Deconstructing the Carter Review: Competing conceptions of quality in England's 'school-led' system of initial teacher education

Trevor Mutton, Katharine Burn and Ian Menter
University of Oxford, Department of Education

Author details

Trevor Mutton (corresponding author)
University of Oxford, Department of Education
15 Norham Gardens
Oxford OX2 6PY
01865 611000
trevor.mutton@education.ox.ac.uk

Katharine Burn
University of Oxford, Department of Education
15 Norham Gardens
Oxford OX2 6PY
01865 274009
katharine.burn@education.ox.ac.uk

Ian Menter
University of Oxford, Department of Education
15 Norham Gardens
Oxford OX2 6PY
01647 253290
ian.menter@education.ox.ac.uk

Biographical details

Trevor Mutton
Trevor Mutton is Associate Professor of Education at the University of Oxford and is the Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) Course Director. He teaches on both the PGCE and the MSc in Learning and Teaching.

Katharine Burn
Katharine Burn is Associate Professor of Education at the University of Oxford. She is Director of the Oxford Education Deanery (a research and professional learning partnership with local schools) and teaches on the PGCE and MSc in Learning and Teaching.

Ian Menter
Ian Menter is Emeritus Professor of Teacher Education and Emeritus Fellow of Kellogg College, University of Oxford.

Abstract

The commitment to establishing a 'school-led' system of teacher education in England, announced by the Coalition Government in 2011 (DFE, 2011) and relentlessly pursued thereafter, represented a radical departure from previous kinds of initial teacher education partnership. While it is entirely consistent with a neo-liberal agenda, with its strong regulatory framework and appeal to market mechanisms, it is also underpinned by a particular conception of teaching as a craft - 'best learnt as an apprentice observing a master craftsman or woman' (Gove, 2010). In 2014 the Government established a Review of Initial Teacher Training, led by a primary school headteacher, Sir Andrew Carter. This signalled the recognition of teacher education as a 'policy problem', adopting Cochran-Smith's term. The ensuing report, published in early 2015, was more nuanced than might have been anticipated although a number of profound tensions emerge from a closer analytical reading; four of these tensions are similar to those previously defined by Cochran-Smith and two are newly emergent. This paper identifies and discusses these tensions as they appear in the Carter Review and relates them to wider debates about the links between teaching, teacher education, evidence and research and to policy making processes in education.

1. Introduction

The history of teacher education in England over the past three decades has seen a 'pendulum swing' (Murray and Mutton, 2016) away from the dominance of higher education institutions (HEIs) towards a greater role for schools and teachers in the formation of beginning teachers. As far back

as 1984, the drive towards more 'practical preparation of teachers, involving more classroom experience' (Craft, 1984, p.338) was already evident, but Craft, writing shortly before the publication of government Circular 3/84 (DES, 1984), was nevertheless arguing that 'the role of theoretical analysis in the development of critical judgement and as a training in professional adaptability is not to be minimised' (1984, p.338). These arguments continue to reverberate in the English teacher education context more than thirty years on and reflect the notion of teacher education as a '*policy problem'* (Cochran-Smith, 2005).

The purpose of this paper is to locate recent policy development in England in the wider international context and illustrate the way in which the 'practicum turn in teacher education' (Mattsson et al., 2011, p.17), a trend identified by researchers across the world, has here followed its own particular course. Whether the Carter Review of Initial Teacher Training (Carter, 2015) comes to be interpreted as a defining moment in the history of teacher education in England or merely another manifestation of the pendulum swing described above remains to be seen, but we would argue that what it represents is something of wider significance. Such significance is rooted in the fact that its attempt to grapple with the complexity of the perceived 'policy problem' is obliged to be conducted within the constraints of an ideologically-driven, national teacher education policy which has privileged school-based experience per se (regardless of the nature of that experience and the processes of learning involved within it) over all other forms of professional learning. It is of profound importance not only for all those involved in teacher education in England (policy makers and teacher educators) but also for those working in other contexts where 'policy borrowing' (Philips & Ochs, 2003) is a common feature.

At its most fundamental this 'practicum turn' is represented by the '*drive for increased opportunities for school experience during initial teacher preparation'* (Conroy et al., 2013, p.558), a feature of teacher education policy both in England and internationally (see Darling-Hammond and Lieberman, 2012a). It could be argued, however, that it is not only the amount of time spent in schools that should be seen as the determining factor but rather the *quality* of that experience and the nature of the 'clinical practice'. The term clinical practice, used widely in the literature to designate those programmes that afford beginning teachers opportunities not only '*to rehearse and refine such skills, but also to engage in the creative processes of interpretation, intervention and evaluation, drawing on diverse sources of knowledge, including research evidence as well as student data*' (Burn & Mutton, 2013, p.3), requires all aspects of such programme to be aligned (Hammerness, 2006). Hagger and McIntyre (1996) argue for the potential of a school-based programme of initial teacher education but they are not working from the premise that an increased amount of time spent in schools is sufficient in itself; they too are calling for a model of professional learning that draws on a *range* of different sources. In such a model the valuable contribution of research-based understandings is acknowledged and promoted, and the university is recognised as having a distinctive role to play. However, Ellis (2010; see also Ellis and Orchard, 2015), in his critique of school-based teacher education, argues that even such a model fails to take into account either the nature of *what* beginning teachers learn from experience or the 'social situation of that learning' (2010, p.116).

Similar concerns about the 'policy problem' of teacher education have been examined elsewhere. In its 2010 briefing paper, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education reflected on what were perceived as the key problems in the US context and concluded that:

> *(s)everal studies have found that, when a well-supervised clinical experience precedes or is conducted jointly with course work, teacher candidates appear more able to connect theoretical learning to practice, become more comfortable with the process of learning to teach, and can more ably enact what they are learning in practice* (AACTE, 2010, p.4).

This has been acknowledged in many teacher education programmes across the world where the importance of integrating different sources of knowledge (for example, research-based understandings and the knowledge gained from practical experience in the classroom) has been recognised as the way to enable beginning teachers to draw on all such sources as they seek to make sense of their own classroom experiences (see Burn, Hagger & Mutton, 2015). The process by which such learning occurs has been described variously as 'judgment in practice' (Alter & Coggshall, 2009, p.3), 'clinical reasoning' (Kriewaldt & Turnidge, 2013, p.104) and 'practical theorizing' (Hagger & McIntyre, 2006, p.58). Although there are differences in these conceptualisations, they all '*convey the necessity of bringing research-based understandings of teaching and learning into dialogue with the professional understandings of experienced classroom teachers'* (Burn and Mutton, 2013, p.3) and are dependent on close partnership and collaboration between the university and school. Yet such collaborative partnerships have not always been evident, either in England (Furlong et al., 2000) or elsewhere (Zeichner & Bier, 2014). One of the few collaborative partnerships in England identified by the Modes of Teacher Education (MOTE) project was the Oxford Internship Scheme (Benton 1990), whose underpinning principles were developed around the need for effective integration of all aspects of the programme, and in particular the distinctive contributions of both the school and the university (McIntyre, 1990). A key aspect of such partnerships, both in England and internationally, has been the integrated nature of their programmes within models of 'research-informed clinical practice' (Burn & Mutton, 2013). Such models assume distinctive roles for HEIs and schools, each drawing on particular knowledge bases but working closely in partnership with each other, yet the emphasis on the 'practicum turn' could be seen to challenge the nature of these partnerships.

Such an emphasis on the practicum experience often carries with it implied (if not, at times, explicit) criticism of the university components of teacher education programmes and such criticism was particularly noticeable in England in the policy discourse associated within the 2010-2015 Coalition Government's reforms of teacher education (see Childs & Menter, 2013, for an analysis). These reforms had, at their heart, a conception held by policy makers that '(t)eaching is a craft and it is best learnt as an apprentice ...' (Gove 2010) and the view that teaching can only be learned in the context of school classrooms. While the limited nature of these conceptions has been strongly criticised (see, for example, Winch et al., 2015), ongoing initiatives since the publication of the Government's 2010 White Paper, *The Importance of Teaching*, have consistently sought to '(r)eform

initial teacher training so that more training is on the job' (DfE, 2010, section 2.6). While the reforms in England clearly reflect particular priorities in government policy, they are also consistent, with broader trends internationally which see governments aspiring '*to intervene in order to have greater influence, if not control, over the form and content of initial teacher education more directly than in the past*' (Furlong et al, 2013: 2)

The clear view of politicians in the Coalition Government in England was that 'schools should play a greater role in leading the recruitment, selection and training of teachers' (DfE, 2011, p.11, paragraph 3.1), a policy leading to the development of the School Direct[1] programme, the encouragement of more schools to become accredited providers, in their own right, of postgraduate programmes of initial teacher training (ITT) and the prioritisation of government-allocated training places to existing high quality school-centred ITT providers (SCITTs[2]). Such policy developments seemed at odds with what was happening elsewhere in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland, where separate reviews of teacher education (see Donaldson, 2011 in Scotland; Sahlberg et al, 2013 in the Republic of Ireland; Tabberer, 2013, and Furlong 2015 in Wales; Sahlberg et al, 2014 in Northern Ireland) resulted in proposals for reform that sought to strengthen partnerships between HEIs and schools within a collaborative framework rather than a market-driven model. The proposals put forward by these various reviews appeared to focus less on the practical and logistical arrangements for partnership, as was arguably the case with the reforms in England, and more on partnership as the context for beginning teachers' learning (Mutton, 2016). The same might also be said in relation to the recent review of initial teacher education carried out in Australia (TEMAG, 2014)

The relentless pursuit of a 'school-led' system of teacher education in England was accompanied by what was perceived to be a desire to reduce (or, as some believed, even remove) the role of universities in the training of teachers. Such concerns are reflected in the House of Commons Education Committee (2012) Report which, while welcoming many of the initiatives to allow more schools to become directly involved in the training of teachers, clearly states the necessity for high quality ITT partnerships and warns that '*the diminution of universities' role in teaching (sic) training could bring considerable demerits and (we) would caution against it*' (2012, p.4).

The commissioning of the Carter Review

[1] School Direct was introduced in 2012 as a government initiative in England to give schools a greater say in the recruitment of trainee teachers and the delivery of ITT programmes (see https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-school-led-teacher-training-programme-announced for details). Under the schemes a school would register as a 'lead school' and negotiate a training partnership with a university.

[2] SCITT programmes are designed and delivered by groups of neighbouring schools and colleges and are accredited ITT providers in their own right. All offer programmes leading to Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) and many also work in conjunction with a university to award the Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).

This then was the context in which, in May 2014, the then Secretary of State for Education, Michael Gove, announced an independent review of the quality and effectiveness of ITT courses in England, the aims of which were to: define effective ITT practice; assess the extent to which the current system delivers effective ITT; recommend where and how improvements could be made; recommend ways to improve choice in the system by improving the transparency of course content and methods (DfE, 2014).

Sir Andrew Carter, the Headteacher of a 5-11 Academy[3] and leader of a SCITT provider (as well as being the ITT lead on the Teaching Schools Council[4]) was the person appointed to chair the Review and a small panel was subsequently selected to work with him. The appointment of the panel members by the government was not without some controversy since there was little representation from experienced teacher educators; the panel comprised two university academics (just one of whom was involved in teacher education); the Chief Executive Officer of a large academy chain; the executive principal of a secondary school and director of an educational trust; and the research and development manager of another large academy chain. Given the composition of the Review panel and its commission to address what the Secretary of State for Education himself had identified in speeches and newspaper articles as the underlying causes of the perceived problems of teacher education (attributable, among other things, to the pernicious influence of university-based academics - see, for example, Gove (2013), writing in the Daily Mail), it was easy to assume, in spite of the designated independent status of the Review, that its judgements and recommendations would tend to favour ITT approaches that reflected the thrust of government policy since 2010.

The Carter Report was published in January 2015 (Carter, 2015), along with the government's response (DfE, 2015a). The latter was supportive of the Review's findings and indicated where specific recommendations would be taken forward, but the appearance of the final report just weeks before the 2015 parliamentary elections and the explicit reference, within the government response, to disagreement in relation to certain recommendations between the two parties within the Coalition Government, meant that many of the recommendations were not implemented as a policy priority.

2. Methods

Drawing upon previous work that traces the complex interaction of different elements of neoliberal policy in teacher education (Childs & Menter, 2013), this paper provides a critical examination of the Carter Review and identifies the particular directions that it has taken in negotiating and arbitrating between competing conceptions of teacher quality and of professional learning. Taking the

[3] An Academy in this context is a state-funded but independently managed school.

[4] Teaching Schools are designated by the Government in recognition of their contribution to professional development and related matters. In late 2015, there were more than 600 Teaching Schools in England, which included Sir Andrew Carter's Academy (primary school).

framework developed by Cochran-Smith (2005) to delineate key features of 'the new teacher education', construed as a 'policy problem,' we use textual analysis to examine the ways in which the specific tensions that Cochran-Smith highlights play out within the recommendations of the Review (and in the government's response to it) and highlight other unresolved contradictions that it reveals within current initial teacher education policy development in England. In using the term 'policy problem' Cochran-Smith does not do so '*in the pejorative sense but in the sense that all developing and developed countries must deal with certain challenges or problems ...* '(2005, p.4). She argues that:

> *the central thesis or theory of reform behind the construction of teacher education as a policy problem is consistent: The implementation of appropriate policies regarding teacher education will solve the teacher supply problem and enhance the quality of the teachers being prepared for the nation's schools, thus leading to desired school outcomes, especially pupils' learning.* (2005, p.6)

The process of implementing such policies does, however, give rise to certain tensions - competing priorities or principles of practice in framing and resolving the 'problem', that potentially operate in direct opposition to one another. Cochran-Smith identifies four such tensions:

- Regulation/deregulation
- Multiple sites/university
- Subject matter/pedagogy
- Diversification/selectivity

These binaries were used as analytical tools in our deconstruction of the Carter Review. The process began with detailed examination of each paragraph within the Review in order to categorise its content in relation to the four designated constructs. Where the content did not relate to any of these constructs, it was initially assigned to an 'open category'. Two of the authors carried out the initial categorisation independently before comparing results, which were highly consistent in terms of the original constructs. Discussion of the material assigned to the open category led to the identification of two further lines of tension between competing constructs. The first was concerned with different conceptions of professionalism: the distinction between a moral or vocational calling and designated forms of behaviour. The second echoed Cochran-Smith's original distinction between 'subject content' and 'pedagogy' but as it applied not to what trainee teachers needed to learn, but to the way in which that programme of learning was conceived: either as a list of essential content to be delivered as a matter of urgency, or as a pedagogical process. The contrast between these two approaches became particularly apparent when the descriptive and analytical sections of the report were set alongside the specific recommendations made. These two additional tensions were summarised as:

- Moral purpose/professional behaviour
- Delivering 'urgent' content /teacher education pedagogy

The paper discusses each of these tensions and concludes with consideration of their implications: first for teacher education in England in general; second for the role of those working within teacher education; and finally for the role of research in teacher education. However , overarching these implications is the recognition that the document itself reflects these tensions and therefore cannot be read as a simple linear narrative. The close analysis reveals some degree of internal incoherence and contradiction.

3. Findings

3.1 Regulation/deregulation

The Report from Carter is very much framed by current regulations for Initial Teacher Training (ITT)[5]; it does not put forward any proposals which would require further deregulation, nor does it address, for example, the training of teachers who, under existing deregulated practices, are able to enter the profession without requiring qualified teacher status[6] , perhaps because this was seen to be beyond the brief of the Review. What it does concern itself with, however, is the issue of the devolution of responsibility for ITT so that schools are in the position of being full and equal partners in the formal arrangements which they have with ITT providers and have much greater control over the content of the ITT curriculum. The suggestion within the Review's first recommendation that '*a framework for core content'* should be developed by a '*sector body (for example the Teaching Schools Council)'*, or a similar body, illustrates this emphasis.

Overall the focus of the Review's recommendation is on strengthening levels of existing regulation as a way of addressing the perceived issues of quality and consistency across the sector. Many of the Review's recommendations call for government intervention in one form or another, including, for example, that the Government should: '*commission a sector body ... to develop a framework of core content for ITT*' (Recommendation 1); '*commission a sector body ...to develop some national standards for mentors*' (Recommendation 12); 'amend *the Teachers' Standards*' (Recommendation 6); and '*undertake a review of the effectiveness of the skills tests'* (Recommendation 15).

The Teachers' Standards (DfE, 2011b) themselves are referred to in the document as '*a clear baseline of expectations for professional practice'* (paragraph 2.2.1) and, since they '*set a common*

[5] The Review uses the term Initial Teacher Training or ITT throughout and so this is the term used here when discussing its findings. The beginning teachers are referred to in Government documents as 'trainees', so again this is the language that predominates here.

[6] Under changes to the funding arrangements for schools converting to academy status (see footnote 1 above) the government announced, in July 2012, that "*head teachers in mainstream and alternative provision academies will be given greater freedom over the teachers they employ - giving them the same advantages as independent schools, free schools, studio schools and university technical colleges*" (DfE, 2012)

expectation across the system about the knowledge, understanding and skills a new teacher must have' ,the implication is that there must be further regulation to ensure that course content is *'similar and consistent across the system'* (paragraph 3.3.1). Responsive to the nature of these standards as '*baseline thresholds for competence and conduct'* and, in essence, a '*performative tool*' (Kennedy, 2016), much of the Review is based on the view that initial teacher education needs only to equip beginning teachers to meet these 'baseline thresholds' (i.e. acquiring a set of core skills and practices) by means of the delivery of a programme of regulated content.

There is therefore a clear tension between regulation, on the one hand, and deregulation, on the other, which frames the policy context in which the Carter Review was carried out and which, to a certain extent, could be seen to influence both the scope of the Review and the nature of its recommendations. On the one hand there has been a drive from central government in England to give particular schools the freedom to recruit whoever they wish to recruit, regardless of whether or not the teacher in question has a teaching qualification. In addition, the expectation was clearly set out that, over a period of five to ten years, '*rather than government managing much of the ITT system centrally, schools should increasingly take on this responsibility*' (DfE, 2011a, paragraph 7, p. 15). Accompanying this deregulation, however, were specific measures simultaneously intended to tighten regulation in a number of areas which the government deemed to be problematic, including the '*more rigorous selection of trainees'* (DfE, 2011a, p.4) and the introduction of new professional standards intended to '*have a stronger focus on key elements of teaching'* (DfE, 2010, paragraph. 2.35, p.26).

These tensions reflect to some extent those spelt out by Cochran-Smith who sees deregulated practices in the United States (in terms of the diversity of entry routes and the relaxation of professional qualification requirements) being enacted alongside 'centralized federal control that diminishes state- and local-level decisions and greatly prescribes professional discretion and autonomy' (2008, p. 13). While the Carter Review focuses on the need for regulation, rather than any further deregulation, it needs to be viewed within the wider political context in England where deregulation is the means by which schools are given more freedom to appoint the teachers that they choose, regardless of whether they have actually received initial training or gained any kind of professional qualification. The Review also raises interesting questions as to why there needs to be an increase in regulation when the overall policy drive in England, since the publication of the White Paper (DfE, 2010), has been one of devolving responsibility so that decisions are made at a local level within a system of '*school-led teacher training'* (DfE, 2011a, p.15). Why, for example, are decisions about core content to be made by a central body through a regulatory framework rather than by local ITT partnerships?

3.2 Multiple sites/university

The notion of strong partnerships working at local level is actually, in itself, a central tenet of the Carter Review, with a clear emphasis on the need for schools to have 'ownership' of, and full participation in, such partnerships. The tone for the document is set in the Foreword which states

that '(t)*he truth is that partnership is the key*' and the document goes on to highlight what effective partnerships look like:

- *Effective partnerships utilise expertise from across the partnership – from both school partners and universities and between the different phases and subjects they offer.*
- *Effective partnerships are built on mutual respect and a shared vision as well as clearly defined and agreed roles.*
- *Effective partnerships require a critical mass of expertise. Partnerships should be sufficiently diverse so that they can facilitate opportunities for trainees to access a range of settings and contexts and types of expertise (ideally allowing access to Special Schools, PRU[7]s and other contrasting settings). We believe the most effective partnerships include a range of types of schools as well as a university partner.* (paragraph 2.4.14)

Partnership is an area in which the Review neither highlights any significant deficit nor identifies specific recommendations for improvement, other than to note that all schools should identify and, where practical, participate in such partnership arrangements. The high quality of much existing provision is recognised and it is acknowledged that it '*is very difficult to draw conclusions about whether one route into teaching is any more effective than another*' (paragraph 3.2.1). Indeed, such comparisons are regarded as unhelpful in determining quality. Interestingly the Review does not call for increased time during the training period to be spent in school but instead demands that the content of training programmes should be consistent, regardless of the context in which that training occurs. The stipulation that any programme should be planned and enacted as a result of full agreement between the partners involved actually echoes the conception of the 'collaborative partnerships' identified by the Modes of Teacher Education (MOTE) Project (Furlong et al, 2000). Such genuine partnerships were seen, at the time, to be very much the exception, with the dominant model being that of the '*HEI-led partnership'*. Indeed it could be argued that it was the long endurance of the latter that led to the changes in government policy that the Carter Review now seeks to consolidate through its call for schools to have a greater say in the content and delivery of ITT programmes.

What is interesting about the Review is the unacknowledged tension between traditional models of initial teacher preparation and more recent developments within a more market-driven approach. While officially setting aside questions of which model is better, the Review actually operates on the assumption that schools involved in the training of teachers are undertaking that work with a university partner. The implicit nature of this assumption is made clear in the acknowledgement that there are some things best addressed by the university and others that are best addressed within a school context, with the Review promoting the idea that these different aspects need to be planned collaboratively and fully integrated within ITT programmes. The Review also clearly endorses effective partnership working within such relationships, as well as the need for teachers to be

[7] Pupil Referral Units are local authority establishments providing education for children who are otherwise unable to attend a mainstream school for a range of reasons such as exclusion or long-term illness.

trained across multiple sites. There is, however, little if any acknowledgement that partnerships of this nature are no longer necessarily the status quo in England. The assertion in the Foreword that '*neither can do it alone*' ignores the reality that trainees can undergo training and receive Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) through programmes that have no university involvement at all. Although some SCITT provision may be offered in conjunction with a university partner (whose role in some cases, is confined to what are seen as the purely academic requirements of the Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) qualification), other SCITTs can and do operate without any such links.

This raises an interesting tension between the Government's policy to create more SCITTs in England which, according to its 'Get into Teaching' website '*provide practical, hands-on teacher training, delivered by experienced, practising teachers based in their own school or a school in their network*' (DfE, 2015) and the assertion in the Carter Review that *'the most effective partnerships include a range of types of schools as well as a university partner*' (paragraph 2.4.14). Likewise it raises the question as to how the '*critical mass of expertise'* across diverse settings can be achieved, if the training does not give access to such settings (for example, in small partnership in which the range of different types of school tends to be quite narrow).

3.3 Subject matter/pedagogy

Concerns about establishing a '*critical mass*' extend to other areas with the identification of issues that relate to '*smaller partnerships'* and the need to have '*a critical mass of subject expertise within a partnership to ensure that trainees have access to the expertise they need'* (paragraph 3.3.4). The Carter Review highlights the need for trainees to have both secure subject knowledge and to develop effective pedagogy. It does not privilege the former over the latter a view which, as Cochran-Smith (2005) points out, reflects' *the popular myth that there is little to know about teaching and schools, and what little there is can be easily picked up on the job'* (2005: p.12). The Review does, however, state strongly that neither subject knowledge nor subject pedagogy are given sufficient attention in many training programmes in England. While it acknowledges the reasons for this in specific cases (acknowledging the lack of capacity, for example, within small ITT partnerships or the demands of ensuring that primary teachers have sufficient subject knowledge across all curriculum areas), the general exhortation for systemic change accompanied by a set of recommendations (1a, 2, 3, 4 and 5) seems to imply the need to address this deficit across the current system as a whole. In terms of subject knowledge development, The Carter Review sees the answer lying in the establishment of stronger subject communities, with trainees having access to subject experts, and highlights the important role that subject associations can play.

Subject-specific pedagogy is also recommended (1b) as part of any framework of core content, but there is little indication in the Review as to what this might mean in practice. The paragraphs relating to models of teacher development (section 2.2) seem to indicate that appropriate subject-specific pedagogy is something that is rooted in a deep understanding of teaching and learning which draws on '*effective integration between the different types of knowledge and skills [that] trainees need to*

draw on in order to develop their own teaching' (paragraph 2.2.2). There is, however, no indication of how this is to be developed beyond its inclusion as one element of the core content of ITT programmes. Subject-specific pedagogy does indeed require the development of a wide range of professional knowledge and skills, including those areas defined by Bransford et al. (2007) as: knowledge of learners and learning, knowledge of subject matter and curriculum goals, and knowledge of teaching itself. In addition, trainee teachers need to be aware both of the underlying concepts of a particular subject, and of the steps by which a secure conceptual framework and increasingly powerful knowledge can be built (Shulman, 1986). This requires an awareness of the most common misconceptions, likely to impede students' understanding of key concepts within the subject. While the Review acknowledges that the process of acquiring such knowledge and skills is complex (paragraph. 2.2.1) and more specifically states the need for ITT programmes to '*address subject-specific issues, including phases of progression within the subject, linkages between subjects as well as common misconceptions and how to address them'* (paragraph. 2.3.13), the Review does not give any indication as to how different partners might each contribute to this development, beyond the broad endorsement of '*effective integration between different types of knowledge and skills*'. There is no suggestion, for example, as to how an appreciation of common misconceptions (which have been well researched in many subject disciplines) might be connected to practical diagnostic strategies for discerning which particular ideas are held by individual students or to planning for appropriate kinds of remedial action.

The inclusion of subject-specific pedagogy as a separate element within the Review represents a clear rejection of the view advanced by many neoliberal critics of teacher education that secure subject knowledge is essentially all that teachers require (Hillgate Group, 1986; Lawlor, 1990). The Review offered an opportunity to go further by addressing the ways in which partnerships are established and work together to provide access to the different kinds of knowledge on which effective pedagogy depends. But instead of elaborating the principles needed to underpin such working, and the ways in which different sources are actually brought together in the development of effective pedagogy, the inclusion of subject-specific pedagogy as simply one of a number of elements within a prescribed list of core content gives the impression that it can be mastered separately, rather than arising from the integration of the other elements.

3.4 Diversification/selectivity

The fourth aspect of Cochran-Smith's analytical framework focuses on the tension between a focus on training and recruiting teachers with the highest test scores themselves (based on the apparent correlation between such scores and pupil outcomes) and the need to develop a more diverse and representative teaching workforce. The Carter Review was not charged with examining issues of diversity but does focus on aspects of selection and recruitment associated with the clarity of information (or perceived lack of clarity) provided both for individuals wishing to apply to an ITT programme and for schools wishing to work with an accredited ITT provider. Overall the Review does not suggest that there are any problems with the level of qualifications of those training to teach. The problem, if there is acknowledged to be one, relates perhaps to their commitment and

endurance. What is important is for ITT programmes to '*create a robust workforce'* (Carter, 2015, p.4), although the nature of such robustness is not spelt out in the report itself. The introduction to the Review does acknowledge that there are differences among all those entering the profession, but only insofar as '*they range from those who come into the profession at an early age to others who are career changers'* (2015, p.3). Diversity is thus acknowledged in relation to particular kinds of needs among new entrants, but not in relation either to the kinds of teachers that diverse schools might require or to the particular knowledge teachers in such contexts might need. Given the value that the Teachers' Standards place on being able to '*(a)dapt teaching to respond to the strengths and needs of all pupils*' (DfE, 2011b), it is perhaps surprising that the importance of equipping beginning teachers to respond appropriately to the diversity of the school population is not an aspect of the 'core content' that the Carter Review opts to address.

3.5 Further tensions

Cochran-Smith's (2005) analysis of the 'new teacher education' provided the basis for our preliminary analysis of the Carter Review, by focusing attention on the positions that it adopted – or, more accurately, the tensions that it preserved – in relation to four central themes, each characterised by competing orientations. This principle of examining unresolved tensions alerted us to two further themes within which potentially conflicting imperatives can be observed, each of which was added to the framework for our systematic analysis of the Review. The first, which is obviously related to issues of regulation, is concerned with competing conceptions of professionalism. While the tensions that we discerned reflect the distinction that Sachs (2010) has drawn between 'democratic' and 'managerial' forms of professionalism, they find expression within the Review in the contrasts between the high moral purpose with which Carter imbues teaching and the much more restrictive notion of the professional behaviours that the Review seems to expect of teachers. The second echoes the tension between subject knowledge and subject pedagogy that we have already discussed in relation to the Review's conceptions of effective teaching. Here the same tension is considered not in relation to the trainees' practice as teachers but in relation to their own professional learning and the structure of their ITT programme – the extent to which it is considered in terms of the substantive content to be mastered or in relation to the processes of beginning teachers' learning, which calls for consideration of the pedagogy of initial teacher education.

3.5.1 Moral purpose/professional behaviours

One of the most striking emphases within the Foreword to the Review is that placed on the moral purpose that underpins it. The ambition to ensure that every child is taught by '*inspirational and skilled teachers*' is presented as a '*mighty and noble aim*' and this sense of moral purpose is examined in detail before the Review turns its attention to the specified elements that should make up the content of any ITT programme. In this discussion of 'the importance and purpose of 'good teaching'' (paragraph 2.3.6) the Carter Review cites, with approval, an extract from the submission presented to the Review team by the Association of School and College Leaders calling for a '*renewed focus on the moral imperative of teaching and the purpose of education, which we believe*

will create a strong sense of energy, collective purpose and professionalism'. Professionalism itself features again as the final element in the Review's discussion of the core content of ITT, but this very fact – the presentation of professionalism as content to be taught, rather than as consideration of what it means to act as a professional or to exercise professional judgment – betrays the enduring tension within the Review between what Sachs (2010) has characterised as 'democratic professionalism', which emerges from the profession itself (and thus acknowledges the scope for judgment in complex situations, underpinned by expert knowledge) and 'managerial professionalism' which is driven by an overriding emphasis on accountability and effectiveness.

The extent to which the managerial conception of professionalism prevails is revealed in part by the emphasis on pupil outcomes that precedes the discussion of the moral purpose of teaching, but it appears more obviously in the narrow terms in which '*professionalism*' is intended to be addressed within the specified content for ITT programmes. Essentially, this component relates to specific aspects of teachers' own behaviour, such as observing school '*dress-codes'* and maintaining '*appropriate boundaries with pupils'*, rather than to qualities of professionalism such as teachers' continued commitment to their own professional learning, or development of the capacity to make well-reasoned judgements between competing priorities. While the inclusion of training in '*resilience'* and '*time management'* suggests a concern for teachers' well-being, it essentially reflects an over-riding concern within the Review with ensuring efficiency and effectiveness in achieving pre-determined outcomes.

This is not to suggest that the Carter Review excludes alternative conceptions of professionalism. There remains an unresolved tension within the document, most clearly epitomised by the way in which it deals with the development of trainees' decision-making capacities and their abilities to engage effectively with research. The importance of professional judgment is, in fact, deeply embedded in the Review's formal discussion of 'models of teacher development'. Here the Review officially embraces the idea of learning to teach as a process of enquiry in which different sources of knowledge are brought together and subjected to critical scrutiny:

> *Programmes should be structured so that there is effective integration between the different types of knowledge and skills trainees need to draw on in order to develop their own teaching. Programmes that privilege either 'theory' or 'practice' fail to take account of the necessity of such integration. What is needed are models of 'clinical practice' (as described by Burn and Mutton, 2013), where trainees have access to the practical wisdom of experts and can engage in a process of enquiry, in an environment where they are able to trial techniques and strategies and evaluate the outcomes. Importantly, by making explicit the reasoning and underlying assumptions of experienced teachers, trainees are encouraged to develop and extend their own decision-making capacities or professional judgments.*
>
> (pp. 21-22, paragraph 2.2.2)

Not only are beginning teachers expected to learn through a process of enquiry; it is also suggested that they will learn to do so most effectively when they can see that experienced teachers themselves continue to engage in such processes:

> *We have found that the quality of this approach is strengthened where: schools see themselves as centres of professional learning; teachers collaborate in curriculum development, pupil assessment, and school improvement; the principle of schools as self-evaluating institutions is taken seriously; and, as a consequence, the notion of the teacher as researcher is continuously reinforced.* (p.22, paragraph 2.2.4)

Yet, despite the expression of these principles of a much more 'democratic' form of professionalism, it is notable that this particular section of the Review does not appear to give rise to any specific recommendations for practice. While a strong argument is made for careful integration of different sources of knowledge, there are no formal requirements (for example, about partnership structures) to ensure that it is achieved. As a result, this particular vision of professionalism as an autonomous capacity to draw critically on different sources of evidence in specific contexts tends to be overshadowed by more restricted notions.

Restrictions are also explicitly accepted in terms of beginning teachers' capacities to engage in and with research. Despite the earlier vision of trainees engaged '*in a process of enquiry'* (p.21) the discussion of 'evidence-based teaching' in defining the core content required of all ITT programmes concludes that trainees are unlikely within the time available during their training year to become more than '*intelligent consumers of research who take an evidence-based approach to their own practice.'* This emphasis on merely applying the findings of others' research is further endorsed by the Review's call for the development of '*a central portal of synthesised executive summaries, providing practical advice on research findings about effective teaching in different subjects and phases*' (Recommendation 7), and of '*a central repository of resources and guidance on assessment*' (Recommendation 9). The implications of furnishing beginners with such 'synthesised summaries' (from which discussions of the context of the research are likely to have been expunged) is that these distillations of research all too easily become simple prescriptions for practice.

3.5.2 Delivering 'urgent' content /teacher education pedagogy

The compromises that are expressed in settling for this much more restricted notion of research engagement reflect where the balance lies in relation to the final – and arguably, most important – tension that emerged from our analysis of the Review: that between defining teacher education in terms of the content to be mastered or defining it in relation to the kinds of pedagogy that are required.

The structure of the report, as implied by its contents page, suggests that both these dimensions of teacher education have been taken into account. The definition of ITT practice with which Section 2 is concerned, gives its attention first to discussion of 'Models of Teacher Development', which would

imply that a high priority has been accorded to the question of 'how teachers learn to teach' (Section 2.2). This discussion, in which it is clearly stated that '*what is needed is effective integration between the different types of knowledge and skills*' and a conception of learning to teach as '*a process of enquiry'* is followed first by an elaboration of the '*content'* required for '*effective ITT practice'* (Section 2.3) and then by a parallel section devoted to '*ITT Course Delivery'* (Section 2.4). This implies parity of esteem: clear acknowledgment of the importance of attending both to content and to pedagogy.

The section on the content of ITT courses begins with the elaboration of the moral purpose of teaching, discussed earlier, framed in terms that emphasise improved pupil outcomes as the means of achieving a 'fairer society' in which the link between socio-economic advantage and educational achievement is broken. Thereafter the content section deals, in turn, with what are presented as the eight essential components for any ITT programme, namely: subject knowledge development; subject-specific pedagogy; evidence-based teaching; child and adolescent development; behaviour management; assessment; differentiation and provision for students within special educational needs and disabilities (SEND).

In specifying what each of these dimension encompass, explicit attention is often given to the range of sources from which trainees will need to learn, with as much of an emphasis on the development of trainees' knowledge and understanding as on their practical skills. It is notable, for example, that the section on 'Behaviour Management', which has a predominant emphasis on practical strategies learned in large part from observation of a 'range of outstanding teachers', nonetheless argues that the strategies that trainees adopt should be '*evidence-informed'* and underpinned by '*deeper understanding of behavioural issues, securely grounded in their knowledge of child development'*. In similar fashion, the section on assessment details a range of '*theoretical content'*, '*core knowledge'* and even '*technical skill'* all of which '*can usefully be provided by universities'* – though it is interesting that here there is an apparent requirement for duplication in terms of the partners' roles since this content apparently also needs to be delivered '*in the context of schools and classrooms to ensure that trainees understand its relevance*'. The discussion of content thus implies careful consideration of the sources of trainees' learning, with attention also given, in some cases, to the processes by which they should learn. Paragraph 3.2.26, for example, highlights, the need for trainees not merely to observe expert teachers, but to be '*taught and mentored in what to look for*' and given '*structured opportunities for reflection where policy and practice is deconstructed and explained*'.

As might be expected, the parallel section on effective '*ITT Course Delivery'* gives even more explicit attention to the sources from which trainees need to be able to learn. The nature and variety of trainees' placements is given considerable attention, with praise for the innovative use of diverse settings, particularly those that allow focused attention to be given to priority issues, such as SEND and the needs of pupils for whom English is an additional language. Attention is also given to the structure of the course in terms of the scope for learning at different times of the year, with a strong argument advanced that learning about behaviour management specifically through observation

requires trainees to be present in school at the beginning of terms when expectations and routines are actually being established. The challenges of learning from unstructured observation, noted above, are also addressed in consideration of the qualities required in school-based mentors: not merely that they should model '*outstanding practice'* but that they should also be able to articulate the knowledge and thinking that underpins it. Mentors are also expected to act as conduits to the subject specific expertise available through subject associations and to serve as role models in terms of their own engagement with research.

While considerable attention is thus given to what should be learned in school – and from a range of different school contexts – the role of the university receives rather less explicit attention, though (as noted above) it is clearly assumed to be a relevant and important one, particularly associated with driving school improvement through its support for teachers' engagement with research. As we have noted, partnership is widely praised – and it is assumed that partnership implies a relationship between schools and a university rather than simply between schools. Effective partnerships are defined as those that achieve a '*seamless integration of different elements'*, based on '*mutual respect and a shared vision*'.

While course structure and teacher education pedagogy thus appear to be accorded as much attention as issues of course content in Section 2 of the Review, it is important to consider what happens to this balance in Section 3, which presents the Review's recommendations for policy and practice. The specific recommendations are set out in Appendix 1, which also illustrates how many of them are concerned with issues of content and how many are concerned with issues related to teacher education pedagogy (the sources and processes of learning and their implications for course structure).

There are three recommendations (1, 7 and 9) which are essentially concerned with the subject content of the ITT programme and three further recommendations (3, 4 and 5), looking beyond initial training itself, to students' prior educational experiences and to their subsequent professional development, that are also concerned exclusively with the knowledge that teachers need. Likewise other recommendations (8 and 2) focus on providing knowledge, rather than on the processes by which that knowledge might actually come to influence practice. Within Recommendation 10, which is also concerned with a specific content focus, that is knowledge related to SEND, the implications for course structure and ways of learning are more explicit, with a strong emphasis on learning from practical experience in particular specialist contexts.

There are three recommendations (11, 12 and 13) that are much more concerned with the sources of teachers' learning and how their access to knowledge is structured; two of these focus on ensuring high quality mentoring, while the third calls on all schools to seek out and participate in robust local partnership arrangements. Recommendation 6 which deals with teaching as an evidence-informed practice could be construed as concerned with both content and pedagogy, and its implications depend, as previously discussed, on the extent to which 'evidence-informed' is

associated with the application of the findings of the research syntheses called for in Recommendation 7, or is assumed to mean engagement in teaching as a process of enquiry.

Thus, while a degree of balance is certainly preserved within the recommendations of the Review, the emphasis tends towards the content to be covered. This is particularly true, when it is noted that Recommendation 1 contains seven separate sub-recommendations, enumerating all the specific areas of content that need to be addressed within the regulatory framework of core content for which the Review calls. The very fact that course content is presented as a matter for urgent regulatory action and is presented in this way, as a list of the distinct elements, all of which need to be covered, as essentially equal priorities, makes it much less likely that those charged with implementing the Reviews' recommendations or (as is happening already) those providers anxiously seeking to demonstrate their effectiveness by auditing their existing provision with reference to the Review's recommendations will pay serious attention to the ways in which their provision is structured or sequenced or to the effectiveness of its integration. Their overriding concern is likely to be explicit demonstration that they have the core areas of content 'covered' by one or other of the partners.

4. Discussion and conclusions

Detailed systematic analysis of the Carter Review reveals a much more complex and nuanced document than many of those engaged in initial teacher education in England had anticipated when the Review was established (see for example, The Guardian, 2014). Such analysis also demonstrates that the Review *as a whole* is also more complex and nuanced than an exclusive focus on its recommendations tends to imply. This is evident in the range of concerns that are revealed, some of which are indicative of issues facing policy makers in many countries of the world while others reflect very much the English context. These concerns are:

i. A concern '*to maintain a supply of outstanding teachers so that every child has the opportunity to be taught by inspirational, skilled teachers throughout their time in school*' (Foreword, p.3). This concern, presented as a *'challenge for the nation',* echoes Cochran-Smith's framing of teacher-education as a 'policy problem', one which governments across the world are seeking to address through a demand for systemic reform as a response to pressures to improve national educational performance within a global context (Tatto, 2006).

ii. A concern to acknowledge the nature of teaching as a profession. While there are several acute tensions associated with the way in which teachers' professionalism is conceptualised within the Review, teaching is clearly acknowledged to be a complex and demanding enterprise in which expertise is underpinned by an extensive knowledge base. The insistence that initial teacher training is only the first stage in a long process of professional learning further emphasises the fundamental importance of that wide-ranging knowledge and

expertise, but in also calling for further regulation and standardisation the Review may become self-defeating to the extent that it ultimately rejects the sort of 'democratic' professionalism (as opposed to 'managerial' professionalism) advocated by Sachs (2010).

iii. A concern that all new entrants should have access to the same high quality of training, regardless of the route by which they enter the profession. While many of the concerns that underpin the Review reflect those being addressed by teacher education policy makers across the world, this particular issue is very much one that relates to England, where the move towards what the government has designated as 'school-led teacher training' (DfE, 2011) has led to a proliferation of different routes, many offered by very small providers which makes it difficult to assure quality effectively.

iv. A concern for parity in terms of the status and influence of both schools and universities in the design and implementation of ITT programmes. While the Review adopts the assumption that all such programmes are 'school-led' – and thus calls upon schools to seek out 'robust partnerships' – it also assumes that all partnerships necessarily encompass both schools and universities and emphasises (though does not seek to mandate) integrated provision. While the review thus expresses an intention to overcome the enduring and problematic 'conceptual binary around theory/practice' and the related 'universities/school divide' (Murray & Mutton, 2016 p70) it fails to acknowledge the sustained effort that it has been found necessary to invest in achieving genuinely integrated models of 'research-informed clinical practice' (See Conroy et al. 2013 and Burn and Mutton, 2013 for examples of such programmes.)

v. A concern that the nature of the actual qualification awarded to teachers should be clearly defined and understood by all stakeholders. This concern pertains predominantly to England where all initial training routes lead to QTS but only those programmes accredited by a university lead to an academic qualification such as the PGCE.

vi. A concern that information about the nature of different training routes and how to apply to them should be readily accessible and easily understood by all potential applicants, ensuring the effective operation of the market, again a predominantly 'English' concern, given the proliferation of training routes (National Audit Office, 2016). There are nevertheless some echoes of this concern in the United States where there is a similar '*wide variability in programs and entry pathways to teaching'* (Darling-Hammond, 2012, p.136)

All of these concerns are addressed to a greater or lesser extent in the Review, but the nature of the document means that they are often dealt with separately, rather than in an integrated way, giving the impression of there being different (and sometimes, perhaps, competing) voices within it. This is particularly true in relation to the tensions identified between the conceptualisation of ITT programmes as a discrete list of topics to be covered and the careful consideration of the processes of beginning teachers' learning which calls for a focus on effective pedagogy and curriculum design. The distance of the Review's recommendations from the analysis of what contributes to effective ITT compounds this disjuncture.

In this respect, the Carter Review perhaps represents a missed opportunity to move beyond administrative conceptions of partnership that focus predominantly on organisational structures to exemplify, or even specify, how the different contributions to trainee teachers' learning through ITT programmes could be brought together in relation to the different dimensions of core content. As it stands, even where the Review has elaborated the different elements that might be contributed by particular partners, as in its discussion of the '*theoretical content, core knowledge and technical skills*' to be provided by universities in relation to assessment, it does not suggest how these might be integrated with insights gained from observation, analysis or discussion of practice in school.

This omission is understandable of course, given the ambiguous context in relation to the regulation of initial teacher education within which the Review was conducted, which in turn reflects the wider view of teacher education as a 'policy problem'. In these terms it is naturally the regulatory framework of teacher education which policymakers promote as being the key to improvements in the quality of teaching, since this is the area within their immediate control (Cochran-Smith, 2005). So, given the diversity of training routes that have been endorsed, it is much easier to prescribe the content that has to be provided than the ways in individual partnerships should function in order to facilitate effective processes of professional learning. It behoves teacher educators who are reading the Review, therefore, to interpret its wider analysis with an awareness of that context and an appreciation of the tensions inherent in framing teacher education as a 'policy problem'. Rather than simply treating its specific recommendations as a checklist by which to audit current provision in order to ensure 'coverage of the key aspects of the core content', it is important to focus instead on the ways in which provision of different kinds of input in relation to these overlapping aspects of practice is structured and sequenced and on the effectiveness of their integration.

It will thus be the nature of providers' responses to the Review, as they seek to develop programmes in light of its recommendations relating to effective models of teacher education, which will effectively determine the kinds of partnerships that emerge. The Review itself certainly provides scope and considerable encouragement for the development of genuinely collaborative and stable partnerships, within which the pedagogy of teacher education – and the development of teachers' own pedagogy – can be supported by careful integration of knowledge drawn from different sources. There is equal scope, however, and a stronger regulatory thrust, embodied in the recommendations, for the development of purely 'complementary partnerships' (Furlong et al., 2000), within which work is allocated along the lines of 'who does what best' but with little programme integration and a predominant concern with the coverage of core content.

Neither the recommendations themselves, nor the Coalition Government's immediate response to them (DfE, 2015a), will necessarily determine which of those outcomes prevails. While some of the work has been subsequently allocated to an 'independent expert group' (defining the core content of all ITT programmes) and to the Teaching Schools Council (establishing common standards for mentors)(see DfE 2015b for details), other elements have been entrusted to a body not yet in existence, a future College of Teaching, which the Review indicates 'would be well placed to

develop' specific recommendations (i.e. 7 and 9) . While we cannot be sure what the final outcomes will be, it seems almost inevitable that there will be greater prescription. Here policy in England is simply echoing wider international trends, with the OECD reporting '*widespread recognition that countries need to have clear and concise statements of what teachers are expected to know and be able to do'* (OECD, 2005, p.9).

Finally, it is important to ask what the implications of the Review might be for the role of research in initial teacher education, since research as a feature of provision is highlighted throughout. As we have noted the unresolved tensions inherent within the Review preclude a straightforward answer to that question, in that the various references to research and teachers' engagement with it may be interpreted in different ways, many of which ultimately imply a narrow conception of teacher as technician, essentially implementing what has been carefully distilled for them: the definitive claims about 'what works'. Nonetheless, research is acknowledged to have a vital role to play in the education of teachers, and, in its call for trainee-teachers to develop more critical engagement with research (paragraph 3.3.13), the Review clearly advocates the conception of a research-literate teacher advanced by the BERA-RSA (2014) Inquiry into the Role of Research in Teacher Education. As noted previously, the Review cites one of the papers submitted to that review (Burn and Mutton, 2013) in its explicit endorsement of 'research-informed clinical practice', which, its authors argue can only be developed within integrated collaborative partnerships. Although the Carter Review specifically rejects any claim that its own investigation might constitute research, it takes care to acknowledge the different sources of evidence on which it has drawn and implies that research into teacher education itself is of considerable importance. The process of learning to teach is so complex that all ITT programmes need to be underpinned by 'a clear understanding of how new teachers learn and how to support their growing knowledge and understanding' (paragraph 2.2.1).

The role of research is thus seen to be secure: it is important both for teachers and teacher educators, and indeed for policy-makers. This is perhaps not surprising, since Cochran-Smith drew attention to the role of research when first noting the framing of teacher education as a 'policy problem'. Given that the purpose of improving teacher education is ultimately to produce teachers who are able to secure good outcomes for their pupils, (Cochran-Smith, 2005, Darling-Hammond, 2006), there might be a tendency for the quality of teacher education to be judged in terms of those outcomes and for teacher education research to employ reductive measures (such as the analysis of pupil outcome data in relation to their teachers' initial training route and provider) to reveal 'what works'. It is significant, therefore, that the Carter Review, while fully endorsing the ultimate objective of improved pupil outcomes, does not apparently adopt such a narrow view of the research needed to achieve it. The call that we have just cited, for a thorough understanding of how teachers learn (paragraph 2.2.1), actually implies a much broader research agenda[8]. It will be important, however, to ensure that subsequent research on the effect of the Review's

[8] This broader research agenda appears to be moving forward in Australia, in the wake of the Report from the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG, 2014). See also Mayer et al (2015) for a sustained attempt to link teacher education and pupil outcomes in Australia.

recommendations looks not only to pupil outcomes – which are in fact very difficult to link with any confidence to the nature of their teachers' initial training (Cochran-Smith and Zeichner, 2005) – but also to the learning processes and experience of the beginning teachers themselves.

In conclusion, although we have said something about the background to the Review and about the implications emerging from it, the central focus of this paper – our close analysis of the text of the Report itself – reveals how the process of policy text production is one which is itself also strongly shaped by other processes. Bowe and Ball (1992, pp.19-23) wrote of the significance of the three contexts of policy making, namely the context of influence, the context of text production and the context of practice. This document offers a very clear demonstration of the interaction of the three. Elements of compromise, pragmatism, negotiation and arbitration are built into the heart of this document as these three contexts interact, and will continue to do so as the report is 'enacted'. Even though its text is formally attributed to one person, the interventions from the advisory group and, of course, from the range of stakeholders consulted and involved in its construction lead to a document that is riven with the very tensions and challenges that face practitioners in the field of teacher education – in England and across the world – on a daily basis.

The significance of the Carter Review lies not so much in the extent to which it will ultimately have an impact, or otherwise, on teacher education policy and practices in England but rather in what the process of the Review itself reveals about the way in which much wider and potentially intractable policy concerns are addressed within a specific national context. Commissioned with the clear aim of reviewing the quality and effectiveness of initial teacher education programmes, what the Review presents is instead a picture of complexity and a clear sense of the tensions and challenges inherent in a policy review of this nature, reflecting in many ways the same issues and dilemmas that confront policy makers in many other international contexts. Darling-Hammond & Lieberman (2012) assert that:

> *(T)he changes that are needed to build a strong profession of teaching that can meet these challenges around the globe will require us to learn from each other about what matters and what works in different contexts* (2012b, p.169)

What the Carter Review gives us, however, is an example of how these complexities and challenges may never be able to be addressed effectively if teacher education policy is ultimately reduced to mandating national standards rather than paying attention to the processes of professional learning.

References

Alter, J., & Coggshall, J. (2009). *Teaching as a clinical practice profession: Implications for teacher preparation and state policy.* New York: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (2010) *The Clinical Preparation of Teachers: A Policy Brief,* Washington DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

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

BERA- RSA (2014) Research and the Teaching Profession: Building the Capacity for a Self-improving Education System. https://www.bera.ac.uk/project/research-and-teacher-education.

Bowe, R. and Ball, S. (1992) *Reforming Education and Changing Schools.* London: Routledge.

Bransford, J., Darling-Hammond, L. & LePage, P. (2005). Introduction. In L. Darling-Hammond, L., & J. Bransford, J. with P. LePage, P., K. Hammerness, & H. Duffy, H. (Eds.) *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able to Do,* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 1-9.

Burn, K., Hagger, H. & Mutton, T. (2015) *Beginning Teachers' Learning: Making experience count*, Northwich: Critical Publishing.

Burn, K. & Mutton, T. (2013) *Review of research-informed clinical practice in teacher education*, paper submitted to the BERA-RSA Inquiry, London: BERA/RSA

Carter, A. (2015) *Carter review of initial teacher training (ITT)*, London: DfE. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/carter-review-of-initial-teacher-training

Childs, A., & Menter, I. (2013). Teacher education in 21st Century England: a case study in neoliberal public policy. *Revista española de educación comparagraphda*, (22), 93-116.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2005) The new teacher education: For better or for worse?, *Educational Researcher*, 34 (7) 3-17

Cochran-Smith, M., and Zeichner, K. (Eds.) (2005) *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Conroy, J., Hulme, M. & Menter, I. (2013) Developing a 'clinical model' for teacher education, *Journal of Education for Teaching: international research and pedagogy*, 39 (5), 557-573

Craft, M. (1984) Change and Continuity in Teacher Education, in R. Alexander, M. Craft & J. Lynch (Eds) *Change in Teacher Education. Context and Provision Since Robins,* pp 332-341 (London, Holt, Rinehart and Winston)

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006) Assessing teacher education the usefulness of multiple measures for assessing program outcomes. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57 (2), pp.120-138.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2012) Teacher Education and Development in the United States: A changing policy landscape, in L. Darling-Hammond & A. Lieberman (Eds.)*Teacher Education around the World - changing policies and practices*, pp 130-150. London: Routledge.

Darling-Hammond, L. and Lieberman, A. (Eds.) (2012a) *Teacher Education around the World - changing policies and practices*. London: Routledge.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Lieberman, A. (2012b) Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice, in L. Darling-Hammond & A. Lieberman (Eds.)*Teacher Education around the World - changing policies and practices*, pp 151-169. London: Routledge.

Department for Education and Science (1984). Initial teacher training: approval of courses. (Circular 3/84). London: HMSO.

Department for Education (2010) *The Importance of Teaching: the Schools White Paper 2010*, London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Department for Education (2011a) *Training our next generation of outstanding teachers*. London: DfE. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/training-our-next-generation-of-outstanding-teachers-implementation-plan

Department for Education (2011b) *Teachers' Standards*. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/301107/Teachers__Standards.pdf

Department for Education (2012) News article. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/news/academies-to-have-same-freedom-as-free-schools-over-teachers

Department for Education (2014) Press release. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/independent-review-of-initial-teacher-training-courses-launched

Department for Education (2015a) Government response to the Carter review of Initial Teacher Training (ITT). Retrieved from:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/396461/Carter_Review_Government_response_20150119.pdf

Department for Education (2015b) Press release. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/carter-review-recommendations-get-underway

Donaldson, G. (2011) *Teaching Scotland's future: Report of a review of teacher education in Scotland*, Edinburgh, Scotland: Scottish Government.

Ellis, V. (2010) Impoverishing experience: the problem of teacher education in England, *Journal of Education for Teaching: international research and pedagogy*, 36 (1), 105-120.

Ellis, V. and Orchard, J. (eds.) (2014) *Learning teaching from experience.* London: Bloomsbury.

Furlong, J. (2013) *Education–An Anatomy of the Discipline: Rescuing the University Project?* London: Routledge

Furlong, J. (2015) *Teaching tomorrow's teachers. Options for the future of teacher education in Wales*. Retrieved from: http://gov.wales/docs/dcells/publications/150309-teaching-tomorrows-teachers-final.pdf

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

Furlong, J., Cochran-Smith, M., & Brennan, M. (2013) (Eds) *Policy and politics in teacher education: International perspectives*. London: Routledge

Gove, M. (2010) Speech to the National College Annual Conference. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/michael-gove-to-the-national-college-annual-conference-birmingham

Gove, M. (2013). I refuse to surrender to the Marxist teachers hell-bent on destroying our schools: Education Secretary berates' the new enemies of promise' for opposing his plans. *Mail Online*, *23*. Available at http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-2298146/I-refuse-surrender-Marxist-teachers-hell-bent-destroying-schools-Education-Secretary-berates-new-enemies-promise-opposing-plans.html

Hagger, H. and McIntyre, D. (2006). *Learning teaching from teachers: Realizing the potential of school-based teacher education,* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Hillgate Group (1986) *Whose Schools? A Radical Manifesto*, London: Hillgate Group

House of Commons Education Committee. Great Britain. Parliament (2012): *Great Teachers: attracting, training and retaining the best Volume I* (HC 2012 1515-1). London: The Stationery Office.

Kennedy, A. (2106) Chapter 9 - Standards and Accountability, in Teacher Education Group, *Teacher Education in Times of Change*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Kriewaldt, J. and Turnidge, D. (2013) Conceptualising An Approach To Clinical Reasoning In The Education Profession, *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(6) 103-115.

Lawlor, S. (1990) *Teachers mistaught: training in theories or education in subjects?* London: Centre for Policy Studies.

Mayer, D. , Allard, A., Bates, R., Dixon, M., Doecke, B., Kline, J., Kostogriz, A., Moss, J., Rowan, L., Walker-Gibbs, B., White, S. and Hodder, P. (2015) *Studying the effectiveness of teacher education - final report.* Deakin University.

McIntyre, D. (1990) Ideas and principles guiding the Internship Scheme in P. Benton (Ed.) *The Oxford Internship Scheme: Integration and partnership in initial teacher education*, London: Calouste Gulbenkian

Murray, J. & Mutton, T. (2016) Chapter 4 – Teacher Education in England; change in abundance, continuities in question, in Teacher Education Group, *Teacher Education in Times of Change* , Bristol: Policy Press.

Mutton, T. (2016) Chapter 12 – Partnership in Teacher Education, in Teacher Education Group, *Teacher Education in Times of Change* , Bristol: Policy Press.

National Audit Office (2016) *Training new Teachers*, available at https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Training-new-teachers.pdf

OECD, 2005, *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers*, Paris: OECD

Phillips, D. and Ochs, K., 2003. Processes of policy borrowing in education: Some explanatory and analytical devices. *Comparative education*, *39*(4), pp.451-461.Sachs, J. (20010) Teacher professional identity: competing discourses, competing outcomes, *Journal of Education Policy,* 16 (2), 149-161.

Sachs, J. (2010) Teacher professional identity: competing discourses, competing outcomes, *Journal of Education Policy,* 16 (2), 149-161.

Sahlberg, P., Broadfoot, P., Coolahan, J., Furlong, J. & Kirk, G. (2014) *Aspiring to Excellence. Final Report of the International Review Panel on the Structure of Initial Teacher Education in Northern Ireland*, available at http://www.delni.gov.uk/aspiring-to-excellence-review-panel-final-report.pdf

Sahlberg, P., Munn, P. & Furlong, J. (2012) *Report of the International Review Panel on the Structure of Initial Teacher Education Provision in Ireland: Review conducted on behalf of the Department of Education and Skills*, available at https://www.education.ie/en/Press-Events/Press-Releases/2012-Press-Releases/Report-of-the-International-Review-Panel-on-the-Structure-of-Initial-Teacher-Education-Provision-in-Ireland.pdf

Shulman, L. (1986) Those who understand: knowledge growth in teaching, *Educational Researcher,* 15 (2), 4-14.

Tabberer, R. (2013) *A Review of Initial Teacher Training in Wales*, available at http://wales.gov.uk/docs/dcells/publications/131007-review-of-initial-teacher-training-in-wales-en.pdf

Tatto, M. T., (2006) Education reform and the global regulation of teachers' education, development and work: A cross-cultural analysis, *International Journal of Educational Research*, 45 (4-5), 231-241

Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (2014) *Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers.* Retrieved from: https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/action_now_classroom_ready_teachers_accessible.pdf

The Guardian (2014) Gove announces independent review of initial teacher training courses, article published on 01.05.2014, available at http://www.theguardian.com/teacher-network/teacher-blog/2014/may/01/gove-initial-teacher-training-courses-independent-review

Winch, C., Oancea, A., & Orchard, J. (2015) The contribution of educational research to teachers' professional learning: philosophical understandings, *Oxford Review of Education*, 41 (2), 202-216.

Appendix 1: The formal recommendations made the Carter Review, with an indication as to whether they are concerned with the course content (what is to be learned) or with the pedagogy of initial teacher education (the sources or processes of learning, which have implications for course structure)

	Course content	ITT pedagogy
1: DfE should commission a sector body (for example, the Teaching Schools Council, a future professional body (College of Teaching), or another sector body) to develop a framework of core content for ITT. We believe that a framework of the essential elements of core content would build a stronger shared understanding of good ITT content meaning that trainees will have a more consistent experience. We also feel it is critical that a framework is developed by the sector, rather than by central government. Though we have not aimed here to set out exactly what should be in the framework, we feel that the areas outlined in section 1 offer a good starting point (we have included this as an Annex in this report). We would like the framework to be informed by the areas for improvement we outline in this report, as highlighted in the following sub-recommendations:	✓	
1a: Subject knowledge development should be part of a future framework for ITT content	✓	
1b: Issues in **subject-specific pedagogy**, such as pupil misconceptions, phases of progression in the subject as well as practical work, should be part of a framework for ITT content.	✓	
1c: Evidence-based teaching should be part of a framework for ITT content.	✓	
1d: Assessment, including the theory of assessment and technical aspects of assessment, should be part of a framework for ITT content	✓	
1e: **Child and adolescent development** should be included within a framework of core ITT content	✓	
1f: **Managing pupil behaviour** should be included in a framework for ITT content; with an emphasis on the importance of prioritising practical advice throughout programmes.	✓	
1g: **Special educational needs and disabilities** should be included in a framework for ITT content.	✓	
2: All ITT partnerships should: i. rigorously audit, track and systematically improve subject knowledge throughout the programme ii. ensure that changes to the curriculum and exam syllabi are embedded in ITT programmes iii. ensure that trainees have access to high quality subject expertise iv. ensure that trainees have opportunities to learn with others training in the	✓	✓

same subject		
3: Schools should include subject knowledge as an essential element of professional development.	*Applies to CPD not ITT*	
	(✓)	
4: DfE should make funded in-service subject knowledge enhancement courses available for new primary teachers to access as professional development.	*Applies to CPD not ITT*	
	(✓)	
5: Universities should explore offering "bridge to ITT" modules in the final years of their subject degrees for students who are considering ITT programmes.	*Applies to prior training not ITT*	
	(✓)	
6: The Teachers' Standards should be amended to be more explicit about the importance of teachers taking an evidence-based approach.	✓	? 'Evidence based' may imply *process* of enquiry
7: A central portal of synthesised executive summaries, providing practical advice on research findings about effective teaching in different subjects and phases, should be developed. A future College of Teaching would be well placed to develop this.	✓ Research as content not process	

8: There are many universities that are home to world-leading research and assessment organisations – yet in our experience it can be the case that these organisations are either not involved in ITT or are involved in a superficial way**. ITT partnerships should make more systematic use of wider expertise outside university departments of education.**		? Concerned with the source of knowledge not really how it is acquired
9: Alongside a central portal on evidence-based practice, **a central repository of resources and guidance on assessment should be developed.**	✓	
10: Wherever possible, all ITT partnerships should build in structured and assessed placements for trainees in special schools and mainstream schools with specialist resourced provision.	✓ Concern to deal with specific issues	✓Implication tends towards learning from practice
11: ITT partnerships should ensure all trainees experience effective mentoring by: i. selecting and recruiting mentors who are excellent teachers, who are able to explain outstanding practice (as well as demonstrate it); ii. providing rigorous training for mentors that goes beyond briefing about the structure and nature of the course, and focusses on how teachers learn and the skills of effective mentoring; and iii. considering whether they are resourcing mentoring appropriately – the resource allocated to mentoring should reflect the importance of the role.		✓
12: DfE should commission a sector body, for example the Teaching Schools Council, to develop some national standards for mentors.		✓
13: All schools should, whenever practically possible, seek out and participate in robust local partnership arrangements. In a school-led system, this recommendation is naturally the responsibility of schools.		✓
14: Building on the development of school-led ITT, **DfE should work in collaboration with those involved in ITT to consider the way in which teachers qualify with a view to strengthening what has become a complex and sometimes confusing system.** We would like applicants to understand that QTS is the essential component of ITT and that a PGCE is an optional academic qualification.	*Nature of award not content or pedagogy*	*Nature of award not content or pedagogy really*
15: DfE should undertake a review of the effectiveness of the skills tests in selecting high quality trainees.	*Process of selection not course content*	*Selection not course content or pedagogy*

	or pedagogy	
16: In order for applicants to make well informed decisions when choosing a course, **we recommend the development and expansion of theNCTL's "Get into Teaching" website**. This should signpost information that applicants might consider when choosing a course, for example: provider Ofsted rating and inspection report; completion rates; NQT survey results; and employability rates.	*Operation of market: not course content or pedagogy*	*Operation of market: not course content or pedagogy*
17: In order for schools to find out how to get involved with ITT and make well-informed decisions about the partners they work with, we recommend that the DfE develop a page on the Gov.uk website to signpost information that schools should consider when making choices about a partner provider, including, for example: provider Ofsted ratings and inspection reports; completion rates of trainees; and employability rates.	*Operation of market*	*Operation of market*
18: Schools should make clear information about how to train readily available at all school reception areas and a link to recruitment appointments on all school websites. It would be for schools to take this recommendation forward.	*Operation of market*	*Operation of market*