasing potential, achieving excellence

Developing a Programme of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) in Citizenship

*Ian Warwick, Kim Rivers and Peter Aggleton
with Abigail Knight, Stuart Watson and Maria Zuurmond*

*Thomas Coram Research Unit
Institute of Education, University of London*

Contents

Glossary

ACT – Association of Citizenship Teachers
AST – Advanced Skills Teacher
CATS – Credit Accumulation and Transfer Scheme
CPD – Continuing Professional Development
DfES – Department for Education and Skills
HEI – Higher Education Institution
INSET – In-Service Education and Training
ITT – Initial Teacher Training
LEA – Local Education Authority
NFER – National Foundation for Educational Research
Ofsted – Office for Standards in Education
PDR – Professional Development Record
PGCE – Postgraduate Certificate in Education
PSHE – Personal, Social and Health Education
QCA – Qualifications and Curriculum Authority
SMT – Senior Management Team
SRE – Sex and Relationship Education
TPLF – Teachers' Professional Learning Framework

Executive Summary

Background

In response to the ongoing need to promote the provision of Citizenship in schools and colleges, ministers have recently agreed a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) strategy. In November, 2003, The Thomas Coram Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London, was commissioned to conduct a study to determine the form and content of a CPD in Citizenship Programme. This summary provides an outline of the study.

Key findings

- Collaborative forms of CPD that allow participants to focus on issues of relevance to them and over a period of time assist teachers embed new learning into professional practice.
- The development and provision of a CPD programme in Citizenship should be kept local, yet utilise a national framework to ensure a degree of coherency, consistency and credibility.
- The breadth of Citizenship, together with variation among teachers with regard to their backgrounds and educational contexts, suggests that a CPD programme in Citizenship must offer more than a set of standardised topics.
- Portfolios or professional development records should be the main way in which teachers' learning should be assessed.
- Senior management in schools should work with the DfES to provide leadership to raise the profile of Citizenship and the need for teachers to be involved in Citizenship-related CPD activities.

Aims of the study

The overall aim of the study was to determine the form and content of a certification scheme in Citizenship. More specifically the study involved:

- Reviewing best practice in CPD for teachers;
- Identifying the perceptions of key stakeholders working on Citizenship at national and regional level concerning the nature and content of a potential CPD Citizenship teaching certification scheme or programme; and
- Identifying the perceptions of teachers involved in the delivery of Citizenship in schools concerning the nature and content of a CPD Citizenship teaching certification scheme or programme.

Methods

A concise review examined the context and need for CPD in Citizenship. This drew on existing summaries and reviews of best practice (such as those carried out by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted), the Department for Education and Skills (DfES), the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER), and the Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Coordination (EPPI) Centre at the Institute of Education, University

of London). Key themes emerging from this work were related to government policy and guidance in CPD, including the revised Teaching Standards Framework.

Following the review, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a sample of respondents purposively selected to represent organisations with an interest in Citizenship (or related areas such as Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE) and CPD at national and regional level. Interviews were also conducted with teachers with an interest in developing their expertise in Citizenship, drawn from a sample of schools. Schools were purposively selected to reflect those that had made good progress in developing Citizenship and those that faced challenges in doing so. Primary, secondary and special schools were selected.

Interviews were conducted with 22 national and regional respondents and with 29 teachers in twelve schools representing seven Local Education Authorities (LEAs) in five regions of the country (the North West, North East, London, South West, West Midlands).

Key areas of enquiry for national, regional and school-based respondents included, but were not confined to:

- Views about the national, regional, local and school contexts for Citizenship (including the challenges and opportunities in the planning, development and implementation of Citizenship)
- Views about the most appropriate form and content of a CPD Citizenship programme (including the specific needs of those in primary and special schools; the needs, interests and concerns of teachers more generally; views about Citizenship-related issues and topics to be addressed; and which stakeholders should be involved in the design and provision of CPD)
- Perceptions about how best to construct a successful CPD Citizenship programme (including what might attract teachers to CPD in Citizenship, how their achievements might best be recognised; and what forms of support might be most effective)

Findings

The literature review of Citizenship and CPD

- Greater consideration needs to be given to how Citizenship is best organised, managed and taught across schools and within classrooms.
- Teachers often feel unprepared for Citizenship. CPD provision has, to date, been largely unsuccessful in extending teachers' knowledge, understanding and skills.
- Collaborative forms of CPD that allow participants to focus on issues of relevance to them and over a period of time assist teachers embed new learning into professional practice.

Findings from interviews - developing the overall programme

- In schools where leadership is being given to the development and provision of Citizenship, significant progress is being made. In other schools, however, there are confusions about its relationship to PSHE, and whether, when and how it appears across the curriculum and the school.

- CPD is needed, not only for Citizenship coordinators and those who are developing a particular specialism in the subject, but also, as lighter touch, for all teachers who might be expected to incorporate Citizenship-related issues and topics into their own subject area work. This has implications for the types of CPD required.
- Most respondents stated that the development and provision of a CPD programme in Citizenship should be kept local, yet utilise a national framework that would ensure a degree of coherency, consistency and credibility.
- Respondents viewed Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) with existing expertise in Citizenship as key players in the development and design of a CPD programme. While staff in HEIs were expected to bring with them a theoretical understanding of the subject, respondents expected them to establish and utilise the expertise of those in local statutory and voluntary agencies and particularly LEAs. HEIs could also provide the means to accredit CPD, perhaps through the Credit Accumulation Transfer Scheme (CATS), thereby providing a nationally recognised qualification, or at least points towards one.

Findings from interviews – the content of a CPD programme in Citizenship

- The breadth of Citizenship, together with variation among teachers with regard to their backgrounds and educational contexts, suggests that a CPD programme in Citizenship must offer more than a set of standardised topics.
- Teachers face particular challenges and opportunities when working in special, primary and secondary schools and of actively involving pupils in these settings.

Findings from interviews - assessment

- There was general agreement that portfolios or professional development records should be the main way in which teachers' learning should be assessed. However, teachers were cautious about the amount of work, and the sorts of evidence, that portfolios required. Quality rather than quantity was the watchword, and other forms of assessment, especially assignments and observations, should not be overlooked as part of the assessment process.

Implications

National and regional respondents believed the most appropriate model of CPD provision from which to draw was the PSHE CPD programme. If the DfES believes this to be the most appropriate route, the following actions should be considered in developing a CPD programme in Citizenship

The overall form of the CPD in Citizenship Programme

- A pilot CPD programme in Citizenship in a number of contrasting sites and settings could be developed. Sites could be chosen so to ensure geographical spread (perhaps with and without a regional Citizenship adviser); the inclusion of schools with urban/suburban/rural intakes; the involvement of schools with varying percentages of free school meal entitlements (FSMEs); the involvement of schools with varying degrees of support from the senior management team (SMT); the involvement of schools with more or less well advanced forms of Citizenship provision; the involvement of schools with or without

citizenship Advanced Skills Teacher (AST) support; and the involvement of special, primary and secondary schools.

- Ensuring that financial resources are available to schools and others to support the participation of teachers in the programme

Issues of content

- Participants in a CPD in Citizenship Programme should be allowed an element of choice in focusing on particular areas of interest.
- Common issues for all teachers to address include an assessment of the whole school's provision with regard to Citizenship; an assessment of their own and others' practice; an identification of changes needed; a review of changes tried and new teaching undertaken; and an outline of next steps; and how best to involve pupils.

Assessing and recognising achievements

- While professional development records (PDRs) and portfolios could be used as the main form of assessment, opportunities for other assessment methods should be considered – especially assignments and observations.
- Consider should be given to whether, and in what ways, teachers might be awarded CATS points on successful completion of the CPD. Doing so may require work over and above that needed for certification similar to that awarded on successful completion of the PSHE CPD programme.

Formative evaluation

- A programme of formative evaluation should be put in place to run concurrently with the pilot CPD programme to identify the sorts of improvements needed to move from a pilot to a national programme.

Raising the profile of Citizenship

- To raise the profile of Citizenship among those in school communities, the DfES might wish to consider putting in place INSET or other events for all or the majority of staff in selected schools taking part in the pilot programme.

Providing leadership

- A national lead or coordinator will need to be identified for the CPD in Citizenship programme – as well as a supportive organisation in which s/he might be located.
- Senior managers in schools should work with national figures (including those from the DfES) to market the CPD programme and help raise the profile and status of Citizenship.

1. Background

In 1998, the final report of the Advisory Group for Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in School – commonly known as the Crick Report – concluded that the teaching of citizenship and democracy should be a statutory requirement in schools (DFEE/QCA, 1998). In September 2002, Citizenship – which provides learning opportunities for pupils to gain the knowledge, skills and understanding necessary to play an effective role in society at local, national and international levels – became a statutory subject at Key Stages 3 and 4, and part of the non-statutory framework for Personal, Social and Health Education at Key Stages 1 and 2.

Guidelines are available to support the planning, development and implementation of PSHE and Citizenship for pupils with learning difficulties (QCA, 2001). Furthermore, proposals are in place to make Citizenship education an entitlement for students in post-16 education. Given that Citizenship is a relatively new part of the curriculum, and initial training in Citizenship for secondary teachers only commenced in recent years, a large number of teachers have had to take responsibility for Citizenship, without having any specific initial training. Those teachers who have transferred their skills to Citizenship require opportunities for professional development in the subject.

In response to the ongoing need to promote the provision of Citizenship in schools and colleges, ministers have recently agreed a CPD strategy with three key strands: the appointment of Citizenship advisers in three regions supported by a national coordinator; the development of a comprehensive handbook to provide guidance on training, and a study to determine the form and content of a Citizenship CPD certification scheme. This report is the outcome of this third strand of work.

1.1. Aims and objectives of the study

The overall aim of the study was to determine the form and content of a certification scheme in Citizenship, in order to contribute to a rise in standards of achievement and to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

More specifically, the work involved:

- Reviewing best practice in CPD for teachers;
- Identifying the perceptions of key stakeholders working on Citizenship at national and regional level concerning the nature and content of a potential CPD Citizenship teaching certification scheme or programme; and
- Identifying the perceptions of teachers involved in the delivery of Citizenship in schools concerning the nature and content of a CPD Citizenship teaching certification scheme or programme.

2. Methods

2.1. Literature review of CPD

A concise literature review of the context and need for CPD in Citizenship was undertaken. This drew on recent summaries and reviews of best practice (such as those carried out by Ofsted, DfES, NFER and the Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Coordination (EPPI) Centre at the Institute of Education, University of London). Key themes emerging from this work were related to government policy and guidance in CPD, including the revised Teaching Standards Framework.

2.2. Interviews with respondents

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a sample of respondents purposively selected to represent organisations with an interest in Citizenship (or related areas such as PSHE) and CPD at national and regional level. Organisations and interviewees were selected in close consultation with the DfES to represent those that had particular expertise in Citizenship and could provide information on the likely form and content of a CPD programme.

Interviews were also conducted with teachers who had an interest in developing their expertise in Citizenship. To identify teachers, a sample of seven LEAs was first drawn from five regions in England (the North West, North East, London, South West, West Midlands) in consultation with the DfES. Following discussion with national and regional respondents and DfES representatives, 12 schools were then selected from LEAs (around two in each LEA) to reflect geographical and demographic diversity, as well as differing stages of development of Citizenship (to reflect those that had made good progress in developing Citizenship and those that faced challenges in doing so) and varying modes of provision (for example, whole school approaches, cross-curricular or suspended timetabling). Primary, secondary and special schools were selected. Within schools, teachers were selected in consultation with a member of the senior management team. Those interviewed were perceived to be most likely to provide useful information about the need for, and nature of, a new CPD programme in Citizenship

Emerging findings from the review of CPD informed the development of interview schedules for use with national and regional respondents and teachers.[1]

2.2.1. Interviews with national and regional respondents

In total, 22 national and regional respondents were interviewed, drawn from the following organisations:

- Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) (4 respondents)
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2 respondents)
- PSHE CPD Certification Programme (1 respondent)
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (1 respondent)
- Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (1 respondent)
- Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA) (1 respondent)

---

[1] Interview schedules are included as Appendix One

- National College for School Leadership (NCSL) (1 respondent)
- Association of Citizenship Teaching (ACT) (1 respondent)
- Citizenship Foundation (1 respondent)
- Community Service Volunteers (CSV) (1 respondent)
- Institute for Citizenship (1 respondent)
- National Health Education Group (NHEG) (1 respondent)
- The National PSE Association for advisers, inspectors and consultants (NSCOPSE) (1 respondent)

In addition, the National Coordinator for Citizenship was interviewed, along with the four Regional Coordinators for Citizenship (representing 3 regions).

2.2.2. *Interviews with school-based respondents*

It was intended to carry out a total of 24-30 interviews with teaching staff across schools, one with the head teacher (or the most senior school leader with responsibility for Citizenship education), at least one member of the teaching staff who might benefit from a Citizenship CPD scheme and, where appropriate, an Advanced Skills Teacher (AST) (either in-school or attached to the school as part of their outreach responsibilities).

Interviews were conducted with 29 teachers in twelve schools representing seven LEAs in five regions of the country. No schools in the sample had an AST, although one AST within the same LEA in the South West was interviewed.

Interviews took place in eight secondary schools, two primary schools and two special schools. Although the inclusion of Citizenship in the curriculum is not statutory in the two latter settings, some good work is already taking place in these schools – and it is likely that any Citizenship CPD programme will be open to teachers of primary and special schools.

The interview schedule for teachers and school-based professionals was developed as findings were emerging from the interviews with key stakeholders and in consultation with the DfES.

2.2.3. *Areas of enquiry*

Key areas of enquiry for national, regional and school-based respondents included, but were not confined to:

- Views about the national, regional, local and school contexts for Citizenship (including: the challenges and opportunities in the planning, development and implementation of Citizenship)
- Views about the most appropriate form and content of a CPD Citizenship programme (including the specific needs of those in primary and special schools; the needs, interests and concerns of teachers more generally; views about Citizenship-related issues and topics to be addressed; and which stakeholders should be involved in the design and provision of CPD)
- Perceptions about how best to construct a successful CPD Citizenship programme (including: what might attract teachers to CPD in Citizenship, how their achievements might best be recognised; and what forms of support might be most effective)

2.2.4. Data collection and analysis

Face-to-face and telephone interviews were conducted to strike the best balance between efficiency and depth of data collection, and available resources. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with around a third of the sample of national and regional respondents. In each region, teachers in one school took part in face-to-face interviews, with telephone interviews being conducted with teachers in the other school.

Data were analysed by means of successive approximation (Neuman, 2002) to identify similarities and differences across respondents' accounts. Interview write-ups were read on a number of occasions to identify key themes present in responses to questions contained in the interview schedule. In addition, potential new and emerging themes were noted to identify themes that were unanticipated prior to interviews being conducted.

Interviews were written up by fieldworkers as close in time to the interview as possible. To limit bias during analysis, the fieldwork team verbally reported preliminary themes prior to the development of a set of more definite themes that were drawn out of the written interview materials. A final set of themes, issues and topics were then checked with fieldworkers to identify gaps and/or misrepresentations.

3. Findings: literature review of CPD

3.1. The need for CPD in Citizenship

Recent work by Ofsted (2003) has found that even within a sample of secondary schools that exemplify best practice, the requirements of Citizenship were not always well understood – often being confused with those of Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE). Similarly, in some schools, there has been a reported lack of time devoted to the teaching of Citizenship and insufficient attention to its specific content (Ofsted, 2003).

The on-going Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study also found there to be much variation in the provision of Citizenship and that a significant number of teachers feel unprepared for their role in teaching it (Kerr et al, 2003). More can be done to involve whole school communities in planning, developing and implementing Citizenship (Kerr et al., 2003), and teachers also often appear uncertain as to how best to assess pupil achievements in Citizenship (Kerr et al., 2003; Ofsted, 2003).

Most recently, Ofsted (2004) has found that while in the majority of schools, steps have been taken to introduce Citizenship, there is still a great deal of confusion between the activities schools undertake to support pupils' citizenship and the formal teaching of Citizenship to all pupils as a national curriculum subject (Ofsted, 2004). Only a minority of schools have planned and provided Citizenship as a separate subject specialism. More often than not, there is no special timetabled provision for the subject, which is taught either across the curriculum or as part of PSHE (Oftsed, 2004).

The introduction of Citizenship into the National Curriculum has been described as '… a rapid policy intervention to move schools from little or no provision to universal' (Halpern et al, 2002: 218). Other commentators have noted there to be both a lack of tradition of teaching in the area of Citizenship and few teachers who are, at least as yet, professionally committed to it (Davies, 2000). Access to teacher education in this area needs to be promoted (Davies, 2000; Holden, 2000).

Many schools have provided key staff with training opportunities to develop and implement Citizenship. In 2002, Ofsted noted that m ost teachers of Citizenship have had some training, usually provided by a Local Education Authority (LEA) or a commercial trainer (Ofsted, July 2002). However, in most schools only one or two members of staff have had access to training. In addition, many courses have failed to draw teachers into a process that would enable them to try out and reflect on new teaching opportunities over time, or even to report back to colleagues on what they have learned. Some training has been 'ill-informed', suggesting to teachers that a 'low-key' response to the National Curriculum is required (Ofsted, 2003, p. 8) and efforts are needed to improve the teaching of Citizenship by non-specialists (Ofsted, 2004)

There is also variety of INSET available in Citizenship, largely provided by LEAs, but also by commercial providers. There is also a short course of CPD available to teachers at The Centre for Citizenship Studies in Education at the University of Leicester. However, at present there is no nationally recognised CPD in Citizenship for teachers who are transferring their skills to the subject.

3.2. Scope of a potential CPD programme in Citizenship

An effective CPD programme provides teachers with a coherent set of activities through which they can broaden and deepen their professional practice, while being responsive to local and school community circumstances. As noted, the planning, development and implementation of Citizenship at key stages 3 & 4 varies markedly across schools. While some have made good progress, others still have much to do. Furthermore, little is so far known about non-statutory provision at key stages 1 & 2, with challenges remaining about the nature and provision of Citizenship teaching for pupils with special educational needs (see Hartas, 2003). Moreover, the proposed entitlement of pupils in post-16 education and training is likely to increase rather than diminish the training needs of educators.

To date, training opportunities have often failed to exemplify elements of best practice as highlighted in recent reviews of CPD. For example, CPD appears particularly useful in helping teachers to extend pupil learning when it (i) enables teachers to focus on issues of relevance to them (within a broad framework); (ii) allows teachers to collaborate with colleagues (and with training providers) on a sustained basis; (iii) takes place over time to enable learning to be embedded into professional practice; and (iv) is adequately resourced (Cordingly *et al*, 2003; Pritchard *et al*., 2002). 'One-size-fit-all' programmes or schemes of CPD are not well received by teachers, as they often fail to engage with teachers' existing knowledge, experiences and needs (Hustler *et al*., 2003).

The variability of professional practice in Citizenship across phases and types of schools, along with uncertainty in knowing how best to extend the knowledge, understanding and skills of teachers in line with the DfES revised Teaching Standards Framework, presents particular challenges for CPD in Citizenship. However, despite the flexible curriculum there is now information about the sorts of characteristics – particularly in relation to identifying pupil progress according to end-of-key-stage description (see Ofsted, 2002) – about which schools will need evidence to show they are achieving the standards expected by the national curriculum. Furthermore, identifying pupil progress, managing diversity, capitalising on collaboration and assisting teachers to embed learning were features of the pilot Sex and Relationship Education (SRE) Accreditation Scheme – now the PSHE CPD Programme. Developments such as these may provide useful insights into a new programme of CPD in Citizenship. However, striking a balance between national, school-based and individuals' needs is necessary if the scheme is to recruit and maintain teachers, especially senior staff who may have different workload demands to those in the early stages of their career (Hustler et al., 2003).

3.3. CPD for teachers

In late 2000 and early 2001, Inspectors from Ofsted visited 112 primary, secondary and special schools in 10 LEAs to evaluate the management and effectiveness of CPD activities in schools (Ofsted, March 2002). Among their findings they noted:

- Although approximately 7 in 10 schools were judged to adequately identify teachers' needs, the CPD actually undertaken was often described as '… loosely related activities that did not always provide good value for money or achieve the intended outcomes' (p.3).

- There was clearly too little time dedicated to supporting effective CPD and only rarely were CPD activities assembled in such a way to form a coherent individual training plan.
- Lack of supply cover was not a significant factor in preventing teachers undertaking CPD.
- Once back in school, teachers who had attended courses rarely had the time to share or reflect on their practice – and this dampened their enthusiasm.
- Course attendance was the main way of providing CPD in most schools – although the authors did note a growing awareness of other methods – in particular sharing knowledge and skills between practitioners and using consultants to tackle specific issues.
- Although leadership teams and CPD coordinators appreciated that there are an array of CPD activities in addition to the traditional INSET and one-off courses, they were rarely taken up.
- The schools sampled could only rarely point to clear evidence of the effect of CPD – on staff or pupils – monitoring and evaluation of the impact of CPD needs to improve substantially.
- Few school policies included adequate reference to CPD.
- Although as part of performance management, teachers are required to have one objective that focuses on CPD, most of these are short-term and refer to one-off courses.

The report does state, however, that the wider and more comprehensive methods of CPD found in some schools, often work very well. These include whole-school training days, team planning opportunities, joint teaching, peer observation, work shadowing, mentoring, local teaching networks and schools working in clusters.

The General Teaching Council for England (GTC, 2003) has developed the Teachers' Professional Learning Framework (TPLF) to help teachers plan, record and evaluate their CPD needs. This document outlines the range of ways in which teachers can fulfil their entitlement and responsibility to CPD, including:

- Working in a learning team
- Working with a mentor or coach
- Taking part in collaborative teaching, planning and assessment activities
- Observing colleagues
- Sharing teaching experiences with other teachers (either in their own or at other schools)
- Carrying out self-evaluation
- Collaborating in peer reviews
- Observing and analysing children's responses to learning activities
- Engaging with the subject specialists or specialist associations
- Reading educational and professional texts
- Participating in courses
- Participating in online learning

The TPLF emphasises two key features for CPD: first, the importance of moving from individual to collective teacher learning 'plac[ing] collegial learning at the heart of

professional development' (p.15); and, second, for a balance to be struck between school-based and higher education based learning (GTC, 2003). These features are emphasised because of the clear evidence of their effectiveness from school improvement research, as well as the value placed on them in feedback from teachers.

Research conducted in 2000/2001 in 42 schools found that teachers welcomed the opportunity to engage in CPD activities (Brown et al, 2001). Respondents identified a series of key factors underlying good practice in the provision of CPD. These were:

- Providing opportunities for sharing ideas
- Ensuring relevance of content.
- Providing opportunities for hands-on practical sessions.
- Having well-structured and focused sessions.
- Ensuring good delivery by presenters with recent and relevant experience.

With regard to organisational factors within schools that enabled staff to take part in CPD activities, teachers stated that they required adequate non-contact time, resources for supply cover, and to work within a school ethos that is supportive of CPD. The latter was particularly important as school leaders and CPD co-ordinators were commonly identified as gatekeepers to CPD activities (Brown et al, 2001).

More recently, Hustler *et al* (2003) have reported on a survey over 2,500 teachers to determine their perceptions of CPD. Again, the key findings from this report echo those from other studies:

- Most teachers had traditional notions of CPD – such as INSET and courses – although they knew about other methods.
- The approach of the leadership team and CPD co-ordinator could have a radical effect positively or negatively on teachers' understanding, attitudes and experience of CPD.

4. Findings: respondent interviews

4.1. Respondents' professional backgrounds

4.1.1. National and regional respondents

At the beginning of each interview, respondents were asked to describe their own professional background and route into Citizenship. Most usually, national and regional respondents had a professional background in History, Social Sciences (including Politics) or PSHE/Health Promotion, with one having a background in Special Education. Whatever their route into Citizenship, national and regional respondents emphasised the strong links between Citizenship and their original area of work.

Most national and regional respondents had been asked to extend their existing expertise into Citizenship. For example, those working in higher education had often been coordinating or teaching on another Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) area, and had been invited to develop or contribute to the new Citizenship PGCE in their institution. Regional Coordinators in Citizenship, who also tended to have a background in other subject areas, and were often recruited into the work because they had focused on a component of what would now be called Citizenship in their previous work – for example, political literacy or anti-racism. Irrespective of their professional background, or the way in which they first became involved in Citizenship, all national and regional respondents demonstrated a high level of commitment to the subject.

4.1.2. School-based respondents

Secondary teachers' backgrounds were, more often than not, in the humanities – including English, Media Studies, History and Religious Education. One had a specialism in Physical Education. In special and primary schools, teachers had often been involved in PSHE provision, prior to transferring their skills to Citizenship. Most teachers appeared committed to the development of Citizenship in their schools, although remained sceptical about the subject's status and the priority given to it, whether at national or school levels.

4.2. The Background and context of Citizenship

4.2.1. Citizenship in schools

National and regional respondents were asked to specify the principal challenges and opportunities that existed in the development, planning and teaching of Citizenship in schools. Consensus among them was high and they highlighted the following concerns:

- Citizenship is a new subject that does not have a long tradition, and may not be taken seriously by parents and pupils. One respondent noted that school leaders and others must be made aware that '…this is not just another initiative'.
- Citizenship may lack status in schools due to it being a relatively new subject (although there was widespread belief that the inclusion of Citizenship as a statutory subject at key stages 3 and 4 had gone some way to militate against this)
- There were said to be too many 'weak' models of Citizenship in schools – most especially when Citizenship is just 'bolted on' to the existing curriculum. Instead, proper planning,

time and provision need to be made for Citizenship. One respondent noted, 'Citizenship needs its own timetabled space in order to flourish'.

- Respondents felt that there should be a clearer shared understanding of Citizenship with a recognition that it addresses specific and identifiable subject areas (for example, human rights). A number of respondents shared the view that 'Citizenship needs to establish an identity' and develop uniqueness. This should not, however, present a problem, commented one respondent – since a good deal of the subject matter of Citizenship does not appear elsewhere in the curriculum (again, reinforcing the view that Citizenship needs its own timetabled space). However, some respondents commented that, 'schools see Citizenship in the tradition of PSHE – but not in a more academic tradition'.

- Notwithstanding the need for a dedicated place for Citizenship on the timetable – many respondents acknowledged that the curriculum is already 'overcrowded'. One respondent questioned, 'the Curriculum is already 120%, so what has to give to make way for Citizenship?' A number of respondents were especially concerned that Citizenship may squeeze out PSHE.

- There are not enough trained teachers of Citizenship to teach the subject. Teachers (who, for the most part, are transferring their skills to Citizenship) need training in its specific content and the most appropriate forms of provision. In addition, one respondent noted that teachers need training and support 'so as not to be afraid of conflict and controversial issues … including essential anti-racism work'.

- Some interviewees felt an opportunity had been missed by not making Citizenship statutory in primary schools, since a good deal of important work is taking place in these settings (much of this is within the context of the National Healthy Schools Standard).

- There were some concerns about how to plan for progression in Citizenship through the key stages – especially given that Citizenship is not statutory in primary schools. Careful thought needs to be given on how to build on work in previous key stages and progress the subject appropriately as the students get older.

- Some interviewees expressed concerns about the assessment of Citizenship. One interviewee questioned how pupils could '… fail at being a citizen?' Another queried how Citizenship would be assessed in settings where it is *only* delivered across the curriculum.

Compared to primary and special schools, in which teachers stated they had a familiarity with many Citizenship-related issues, respondents in secondary settings appeared more challenged. This is not to say that attempts to address Citizenship in secondary schools were absent, but its status in these settings was somewhat low – a 'Cinderella subject' as one teacher put it. Some secondary respondents had been asked by their line managers to audit the curriculum and identify where Citizenship could be addressed. But, as one secondary teacher commented after an audit, 'It's a subject that teachers don't want to touch … Although I coordinate it, I don't teach it at all.' In another, Citizenship was timetabled once a week but, with it being taught concurrently with PSHE, tutors would teach one and then, on occasions, the other. It was said to be '… sometimes more of a coincidence' that Citizenship was addressed at all.

However, in a secondary school in which the head teacher was said to be 'very forward thinking', two assistant head teachers had been instructed to develop 'a high quality Citizenship programme'. As well as appearing across the curriculum, (even though this was more easily achieved in English, Drama and Art where teachers commonly used participatory learning styles), Citizenship had dedicated days across the school year to encourage 'kids to think beyond the classroom.'

In primary and special schools, teachers stated that, prior to the introduction of Citizenship, much of their work had already addressed aspects of the subject in one way or another. However, it was now given separate and timetabled days, sometimes raised during circle time, and routinely addressed at least once a week.

Although the presence of Citizenship in schools appeared to relate more to the support given by the senior management team than to the uptake of CPD, the two were not unconnected. One teacher in a secondary school had funded her own participation in Citizenship-related CPD but found that, without SMT support, she could do little with her newly gained skills. In this school, senior managers were reported to work under the belief that Citizenship would 'go away'. Across the school as a whole, Citizenship was said to be a '…resented subject as the timetable is too full …and there is a belief that [those in government departments] believe it will solve all the problems with young people.' Echoing these concerns, another secondary school teachers felt that Citizenship was 'A sledgehammer to crack a nut, it will not solve all the problems.' And at one other secondary school, where members of the senior management team (SMT) were said not to support the subject, a respondent commented, 'The new Citizenship curriculum was greeted with horror and dreaded by teachers, and that hasn't changed I'm afraid.'

Although, perhaps, more keenly felt among respondents from schools without a great deal support from senior management for Citizenship, school-based respondents in all schools noted that continued leadership for the subject was needed from senior managers if it was to play its proper role in the life of the school.

National and regional respondents, too, were aware of the challenges facing the introduction of Citizenship. Ofsted was thought to be in a position to make a big contribution to the development of Citizenship in schools – because as a statutory subject in Key Stages 3 and 4, it is inspected alongside other subjects. One respondent stated that the establishment of Citizenship was no different to that of any new subject – and went on to point out that Citizenship is the first new subject since the introduction of Information Technology in 1988. She emphasised that the development and entrenchment of Citizenship cannot be expected 'to take place over-night when other subjects on the curriculum are one hundred years old'. And, somewhat reassuringly, one respondent noted that there was 'the same panic over ICT – but 16 years on, all is well'.

4.2.2. Citizenship and CPD

National and regional respondents were asked to identify existing contexts and structures that might support or hinder a CPD programme in Citizenship. Key factors that could support a new CPD programme were noted:

- The statutory status of Citizenship at key stages 3 and 4 was considered crucially important – as well as being indicative of the DfES' commitment to Citizenship. The on-going and high profile commitment of government departments to Citizenship was considered crucial to the success of any programme of CPD in Citizenship.
- The role of national and regional coordinators was widely thought to be crucial in determining the success of any programme of CPD in Citizenship – especially in the case of teachers who feel isolated and marginalised (some interviewees suggested that many teachers of Citizenship experience this). Many respondents felt that the role of the national, regional and local advisers in the success of the PSHE CPD programme was pivotal – and recognised this as a model that may be well worth replicating.

- The local networks established as part of the PSHE CPD programme were considered a big success by many respondents – who felt that similar structures might be developed for CPD in Citizenship. Some respondents pointed to the good national networks that have begun to be established by the Association of Citizenship Teachers, which may provide a supportive structure for CPD in Citizenship.
- Some respondents felt that existing training provided by non-statutory organisations working in the area of Citizenship could be built upon to provide good training for teachers. However, most also highlighted the crucial contribution of those in Higer Education Institutions (HEIs) – who can validate and provide pathways to other qualifications. Similarly, many interviewees emphasised that HEIs can make provision for lifelong learning and long-term career development – while voluntary agencies and other providers are more likely to help people learn swiftly about Citizenship and get 'up to speed' in specific content areas.
- A number of interviewees felt that collaborative working is commonplace in Citizenship – 'the world of Citizenship is already collaborative' and felt that this would help in developing an advisory group constituted of DfES, HEIs, non-statutory organisations and other interested parties to guide CPD in Citizenship.

Those factors that were thought to hinder the development of a CPD programme in Citizenship included:

- The existing PSHE certification scheme and any new programme of CPD in Citizenship could be in competition with each other in an environment of limited time and other resources. Some respondents were concerned that those taking a lead on Citizenship in schools are often the same people who take a lead on PSHE. They may have already undertaken CPD in PSHE which could mean they are less likely to be released by schools to undertake Citizenship CPD – or may elect not to take on further CPD having completed one Certificate already.
- Some non-statutory organisations working in the field of Citizenship were thought to have a limited understanding of the specific needs of teachers and pupils.
- The existing materials for schools were considered to be highly variable – as well as prone to date quickly. While some learning packs were singled out as excellent (for example the learning materials produced by the Cornwall based non statutory organisation 'Surfers Against Sewage'), many others were not highly recommended by interviewees.

There were some areas of disagreement here too – some national and regional respondents felt that Citizenship needs to be 'Completely divorced [from PSHE] … because a lot of teachers are comfortable addressing 'Animals and the Law, but not 'venereal disease''. Another said that 'Citizenship is not always seen as a separate issue – there's not a clear understanding of the difference [between Citizenship and PSHE] – it shouldn't be completely separate but there does need to be a demarcation of topics'. Overall, views were mixed. However, some respondents were at pains to point out that in a crowded curriculum, Citizenship may push PSHE out – one respondent felt passionately about the importance of both subjects stating it to be crucial that PSHE continued to be delivered well in schools as it '… deals with issues of life and death'.

4.2.3. Learning from other CPD activities, initiatives and programmes

National, regional and school-based respondents were asked to identify any particularly good existing programmes of CPD – in any subject area – from which those developing CPD in

Citizenship might learn. Most usually, national and regional respondents cited the PSHE CPD Programme. This was widely described as exemplary, most particularly because it had been well received by teachers. One regional/national respondent summed up the feeling by saying that any scheme of CPD in Citizenship 'must match the enormous success of the PSHE certificate …Certification is the best thing to have happened to PSHE – ever!'

Few teachers, though, had familiarity with the PSHE CPD programme. Two had, and held contrasting views. One respondent from a secondary school had participated in the programme and had been disappointed to find that it had been more about 'testing than training'. She was upset not to have been provided with more opportunities to learn about PSHE in greater depth and added that using this as a model for CPD in Citizenship would be 'disastrous'. One other teacher was due to take part in the programme in a few months time. He described the structure of provision as a model for other CPD programmes and spoke of the supporting written material as 'beautiful'. Even so, comments from just two respondents in schools are unlikely to provide a balanced picture of teachers' experiences of the programme as whole.

Other CPD considered useful by national and regional respondents included courses run by the Citizenship Foundation and the Institute for Citizenship (which were considered to have a good practical elements) and PGCEs at the Institute of Education, University of London and Manchester Metropolitan University (which were considered to provide a good theoretical grounding). Some respondents also pointed to the accredited short course in Citizenship offered at the Centre for Citizenship Studies at the University of Leicester and also named the National College for School Leadership's *Leading from the Middle* course of professional development for middle leaders in both pastoral and subject-based roles.

However, teachers were less forthcoming about instances of exemplary CPD. Around a third mentioned that they had taken part in good CPD: training in art, developing expertise when working with pupils with special needs, drug education, a 'transforming learning' project, developing expertise in religious education teachers, and a management course. Rather more often, teachers either stated they could not identify good quality CPD or occasionally noted examples of poor CPD. However, almost all teachers indicated what they saw as a key characteristic of effective CPD: its relevance to their own professional practice, whether teaching in the classroom or working across the whole school. This and other issues are returned to below.

4.3. The content of a CPD in Citizenship programme

4.3.1. Expectations of a CPD programme

In describing their own expectations of a CPD programme, national and regional respondents routinely noted the need to raise its status and credibility among those in schools, as well as improve teachers' expertise in teaching and learning

Most commonly, school-based respondents expected their involvement in a Citizenship CPD programme to improve their skills in teaching and learning. For respondents in special and primary schools, there was a need for age appropriate activities as well as those that could be customised and tailored to the particular needs of individual pupils. Confirming the views of regional and national respondents, some teachers stated that they would wish to raise the profile of Citizenship across the school and, as one secondary teacher put it, stimulate a sense of 'collective ownership'.

4.3.2. Subject specialism: process and content

National and regional respondents agreed that teachers needed more training in the methods of Citizenship, and a majority of them emphasised that CPD in Citizenship needs to focus on pedagogy and not just subject matter. Most emphasised the importance of methods that are participatory and inclusive. One commented that 'You can't do Citizenship on the blackboard, it's got to be an active subject … it's got to be fun, motivating and engaging – it's got to be about them [the students]'. However, while acknowledging the importance of participative methods, a few respondents stated that there needs to be more use of texts and more writing exercises than are currently taking place. This, they pointed out, is crucial for both the status and the assessment of the subject – as well as providing students with an opportunity to fully explore the complexities of Citizenship. One respondent stated that if this does not occur, Citizenship '… will just become the easy option'. There is tension here though which one interviewee summed up by saying, 'the pressure is on teachers that is performance-related … to do the quantifiable stuff … for example, GCSE and A level … if Citizenship is performance-managed to tight criteria it doesn't allow for creativity … don't let's go back to Civics – which is content not process driven'.

Many national and regional respondents referred to the three key areas outlined in the National Curriculum orders in Citizenship, when asked specifically about the content of a programme of CPD. These are (i) knowledge and understanding about becoming informed citizens; (ii) developing skills of enquiry and communication; and, (iii) developing skills of participation and responsible action. More specifically, though, respondents also identified a range of more particular and related topics including:

- Understanding political systems
- School-based, local, regional, national, European and global governance (including, for the first of these, the setting up and running of school councils)
- Rights (including animal and human rights. The latter included anti-racism work as well as understanding issues related to refugees and asylum seekers)
- Systems of welfare
- Religious and political identities
- Legal systems (national, European and global)
- International Relations

However, among teachers, topics that needed to be addressed depended somewhat on their own background, highlighting that participants in a CPD programme should be able to choose the topics and issues on which they focussed. As one teacher in a secondary school commented, 'As an English teacher, I need to address all areas – apart from media.'

A number of national and regional respondents, as well as those based in schools, noted that methods to encourage active citizenship among young people should also be part of the CPD programme. A number of noted that this would almost certainly require an understanding of the local community, knowledge of local services and an acquaintance with local professionals in statutory and voluntary services.

When asked about issues to address during Citizenship CPD, one secondary teacher responded emphatically, 'Not assessment, we are inundated with this'. But however strongly felt this view, it was not shared by other teachers. Most teachers (as well as many national and regional respondents) highlighted that further support was required as to how best to assess pupil learning – whether in

dedicated Citizenship lessons or where integrated across the curriculum.

A few national and regional respondents, and some teachers, highlighted the importance of developing teachers' skills of enquiry, developing their expertise in action-oriented research and contributing to their role as reflective practitioners.

Most respondents wanted to see space in a CPD programme for participants to determine their own learning needs. More often than not, teachers spoke of the need for the programme to have relevance to local and school circumstances – and to draw on pupils own interests and concerns. With regard to involving pupils, one national/regional respondent noted that, '… the spirit of the Crick Report should be retained' – which calls attention to the empowerment of pupils and the development of constructive relationships among those in local communities and schools.

4.3.3. Written materials for Citizenship

National, regional and school-based respondents noted that the quality of written materials was currently highly variable. Citizenship coordinators tended to highlight that they were sent many resources, having to 'wade through' these to find just a few of use. Still, some materials were spoken of positively: resources produced by UNICEF, *Understanding Citizenship: Teacher's book*, and *Me as a Citizen* were among these. But some teachers pointed out that in a fast-moving world, printed materials often become outdated quickly and that good online resources need to be made available. Some already exist: the Teacher Training Agency's *ITT CitizEd*, which is specifically for teacher educators in Citizenship – although might also be useful for Citizenship teachers themselves – came in for particular praise. Similarly, the Association of Citizenship Teachers' website was highly regarded by interviewees. A number of national and regional respondents referred to the DfES Citizenship Handbook in development. This was widely considered to be a step in the right direction – although there is some concern that these should not be unwieldy. As one respondent said, 'I would hate to think of millions of ring binders going round that no-one ever looks at'. Another mentioned that it was not necessary 'to reinvent the wheel – rather just signpost to teachers the materials that are already out there'.

4.4. The Development of a Citizenship CPD programme

4.4.1. Key issues

Across interviews with national, regional and school-based respondents, a number of key elements of a programme of CPD in Citizenship were identified and included:

- A carefully planned, recognised and validated programme was needed for teachers transferring their skills to Citizenship.
- In order to ensure that Citizenship has a similar status to other academic subjects, a programme of CPD must be well grounded in theory as well as practice: 'Citizenship must be a properly founded course with a theoretical background'.
- Teachers would need to develop an understanding of topics and issues as well as extending their skills of teaching and learning processes
- CPD must be kept 'streamlined' in order not to over-burden teachers (particularly with regard to assessment requirements)
- To help ensure the programme's relevance to teachers' circumstances, the programme might allow some choice within training – at least with regard to topics and issues addressed.

- Any programme of CPD in Citizenship must be linked to other qualifications – most especially the award of CATS points towards masters degrees – one interviewee summed this up by saying that 'it is very important to see a pathway … something that can be cashed in for something bigger'.[2]
- Alliances between LEAs and HEIs were considered to provide a useful way forward for CPD in Citizenship – because HEIs can provide theoretical grounding and validation of courses, while LEAs can provide opportunities for action research and networking.
- A programme of Citizenship with components of face-to-face delivery and group working was highly favoured over distance learning – although this clearly needs to be carefully planned as most interviewees were concerned that CPD be routed in practice and others were concerned that teachers should not be taken out of school too often.
- Locally provided courses were considered favourable, as they allow teachers to network with others working in the LEA or neighbouring LEAs.

4.4.2. Views about the demand for CPD

There was general agreement among national and regional respondents that there existed a high demand for training and support in Citizenship among secondary school teachers. One respondent believed teachers were 'crying out' for training. Overall, however, respondents felt that a certification scheme would only be popular with teachers who are transferring their skills to Citizenship – and not with those who have recently acquired a PGCE in Citizenship and are already subject specialists.

Many national and regional respondents pointed out that primary and special schools have a great deal of good practice to share with mainstream secondary schools, most especially in relation to whole school approaches and active citizenship. However, all still thought it unlikely that CPD in Citizenship would be widely taken up by primary and special school teachers. One interviewee said that 'secondary education is about protecting your own subject', and added that this was not the case in primary or secondary schools, rendering subject specific CPD less attractive. For primary school teachers, some national and regional respondents felt that CPD in Citizenship may not be viewed as a useful lever to career development, unless appropriately 'marketed'. For teachers in post-16 entitlement, there was thought to be particular problems of sourcing funding for non-statutory provision. Most national and regional respondents felt that, realistically, 'non-statutory demands are not likely to be promoted above those that are statutory'.

Teachers outlined a series of factors that might support their participation in a Citizenship CPD programme. Chief among these was adequate resourcing. With it, the direct costs of training and the other costs of bringing in supply teachers could be met. Even so, in specials schools especially, there remained the concern about using supply teachers. As one teacher highlighted, 'Planning for supply teachers can be just as much work as doing the teaching yourself.'

4.4.3. Designing and providing CPD

There was widespread agreement among national and regional respondents that those in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) should have substantial involvement in developing and providing CPD in Citizenship. HEIs had an important role to play, respondents suggested, in validation of a

---

[2] Under the credit accumulation and transfer scheme (CATS), a student builds up a number of credits which, when accumulated, result in a qualification. Under CATS, it may be possible to transfer credits from one Higher Education Institution to another.

programme and provide opportunities for those involved to progress onto other qualifications. However, few respondents suggested that HEIs should work in isolation of voluntary sector organisations, LEAs or the DfES. Representatives from different settings and organisations could provide an important input in the design and facilitation of a programme of CPD – which most respondents noted should have a strong focus on classroom practice and cannot be provided by HEIs alone.

Those HEIs in which Citizenship is already established (as a PGCE offering, for example) were thought to be especially well placed to begin work on CPD in Citizenship. Some respondents however, pointed out that while a programme of CPD must be accredited by HEIs – recognised providers might be drawn from voluntary sector organisations, consortia or others. Most importantly, whoever provides the scheme should be ready to work in real partnership with teachers – so that a dialogue develops instead of a linear relationship between providers and receivers. Teachers must be able to identify their own (sometimes local) needs which would then inform the CPD programme in Citizenship.

Teachers, too, emphasised the major role that HEIs might have in designing and providing CPD. They also echoed the views of national and regional respondents that HEIs must work in partnership with LEAs, with local voluntary and statutory agencies and with teachers themselves. A few teachers, especially those who considered their LEA to be a competent training provider, felt that this body, rather than an HEI might best take a lead on CPD design and provision.

Taken together, national, regional and school-based respondents outlined a model of CPD whereby criteria and standards were developed by a range of interested parties at national level (including DfES, QCA, HEIs, ACT and Citizenship Foundation); where local bodies (including but not exclusively HEIs) provided HEI accredited CPD (with opportunities for progression to other qualifications); and where teachers studied in local networks supported by regional coordinators and regional steering committees (consisting of representatives from LEAs, Connexions services and voluntary sector organisations, for example, as well as other local partners with an interest in Citizenship).

One national/regional respondent posited a role for school clusters – like those in teacher training – whereby a school is identified to take a local lead in Citizenship, and CPD in Citizenship. Another said that 'learning sets' (whereby a facilitator acts as arbitrator and the learners guide their own programme of study) are an ideal mechanism for professional development. Overall, a strong voice for local partners was called for, this being seen as the best way for practitioners to learn from each other about what works best when drawing on the resources of local communities, raising the profile of Citizenship across a school and supporting teaching and learning within classrooms.

4.4.4. Finding the right time for CPD

Some national and regional respondents stated that it would be important that CPD is not offered as a twilight course – but during the working week 'although this is more expensive, other professionals [non-teachers] expect this and it is the proper way to learn'. Others felt that having to study at weekends or during evenings is a disincentive to many teachers – who already having preparation and assessment to do during that time.

Among teachers themselves, there was no real consensus about the most appropriate days, or times of days, when CPD should be provided. A few suggested that weekends, the occasional Saturday or

the 'edges of school holidays' might be best. Others noted that training held on weekends and holidays 'raises issues of equity for staff with caring responsibilities.' Some suggested that 'twilight' sessions would be mostly appreciated, especially if a social element such as a meal were included. Others felt that, by the end of the day, many teachers were too exhausted to make best use of training at this time. One or two called for whole days, others for half. And one respondent from a schools' senior management team (SMT) did not wish training to be held at all during term time, the cost of cover making this 'prohibitive'. Some respondents felt that whole school INSET days might usefully form one element of a CPD programme, not only to support form tutors but also to raise the profile of Citizenship across a school.

4.4.5. *Approaches to teaching and learning*

National and regional respondents outlined the importance of developing teachers' networks and establishing school clusters. Teachers' networks were considered to be one of the successful elements of the PSHE programme – although respondents emphasised that these should 'not be just talking shops', but purposeful meetings. Respondents also mentioned the importance of post-CPD networks. The establishment of clusters of schools to work together or build in opportunities to visit other schools was also considered to be an ideal mechanism through which to deliver CPD. These local clusters, it was suggested, might also provide coaching or mentoring.

Teachers had more to say about the range of teaching and learning methods that would most usefully constitute a CPD programme. Many highlighted the importance of face-to-face meetings, not only with tutors but also with colleagues. As noted, localised collegial activities would enable teachers to learn from each other about best practice, as well as that in need of development. A few teachers also suggested that seeing Citizenship lessons being taught would be useful. Although observation of real-time lessons might prove difficult to organise (and to find time for), videos could be just as useful providing, as one respondent noted, they were actual lessons and not reconstructions.

Teachers were keen, too, to learn from the expertise of those in HEIs, and looked forward to courses facilitated by those with expertise in Citizenship. A few also wished to utilise the expertise of those in local community agencies who could, perhaps, bring a different understanding of how best to work with young people.

As noted, some teachers thought it best for written teaching materials for Citizenship to be available online. So too with written materials for their own CPD, although not at the expense of doing away altogether with printed resources. But, as well as worksheets and 'up to date contemporary materials' that could perhaps be shared with other schools, one teacher asked for a booklet 'that allows you, early on, to plan a route through the training.'

4.4.6. *Support through a CPD programme*

On a day-to-day basis, support for teachers undertaking a course of CPD in Citizenship was thought by school-based respondents to be most appropriately provided by course facilitators (such as LEA staff or specialists in HEIs), local networks of other teachers engaging in the CPD process and local advisers in Citizenship (assuming that they are widely employed).

However, in addition, the support of head teachers and school leaders, of a somewhat less immediate kind, was thought to be crucial. As one member of school's SMT commented, he would

have little time to provide direct support to staff involved in CPD – such as that required to consider how best to produce an assignment, portfolio or other form of assessment. One teacher added that should support come neither from regional nor national people, 'they are too far away' it was believed.

4.4.7. Assessing CPD

When asked about modes of assessment for teachers undertaking CPD in Citizenship, national and regional respondents tended to the general rather than the specific. Most commonly, they recommended a portfolio of achievements similar to that used in the PSHE CPD programme. This was widely favoured as it was seen as a flexible method that could be adapted by teachers in different contexts.

Teachers, however, appeared less enthusiastic about portfolio styles of assessment than national and regional respondents. True, the majority made mention of them, but usually in addition to other forms of assessment: an assignment perhaps, observations of lessons and interviews with pupils. Teachers' appeared concerned that portfolios were 'too general', or were a somewhat overwhelming task to put together. One secondary teacher stated, 'A portfolio is ok, as long as it is about the quality and not the quantity of evidence and materials.' Some teachers reported they would be happier to 'write up a project' or produce 'schemes of work with observations' as their assessment.

National and regional respondents, and to a lesser extent teachers, emphasised that assessment must be rigorous to bring credibility to the programme. In addition, there was some concern among national and regional respondents that subject knowledge should be well evidenced by teachers – especially as so many are transferring their skills to Citizenship from other subjects. Some also highlighted the importance of formative assessment, where teachers received feedback during their involvement in CPD so as to make adjustments and improvements to their assessment evidence on a periodic basis.

4.4.8. Recognising achievements

Among national, regional and school-based respondents, opportunities for career development (possibly increments) and progression on to other professional qualifications were seen as important 'hooks' for teachers transferring their skills to Citizenship. Most respondents felt that while certification in itself would be important, it would be crucial that teachers could accumulate credits towards further qualifications (such as CATS points).

Some teachers, however, did not always wish for certification for themselves, and one or two noted that this might be more suitable for newly qualified teachers or for classroom assistants. More usually, however, certification appeared to be valued among teachers – particularly if it were nationally recognised so that teachers could make the most of it if moving from one school to another.

Some national and regional respondents noted the importance of awards ceremonies, especially if they were tied in some way to raising the profile and status of Citizenship. A few others felt that teachers themselves should answer the question of how they would like to see their achievements recognised. Most respondents agreed that any recognition of achievement needs to be accompanied by tangible opportunities for career advancement. Teachers were particularly of this view, often

stating that, following an award of a certificate, there should be some link to higher pay, enhanced status, and preferably both.

4.4.9. *Looking to the longer term*

National and regional respondents were asked to outline what changes they would expect to witness five years after the introduction of a successful programme of CPD in Citizenship. Responses included:

- Citizenship 'will not have been just another initiative that went away'.
- The status of Citizenship will be raised.
- There will be a cadre of confident teachers with 'their hearts in Citizenship'. One interviewee pointed out that he would consider a scheme of CPD in Citizenship a success if 'in five years there exists a cadre of specialist teachers in Citizenship – and at least one in every school'.
- Citizenship will have become a valued part of the curriculum and have parity with other Humanities subjects.
- Citizenship will be a subject with a distinct identity.
- Schools will not only be delivering Citizenship across the curriculum, but in timetabled spaces.
- The subject will be popular among students.
- Schools would have become more democratic places.
- Citizenship will 'have retained its radical edge – and will be a place where animated and lively debate can take place'.

National and regional respondents recognised, however, that there is much to do to achieve these goals, and much besides a programme of CPD that may lead to such outcomes.

One secondary teacher noted, at the end of their interview, thereby highlighting the opportunities so far provided to reflect on Citizenship, 'This is the most I've thought and talked about Citizenship ever, having worked in the school for a few years. Perhaps there should be a marketing project – what is Citizenship? Who should be teaching it? What are the requirements? … It's part of the curriculum now but a lot of colleagues aren't even aware of that …' Similarly, another school-based respondent highlighted just how timely it would be to improve Citizenship, 'I wish they'd sort it out – the longer they mess around with it, the more difficult it gets.'

5. Summary and Implications

5.1. Summary

5.1.1. Findings from the literature review of CPD

In some schools, and as Ofsted has noted, teachers are making great strides in providing pupils with opportunities to learn about, through and for Citizenship. But in too many others, children and young people are not receiving the education to which they are entitled.

Greater consideration needs to given to how Citizenship is best organised, managed and taught across schools and within classrooms. There are noticeable variations as to where Citizenship appears in school curricula and with regard to the amount of time given to it. Striking the right balance between teaching it as a specialism and integrating into other subjects – as well as into the fabric of school life – is yet to be achieved in many schools.

Teachers frequently indicate that they feel unprepared for Citizenship; the overall requirements of the subject are not well understood, the topics and issues to address remain unclear, how best to assess learning is ambiguous and what ways to involve whole school communities as yet indiscernible.

Much CPD provision has been unsuccessful in extending teachers' knowledge, understanding and skills. Often 'ill-informed', CPD has, to date, only rarely underscored the importance of Citizenship as a key subject that should inform the life of the whole school community. Traditional CPD activities – such as one-off courses – have done little to enable teachers to focus on issues of relevance to them, to collaborate with colleagues, and to assist them, over time, to embed new learning into their professional practice. Collegial, reflective and extended forms of CPD appear most useful in enabling teachers to manage and improve their teaching and learning activities.

5.1.2. Findings from interviews with respondents – developing the overall programme

Through a series of semi-structured interviews with national, regional and school-based respondents a number of concerns about the provision of Citizenship and CPD were identified. In schools where leadership is being given to the development of Citizenship, improvements are being made to its provision. But in others, there are confusions about its relationship to PSHE, and whether, when and how it appears across the curriculum and the school. Training is needed, not only for Citizenship coordinators and those who are developing a particular specialism in the subject, but also, as lighter touch, for all teachers who might be expected to incorporate Citizenship-related issues and topics into their own subject area.

While most national, regional and school-based respondents held generally common views about the form and content of a CPD programme for specialists, some teachers noted that an occasional or periodic INSET day might be needed for all teaching staff within the school (although this leaves open to question whether other members of the workforce, such as secretarial and other support staff as well as playground and meal supervisors, might benefit from learning more about Citizenship).

One key message that arose from most interviews was that the development and provision of a CPD programme should be kept local, yet utilise a national framework to ensure a degree of coherency, consistency and credibility.

Respondents viewed HEIs with existing expertise in Citizenship as key players in the development and design of a CPD programme. Importantly, while staff in HEIs were expected to bring with them a theoretical understanding of the subject, respondents also expected them to utilise the expertise of local statutory and voluntary agencies and particularly LEAs. HEIs could also provide the means to accredit CPD, perhaps through the Credit Accumulation Transfer Scheme (CATS), thereby providing a nationally recognised qualification, or at least points towards one.

A few respondents, however, doubted whether HEIs would necessarily have the expertise to provide local courses and indicated that much could be learnt from the Citizenship Foundation and Institute for Citizenship with regard to quality provision.

Developing knowledge, understanding and skills best came about, respondents highlighted, by providing opportunities for teachers to review and reflect on their progression through their CPD. As important as externally provided information and support was the generation of new knowledge and new forms of association among teachers themselves. Sharing ideas about what worked best across a school and within classrooms was seen as an important, and probably necessary, element of successful CPD.

Respondents were generally critical of one-off courses. Their views, consistent with reviews of what works best in CPD, highlight that time is needed for professionals to identify an aspect of practice on which to focus, compare what they do in relation to others, consider potential new activities and embed these into new ways of working. But there was little agreement among respondents about when teachers' learning might best take place. Times suitable for some teachers – activities on the weekend, during twilight hours, during holidays or term-time – were not necessarily so for others.

5.1.3. Findings from interviews with respondents – content

The breadth of Citizenship, along with a degree of variation among teachers with regard to their backgrounds and educational contexts, suggests that CPD must offer more than a set of prescribed topics to address.

National and regional respondents emphasised that participants in the CPD programme might need to learn, particularly, about different methods of assessing learning. Although prompted about particular areas of content – legal and human rights, electoral systems and resolving conflict, for example - school-based respondents noted that what they would need specifically to learn would depend in part on what they knew already. Furthermore, teachers in primary and special settings stated that they needed to address Citizenship-related topics and issues with a somewhat different emphasis than their colleagues in secondary schools.

Given the prominence placed on the active involvement of young people in Citizenship, a number of respondents suggested that participants would need to identify and review how best to involve pupils and to establish and consolidate links with local agencies and external professionals.

Responding to teachers' existing expertise suggests that a CPD programme should not be overly prescriptive in terms of content, yet lead participants through a series of activities that enable them to focus on a key areas of relevance to them – such as managing and leading provision, extending their own learning and embedding it into practice, and monitoring and reviewing the effect of the programme on their own work, on that of others, and on the school more generally.

5.1.4. Findings from interviews with respondents – assessing and recognising achievements

There was general agreement that portfolios or professional development records would be the chief way that teachers' learning might best be assessed. However, teachers were cautious about the amount of work, and the sorts of evidence, that portfolios required. Quality rather than quantity was the watchword, and other forms of assessment, especially assignments and observations, should not be overlooked as part of the assessment process.

Gaining CATS points and a certificate were important ways to recognise the successful completion of CPD. But teachers in particular felt that, back in school, a higher salary and status would be important markers of their contribution to the development of Citizenship.

5.2. Implications

Providing teachers with the means to assist pupils to gain the knowledge, skills and understanding necessary to play an effective role in society at local, national and international levels appears to require action at a number of levels. From respondents' accounts, many teachers would value CPD in Citizenship provided that it had a coherent theoretical background, further developed their expertise, was flexible in nature, and helped build new forms of collegiality within and across schools and local communities. Collaborative forms of CPD provision are needed.

5.2.1. The overall form of the CPD in Citizenship programme

Although few teachers interviewed had direct knowledge of it, national and regional respondents were almost unanimous that a CPD programme for Citizenship should follow the model of the CPD PSHE programme. If the DfES believes this to be the most appropriate route, and given findings from this study and from the evaluation of the pilot SRE Accreditation Scheme, it will be important to consider a number of key issues when developing the CPD in Citizenship programme.[3]

A pilot programme could be developed in three to six three trial sites involving around five teachers in each. Sites could be chosen so to ensure geographical spread (perhaps with and without a regional Citizenship adviser); the inclusion of schools with urban/suburban/rural intakes; the involvement of schools with varying percentages of free school meal entitlements; the involvement of schools with varying degrees of support from the senior management team; the involvement of schools with more or less well advanced Citizenship provision; the involvement of schools with or without citizenship AST support; and the involvement of special, primary and secondary schools.[4]

---

[3] The PSHE CPD programme was developed from the pilot SRE accreditation scheme. For further information see: http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RB376.pdf for a summary of the evaluation and http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR376.doc for the full report. Accessed 7 July, 2004.

[4] Including regions with and without a regional adviser would help identify the particular contribution of advisers to the development, implementation and review of local programmes. This would help identify whether advisers should be available within each region.

Respondents noted the importance of local support in a CPD programme. Therefore, in choosing sites, it may also be useful to consider the sorts of local support that might be provided by staff in LEAs and/or HEIs – although involvement of the latter might depend on whether the participation in the programme is likely to lead to an award of CATS points (see below).

Respondents highlighted that there is much potential in teachers learning from each other – sharing good, and identifying weak, practice, observing colleagues, reflecting on their route through the programme, and identifying how best to meet assessment criteria. This will require an active local lead, knowledgeable of Citizenship and skilled in the facilitation of others' learning. The training of local leads, and information about their role, should therefore be provided in advance of them facilitating groups of teachers. Much could be learned from those involved in the CPD PSHE programme about developing the role of local leads.

As with the CPD PSHE programme, financial resources are likely to be required for each school from which teachers are drawn to help ensure their participation in the CPD Citizenship programme.

5.2.2. Issues of content

Given the range of teachers' experience of, and practice in, Citizenship (as well as in recognition of the varying settings and circumstances within which they work) participants in a programme should be allowed an element of choice in focusing on particular areas of interest. Common features for all participants, however, are likely to include an assessment of the whole school's provision with regard to Citizenship, an assessment of their own and others' practice, an identification of changes needed, a review of changes tried and new teaching undertaken, and an outline of next steps. Given the responses of school-based, regional and national respondents about the content of a CPD programme, a particular emphasis should be placed on assisting teachers to extend their knowledge, understanding and skills in teaching and learning (and to include assessment activities) as well in successful ways of giving pupils a voice in matters that affect them.

Given the requirements of Citizenship in terms of pupil participation, participants in the CPD in Citizenship programme might benefit from identifying and trying out established, as well as innovative, activities that successfully involve children and young people.[5]

5.2.3. Assessing and recognising achievements

National and regional respondents were keen to see teachers' participation in the programme assessed by use of a professional development record (PDR) or portfolio. Teachers, however, appeared at least as keen on a range of other forms of assessment (including assignments or write-up of projects). If a PDR is to be used as the method of assessment, criteria for this will be required in advance of teachers' involvement in the pilot programme. Criteria could seek to draw on teachers' interests in producing a range of forms of evidence of development in their professional practice.

Although there may be value in awarding CATS points on teachers' successful completion of the programme, the DfES should consider whether and at what level teachers should be examined (Diploma or Masters, for example). However, whichever level might be chosen, each will require

---

[5] See, for example: http://www.qca.org.uk/ages3-14/downloads/Pupil_voice.pdf Accessed 29 July, 2004

work over and above that required for the completion of a PDR similar to that used in the CPD PSHE programme. Rather than making examination compulsory, and requiring teachers to undertake the extra work involved, optional registration on a Diploma or Masters module could be offered in collaboration with HEIs.

With assessment by PDR or portfolio comes the need to identify, train and support assessors. The CPD PSHE programme has an existing national network of assessors, some working in LEAs, others working freelance, and all of whom require payment for assessment and moderation. Their expertise is likely to prove invaluable in setting up the pilot programme and contributing to the development of a CPD handbook (that highlights, among other things, the nature of the programme overall, teachers' route through the programme, the support to which they are entitled, by when local meetings should be held, standards teachers should meet, the nature of the PDR, examples of types of evidence for submission in a PDR).[6] In addition, assessors should meet with local leads (and interested stakeholders – such as Regional Advisers) to develop a shared understanding of the programme and, in particular, the purpose and nature of the PDR.

Consideration will need to be given to how teachers' successful completion of their CPD might best be recognised. While teachers hope for increased status and pay, gaining this may be dependent to a degree on the priority given to Citizenship and CPD in teachers' own schools. Whether the DfES might make recommendations to schools about this is open to question.

A national event could award teachers with a DfES certificate – such ceremonies proving popular with many teachers completing the CPD PSHE programme.

5.2.4. *Formative evaluation*

Concurrent with the implementation of the pilot CPD Citizenship programme, a process of evaluation should take place. This should identify whether and how participation in the programme extends teachers' confidence, knowledge, understanding, and skills in Citizenship as well as changes they make at the school level. It might also consider, in the longer term, whether and how improvements are being made to pupil level outcomes (although this, in part, may be addressed by a study underway at NFER).

Where examples of good and/or innovative practice are found among those participating in the programme (particularly with regard to giving pupils a voice, and assessment, teaching and learning strategies), the DfES should seek to find ways to disseminate this among others. This is likely to go beyond the provision of printed materials, and bring together teachers (and others where necessary) to consider and identify whether and in what ways they could adapt and adopt new ways of working in their own schools.

5.2.5. *Raising the profile of Citizenship among those in schools*

Over and above reproducing the elements that constitute the CPD PSHE programme, the DfES might wish to consider putting in place brief INSET events in selected schools that help raise the profile and status of the subject among teachers, members of SMTs, governors and members of local communities. Again, pilot events would help identify what works best, with which people under particular school circumstances and local contexts.

---

[6] See, for example, the handbook produced for the PSHE CPD programme. Available online at:
http://www.wiredforhealth.gov.uk/PDF/PSHE-revised29-03.pdf Accessed 7 July, 2004.

5.2.6. Providing leadership

To oversee the new CPD programme, a national lead or coordinator will be needed. There is no clear evidence from this study where such a person might be based, but options include the DfES, the Association for Citizenship Teaching, the Institute for Citizenship, ITT Citiz Ed, an LEA or an HEI. Of key importance, however, is that the national lead/coordinator has expertise in Citizenship and CPD and the qualities needed to consult and negotiate with national, regional, local and school-based stakeholders and works within a supportive organisation. A steering and/or an advisory group could provide a forum for accountability and could offer support to the lead/coordinator in their work.

A new programme of CPD in Citizenship is likely to go some way towards improving the provision of CPD in schools. That said, new forms of leadership are necessary to provide a supportive context for those coordinating and teaching the subject. Senior managers and leaders in schools, with the DfES, could now take action to raise the profile of Citizenship and the priority afforded it. Raising the subject's status would help ensure that teachers, expectantly newly skilled and motivated by CPD, could contribute more fully to extending pupils' learning.

References

Brown, S., Edmonds, S., & Lee, B. (2001) *Continuing Professional Development: LEA and School Support for Teachers*. Slough: NFER

Cordingly, P., Bell, M., Rundell, B., & Evans, D. (2003) The impact of collaborative CPD on classroom teaching and learning, in *Research Evidence in Education Library*. London: EPPI Centre, Social Science research Unit, Institute of Education.

Davies, I. (2000) *Implementing Citizenship Education: Can it be Done?* The School Field, XI (3/4) 91-110.

DfEE/QCA (1999) *Citizenship: the National Curriculum for England*. London: DfEE/QCA.

DfEE/QCA (1998) *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools: Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship 22 September 1998*. London: DfEE/QCA.

General Teaching Council for England (2003) *The Teachers' Professional Learning Framework*. London: GTC.

Halpern, D., John, P., & Morris, Z. (2002) Before the Citizenship Order: A Survey of Citizenship Education Practice in England. *Journal of Education Policy*, 17(2) 217-228.

Hartas, D. (2003) Special Educational Needs in Citizenship. In Gearon, L. (ed.) *Learning to Teach Citizenship in the Secondary School*. London: Routledge/Falmer.

Holden, C. (2000) Ready for Citizenship? *A Case Study of Approaches to Social and Moral Education in Two Contrasting Primary Schools in the UK*. The School Field, X1(1/2) 117-130.

Hustler, D., McNamara, O., Jarvis, J., Londra, M. & Campbell, A. (2003) *Teachers' Perceptions of Continuing Professional Development*. London: DfES.

Kerr, D., Cleaver, E., Ireland, E. & Blenkinsop, S. (2003) *Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study First Cross-Sectional Survey 2001-2002*. London: DfES.

Neuman, W.L. (2002) *Social Research Methods*. London: Allyn & Bacon.

Ofsted (2002) *Inspecting Citizenship 11-16 with guidance on self-evaluation*. London: Ofsted.

Ofsted (March 2002) *Continuing Professional Development for Teachers in Schools*. London: Ofsted. HMI 410.

Ofsted (July 2002) *Citizenship Survey Report: Preparation for the Introduction of Citizenship in Secondary Schools 2001-2*. Ofsted: HMI 730 E-Publication only.

Ofsted (2003) *National Curriculum Citizenship: planning and implementation 2002/03*. London: Ofsted.

Pritchard, R., Jane, J. & Marshall, C. (2002) Professional Development in 'Healthy' vs. 'Unhealthy' Districts: top 10 characteristics based on research, in *School Leadership and Management*, 22(2): 113-141.

QCA (2001) *Planning, reaching and assessing the curriculum for pupils with learning difficulties: Personal, social and health education and citizenship*. London: QCA.

Appendix One – Interview Schedules

a) National and regional respondents
b) School based professionals

Appendix One
a)

Interview Schedule –Key National & Regional Stakeholders

- We are carrying out a study to help determine the design of a certification scheme or programme in Citizenship education. The findings from this and other interviews will be written up into a report for the consideration by the DfES.
- We would like to ask for your views about the form and the content of a certification scheme or programme, as well as any other suggestions you have about CPD in Citizenship.
- The interview will last about 30 minutes over the telephone or about 45-60 minutes face to face.
- Any information we receive from you will be reported anonymously.
- If it is ok with you, we would like to tape record the interview. This will help us later to write-up the themes and issues you highlight.
    o Check that the interviewee agrees to the tape-recording

About You

1) Name
2) Position and organisation represented
3) Could you say a little about your professional background
    a) *Prompts:*
        i) *Involvement in Citizenship Education*
        ii) *Work related to supporting CPD*

Background and Context

4) In your view, what are the key challenges facing the development, planning and teaching of Citizenship education in schools?
    a) *Prompts*
        i) *Strengths*
        ii) *Areas for development*
        iii) *Opportunities*

5) What are your expectations of a new Citizenship CPD scheme or programme?
    a) *Prompts*
    b) *Immediate (within one year)*
    c) *Medium term (within 5 years)*

6) Before we ask you about your thoughts about a Citizenship CPD scheme, could tell us about any excellent CPD schemes/programmes more generally that you believe have really helped to improve teachers' professional practice?
    a) *Prompts:*
        i) *What might be learnt from these existing schemes that could be used to develop the Citizenship CPD programme?*

7) What existing CPD structures and contexts do you know of that might support or hinder a CPD certification scheme in Citizenship education?
   a) *Prompts:*
      i) *Nationally*
      ii) *Regionally*
      iii) *Locally*

8) Who should design and facilitate a scheme of CPD in Citizenship?
   a) *Prompts:*
      i) *Development of a scheme*
      ii) *Provision of a scheme*
      iii) *Moderation and assessment*
      iv) *Recognition of achievement*

9) Could you say a little about who or what might provide support for teachers involved in CPD certification for Citizenship education?
   a) *Prompts:*
      i) *Support at school, local, regional and national levels*
      ii) *Key people who might be helpful*
      iii) *Training events*

The Form and Content of a scheme of CPD in Citizenship Education

10) What kinds of topics and issues should be included in a scheme for CPD in Citizenship education?
   a) *Prompts:*
      i) *Inclusion and participation of ALL pupils: in school and in the community*
      ii) *Issues related to diversity and social cohesion*

11) What methods of CPD might be most helpful for teachers of Citizenship?
   a) *Prompts:*
      i) *Other local networks*
      ii) *Coaching or mentoring,*
      iii) *Input from LEAs and HEIs, INSET?*

12) Could you outline the kinds of written materials that might be developed to support teachers through the certification process?

13) What modes of assessment would be most helpful for a scheme of CPD in Citizenship education?

14) How best might the achievements of teachers be recognised?
   a) *Prompts:*
      i) *The types of evidence you would find credible and persuasive*

The Involvement of Teachers in a scheme of CPD in Citizenship education

15) What might attract teachers to a certification scheme?
 a) *Prompts:*
  i) *Subject specialists (who have a PGCE in Citizenship)*
  ii) *Teachers who have transferred their skills to Citizenship*

16) How might teachers best be recruited into a certification scheme?
 a) *Prompts:*
  i) *Types of schools that might benefit particularly*
  ii) *Teachers who might benefit particularly*

17) What particular challenges might be faced by teachers of KS 1and 2, special schools and post-16 entitlement?

Making the Scheme Work

18) Can you foresee any blocks/barriers or risks that might limit the success of a CPD scheme?
 a) *Prompts*
  i) *Financial resources (national, regional, local)*
  ii) *Time*

19) Is there anything else about CPD and certification in Citizenship education that you would like to add?

Prompts for HEIs and <u>other course providers</u>: Ask if possible to have course materials.

Thank you for your time

Appendix One
b)

Interview Schedule
School Based Professionals

- We are carrying out a study to help determine the design of a certification scheme or programme in Citizenship. The findings from this and other interviews will be written up into a report for the consideration by the DfES.
- We would like to ask for your views about the form and the content of a certification scheme or programme, as well as any other suggestions you have about CPD in Citizenship.
- We are particularly interested in you and your school's needs in relation to policy development, managing citizenship education, specialist subject knowledge, teaching and learning methods and issues relating to assessment.
- The interview will last about 30 minutes over the telephone or about 45-60 minutes face to face.
- Any information we receive from you will be reported anonymously.
- If it is ok with you, we would like to tape record the interview. This will help us later to write-up the themes and issues you highlight.
  - *Check that the interviewee agrees to the tape-recording*

About You and Your School

1. Name

2. School

3. Relevant contextual factors
   a. *Primary/Secondary/Special*
   b. *Rural/urban*
   c. *Faith based (please state which)*
   d. *Single sex/mixed*
   e. *Size of school*
   f. *Other factors – please highlight any that seem important*

4. Position in school

5. Could you say a little about your professional background?
   a. *Involvement in Citizenship to date*
   b. *Specialist Qualification in Citizenship (PGCE/Other)*
   c. *Other PGCE or B.Ed*
   d. *How long you have been involved in the management/delivery of Citizenship in your school?*

6. How is Citizenship provided/delivered in your school?
Prompts:
   a. *Through tutorials*
   b. *As a cross-curricular theme*
   c. *As a timetabled subject*
   d. *Combined with another timetabled subject*
   e. *Through suspended timetabled days*
   f. *Through Whole School approaches*
   g. *Other?*

7. Who is involved in the design and provision/delivery of Citizenship?
   Prompts:
      a. *All class tutors*
      b. *A dedicated team*
      c. *One or two co-ordinators*
      d. *School leaders – which ones?*
      e. *Governors*
      f. *Parents*
      g. *Students*
      h. *Community Members*
      i. *Invited guests*
      j. *Others?*

About Your Involvement in a Scheme of CPD in Citizenship

8. What would attract you or staff working in your school to CPD in Citizenship?
   Prompt as appropriate:
      a. *For secondary subject specialists (who have a PGCE in Citizenship)*
      b. *For secondary teachers who have transferred their skills to Citizenship*
      c. *For Primary teachers*
      d. *For Special School Teachers*

9. Can you name any other CPD schemes that have really helped to improve teachers' professional practice? If 'yes', what can be learnt from these existing schemes that could be used to develop the Citizenship CPD programme?

10. In which areas do you, or the staff providing/delivering Citizenship in your school, need to develop and improve subject knowledge?
   Possible areas to use as prompts:
      a. *Legal and human rights*
      b. *National, regional, religious and ethnic identities*
      c. *Central and local government*
      d. *Parliamentary and other forms of government*
      e. *Electoral systems*
      f. *Community-based, national and international voluntary groups*
      g. *Resolving conflict*
      h. *Media in society*
      i. *Global community*
      j. *Other?*

11. Which skills do you, or the staff providing/delivering Citizenship in your school, need to develop and improve in relation to Citizenship?
   Prompts:
      a. *Developing policy*
      b. *Supporting pupils to develop skills in enquiry, communication etc.*
      c. *Promoting participation (in and out of school) among pupils*
      d. *Talking about sensitive and controversial issues*
      e. *Methods of Teaching and Learning for Citizenship Education*
      f. *Pupil assessment in Citizenship Education*
      g. *Other?*

12. What would a good CPD Citizenship programme enable you to do differently in your school?
    Prompts:
    a. *Policy development*
    b. *Management*
    c. *Teaching and Learning Methods*
    d. *Other?*

13. *[For Primary/Special School teachers]* Are there any special factors that are important for you as a primary/special school teacher?

About the Form, Content, Assessment and Recognition of a Scheme of CPD in Citizenship Education

14. Who should design, provide and facilitate a scheme of CPD in Citizenship?
    Prompts:
    a. *LEAs*
    b. *HEIs*
    c. *Combination of the two*
    d. *Other(s)*

15. What methods of CPD would be best?
    Prompts:
    a. *Type of contact with tutors/facilitators*
    b. *Type of contact with colleagues and peers taking part in CPD*
    c. *Input from LEAs and HEIs, INSET?*
    d. *Other?*

16. When should taught components of a CPD scheme be run?
    Prompts:
    a. *Twilight sessions*
    b. *INSET days or ½ days,*
    c. *During school holidays.*
    d. *During term-time with cover provided*
    e. *Other?*

17. Could you outline the kinds of written materials that should be developed to support teachers through the certification process?
    Prompts:
    a. *Please name any good materials that already exist for Citizenship Education – what makes them effective?*
    b. *Examples of other good CPD materials – what makes them effective?*
    c. *Should materials be available as hard copies, online or both?*

18. How might the learning of those taking part in Citizenship CPD best be assessed?
    Prompts:
    a. *Portfolio*
    b. *Assignment*
    c. *Other forms of assessment?*

19. In what ways might teacher's achievements best be recognised?
    Prompts:
        a. *Certification*
        b. *CATS points towards higher qualification?*
        c. *Other?*

20. Who or what should provide key support for teachers involved in CPD in Citizenship?
    Prompts:
        a. *Support at school, local, regional and national levels*
        b. *Key people who might be helpful*

21. What would help and hinder participation for you or other staff in your school?
    Prompts:
        a. *Time away from school?*
        b. *Involvement in other CPD programmes?*
        c. *Financial resources?*
        d. *Other?*

22. *[For primary and special school teachers only]* Are there any special considerations for you as a primary/special school teacher?

23. Is there anything else about CPD and certification in Citizenship that you would like to add?

Thanks