



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Models of Continuing Professional Development: a framework for analysis

Citation for published version:

Kennedy, A 2005, 'Models of Continuing Professional Development: a framework for analysis', *Journal of In-Service Education*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 235-250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674580500200277>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1080/13674580500200277](https://doi.org/10.1080/13674580500200277)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Journal of In-Service Education

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Journal of In-Service Education on 01/06/2005, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/10.1080/13674580500200277>

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



**Models of Continuing Professional Development (CPD):
A framework for analysis**

Aileen Kennedy

Department of Educational and Professional Studies

University of Strathclyde

76 Southbrae Drive

Glasgow

G13 1PP

Scotland

aileen.kennedy@strath.ac.uk

0141 950 3356

Abstract

The area of teachers' CPD is of growing interest internationally. However, while an increasing range of literature focuses on particular aspects of CPD, there is a paucity of literature addressing the spectrum of CPD models in a comparative manner (Hoban, 2002). This paper therefore considers a wide range of international literature, together with some specific examples from the Scottish context, in proposing a framework built around key characteristics of individual models of CPD. The framework identifies nine key models, which are then classified in relation to their capacity for supporting professional autonomy and transformative practice.

The paper considers the circumstances in which each of the nine models of CPD might be adopted, and explores the form(s) of knowledge that can be developed through any particular model. It also examines the power relationships inherent in the individual models and explores the extent to which CPD is perceived and promoted either as an individual endeavour related to accountability, or as a collaborative endeavour which supports transformative practice.

Finally, it is argued that there is a need for greater interrogation of both the purpose and the potential outcomes of CPD structures – the framework outlined in this paper is offered as one way of supporting such analysis.

Introduction

The area of teachers' continuing professional development (CPD) is of growing interest in Scotland and internationally. However, while an increasing range of literature focuses on particular aspects of CPD, there is a paucity of literature addressing the spectrum of CPD models in a comparative manner (Hoban, 2002). This paper examines a range of models of CPD and proposes a framework through which they can be analysed. This analysis focuses on the perceived purpose of each model, identifying issues of power in relation to central control, individual teacher autonomy and profession-wide autonomy. The paper proposes nine categories under which models of CPD might be grouped. These nine categories are then organised along a spectrum which identifies the relative potential capacity for transformative practice and professional autonomy inherent in each. The premise of this being that such conditions require teachers to be able to articulate their own conceptions of teaching and be able to select and justify appropriate modes of practice.

CPD can be structured and organised in a number of different ways, and for a number of different reasons. While most CPD experiences might be considered as means of introducing or enhancing knowledge, skills and attitudes, it cannot be assumed that this is uncontested. For example, Eraut (1994) argues that it is not merely the type of professional knowledge being acquired which is important, but the context through which it is acquired, and subsequently used, that actually helps us to understand the nature of that knowledge. Analysing the means through which CPD for teachers is

organised and structured may help us to understand not only the motivation behind such structures, but also the nature of professional knowledge and professionalism itself. Eraut (1994) identifies three major contexts in which professional knowledge is acquired: the academic context; institutional discussion of policy and practice; and practice itself (p. 20).

Clearly, knowledge acquisition is not situated exclusively within any one of these three contexts, but the identification of the different contexts is useful in analytical terms. Eraut does not give explicit consideration to the role of informal professional discussion and reading that takes place outwith the institutional context, yet this, too, is surely a relevant context. The models discussed in this paper reflect varying degrees of importance placed on each of these contexts as potential sites of knowledge acquisition, and their consideration aids the analysis of the underpinning agendas that are supported by the various models.

This paper presents a framework in which the main characteristics of a range of models of CPD are identified and categorised. It considers the circumstances in which each particular model might be adopted and explores the form(s) of knowledge that can be developed through the particular model. In broad terms nine models are identified, which have been categorised as follows:

- The training model
- The award-bearing model
- The deficit model
- The cascade model
- The standards-based model
- The coaching/mentoring model
- The community of practice model
- The action research model
- The transformative model

Each of these models will be considered in turn, drawing on specific examples from the Scottish context, before moving on to discuss their interaction and their relative

capacity for supporting transformative practice. However, it should be noted that the nine models are not proposed as necessarily exhaustive or exclusive; rather they are an attempt at identifying key characteristics of different types of CPD with the aim of enabling deeper analysis of, and dialogue about, fundamental issues of purpose.

The training model

The training model of CPD is universally recognisable (Little, 1994; Kelly & McDiarmid, 2002) and has in recent years arguably been the dominant form of CPD for teachers. This model of CPD supports a skills-based, technocratic view of teaching whereby CPD provides teachers with the opportunity to update their skills in order to be able to demonstrate their competence. It is generally ‘delivered’ to the teacher by an ‘expert’, with the agenda determined by the deliverer, and the participant placed in a passive role. While the training can take place within the institution in which the participant works, it is most commonly delivered off-site, and is often subject to criticism about its lack of connection to the current classroom context in which participants work. Day (1999) identifies one of the principal difficulties as being the failure of such training events to ‘connect with the essential moral purposes that are at the heart of their [teachers’] professionalism’ (p.49).

The training model of CPD is compatible with, although not always related to, a standards-based view of teacher development where teachers strive to demonstrate particular skills specified in a nationally agreed standard. The model supports a high degree of central control, often veiled as quality assurance, where the focus is firmly on coherence and standardisation. It is powerful in maintaining a narrow view of teaching and education whereby the standardisation of training opportunities overshadows the need for teachers to be proactive in identifying and meeting their own development needs. The dominant discourse in Scotland, as in many other countries, supports this notion that standardisation of training equates to improvements in teaching, learning and pupil attainment. Indeed, Kirk et al. (2003), in outlining the context for the development of the chartered teacher programme in Scotland, link the standards-based approach with an associated training model of CPD when they say that:

Statements of competence and standards, derived with the support of the profession should help to ensure that development and training are clearly related and effectively targeted at the skills and knowledge teachers require.

(p. 3)

Despite its drawbacks, the training model is acknowledged as an effective means of introducing new knowledge (Hoban, 2002), albeit in a decontextualised setting. What the training model fails to impact upon in any significant way is the manner in which this new knowledge is used in practice. Perhaps even more significantly, though, in terms of the relative power of stakeholders the training model provides an effective way for dominant stakeholders to control and limit the agenda, and places teachers in a passive role as recipients of specific knowledge.

The award-bearing model

An award-bearing model of CPD is one that relies on, or emphasises, the completion of award-bearing programmes of study – usually, but not exclusively, validated by universities. This external validation can be viewed as a mark of quality assurance, but equally can be viewed as the exercise of control by the validating and/or funding bodies.

The introduction of the chartered teacher programme in Scotland provides an interesting example of the way in which university validated award-bearing provision can become the bedrock of a particular CPD structure. While it has been argued that this, together with GTCS accreditation, provides a necessary element of quality assurance and continuity, in practice it also serves to limit the availability of other award-bearing provision (Purdon, 2003) and to standardise the experiences of those working towards chartered teacher status.

However, in current education discourse in Scotland there is an emphasis on professional action, which is not always supportive of what is perceived to be ‘academic’ as opposed to ‘practical’. There is therefore a pressure for award-bearing courses to be focused on classroom practice, often at the expense of issues of values and beliefs (Solomon & Tresman, 1999).

The fundamental meaning of chartered teacher status has been the subject of extensive and public debate by high-profile individuals in the Scottish teacher education scene (for example, Henderson, 'Rift over path to chartered status' TESS, 15/03/2002).

Arguments have centred round the emphasis on 'professional' as opposed to 'academic' routes. This discourse of anti-intellectualism has led to accusations of the irrelevance of the 'academic' work undertaken by universities and placed emphasis instead on the practice-based element of teaching. To interpret 'professional' and 'academic' as antonyms conveys worrying messages about the conception of teacher professionalism in dominant education discourse.

What this particular example illustrates is the way in which the dominant discourse has influenced providers of award-bearing courses, in turn reflecting particular ideological imperatives potentially at the expense of academic and intellectual autonomy.

The deficit model

Professional development can be designed specifically to address a perceived deficit in teacher performance. This may well be set within the context of performance management, which itself is subject to debate over its fundamental purpose. Rhodes and Beneicke (2003) point out that performance management can be viewed as a means of raising standards or 'as an element of government intervention to exact greater efficiency, effectiveness and accountability' (p. 124). Nonetheless, performance management requires that somebody takes charge of evaluating and managing change in teacher performance, and this includes, where necessary, attempting to remedy perceived weaknesses in individual teacher performance. What is not always clear, however, is what the expectations are for competent performance, and whose notion of competence they reflect.

While the deficit model uses CPD to attempt to remedy perceived weaknesses in individual teachers, Rhodes and Benecike (2003) suggest that the root causes of poor teacher performance are related not only to individual teachers, but also to organisational and management practices. Indeed, to attribute blame to individual teachers, and to view CPD as a means of remedying individual weaknesses, suggests

a model whereby collective responsibility is not considered: that is that the system itself is not considered as a possible reason for the perceived failure of a teacher to demonstrate the desired competence. It also assumes the need for a baseline measure of competence, and once this has been committed to paper, it begins to adopt an authority of its own.

Boreham (2004) discusses this issue of individual and collective competence, arguing that in the school context, effective collective competence is dependent on leadership which promotes three particular conditions, namely: making collective sense of events in the workplace; developing and using a collective knowledge base; and developing a sense of interdependency (p. 9). This argument is clearly at odds with the notion of the deficit model which attributes blame for perceived under-performance on individuals and fails to take due cognisance of collective responsibility.

The cascade model

The cascade model involves individual teachers attending ‘training events’ and then cascading, or disseminating, the information to colleagues. It is commonly employed in situations where resources are limited. Although very popular in Scotland in the early 1990s, after local government reorganisation resulted in tighter resource allocations (Marker, 1999), this model is not quite as popular in Scotland now.

Day (1999) reports on a case study in which the cascade model was employed by a group of teachers as a means of sharing their own (successful) learning with colleagues. The group reported on what they had learned, but ‘no detailed consideration was given to the very principles of participation, collaboration and ownership which had characterized their own learning’ (p. 126).

In addition to such issues surrounding the conditions required for successful learning, Solomon and Tresman (1999) suggest that one of the drawbacks of this model is that what is passed on in the cascading process is generally skills-focused, sometimes knowledge-focused, but rarely focuses on values. This is an argument which is also articulated by Nieto (2003) when she claims that teacher education ‘needs to shift from a focus on questions of “what” and “how” to also consider questions of “why” (p. 395).

It could therefore be argued that the cascade model supports a technicist view of teaching, where skills and knowledge are given priority over attitudes and values. The cascade model also neglects to consider the range of learning contexts outlined by Eraut (1994), assuming that it is the knowledge per se that is the important part of the process and not necessarily the context in which it is gained or used.

The standards-based model

Before considering the characteristics of the standards-based model of CPD, it is worth giving some consideration to the terminology used. ‘Standards’ as opposed to ‘competences’ are now de rigueur in Scotland, with their most vigorous proponents extolling the relative virtues of standards as opposed to their predecessors – competences. However, in analysing the difference between the two, while the language has changed, it is difficult to discern any real difference in either practical or philosophical terms. While the language may have shifted to hint at issues of values and commitment etc, the real test is in the implementation of standards. Within the Scottish chartered teacher programme, for example, the emphasis is firmly on the ‘professional actions’, which are seen as the way of demonstrating that the standard has been met. The emphasis on evidence-based, demonstrable practice surely renders the SCT competence-based, despite claims to the contrary. Indeed Kirk et. al. (2003), in writing about their experiences as members of the Chartered Teacher Project Team, state that the team was committed to the proposition that ‘the assessment of potential Chartered Teachers has centrally to focus on competence in professional performance’ (p. 38). It is therefore contested that in real terms, and in contrast to popular academic discourse, there is very little substantive difference between competences and standards, other than in linguistic terms.

The standards-based model of CPD belittles the notion of teaching as a complex, context-specific political and moral endeavour; rather it ‘represents a desire to create a system of teaching, and teacher education, that can generate and empirically validate connections between teacher effectiveness and student learning’ (Beyer, 2002, p243). This ‘scientific’ basis on which the standards movement relies limits the opportunities for alternative forms of CPD to be considered. It also relies heavily on a behaviourist

perspective of learning, focusing on the competence of individual teachers and resultant rewards at the expense of collaborative and collegiate learning.

Smyth (1991) argues that externally imposed forms of accountability and inspection, such as standards, indicate a lack of respect for teachers' own capacities for reflective, critical inquiry. Indeed, this argument could be taken further to suggest that not only is it a lack of respect, but that it sets clear expectations regarding the extent to which teachers should take responsibility for their own professional learning, and encourages them to be reliant on central direction, even in assessing their own capacity to teach.

There are many critics of the standards-based model of CPD. For example, Beyer (2002) criticises the lack of attention given to central and contentious questions regarding the purpose of teaching, claiming that 'teacher education must be infused with the kind of critical scrutiny about social purposes, future possibilities, economic realities and moral directions' (p. 240). He views the move towards increasing standardisation in the US as narrowing the range of potential conceptions of teaching to focus on quality assurance and accountability. This narrowing of view is surely in direct contrast to the above expressed notion of critical scrutiny. Beyer (2002), among others, suggests that the move towards increasing standardisation in teacher education at both initial and continuing stages, is in part a response to growing concerns about nation states' abilities to compete in the global economy. In this context standardisation can thus be equated to the pursuit of improved economic status.

Despite the existence of extensive literature which is critical of the standards-based approach to teacher education, policies which adopt this approach do present a justification for its use. For example, within the context of the chartered teacher programme in Scotland, members of the development team have argued that the participative approach to the development of the Standard for Chartered Teacher will result in teachers being more willing to engage with it (Kirk et al, 2003). Arguably, standards also provide a common language, making it easier for teachers to engage in dialogue about their professional practice. However, Draper et al (2004) note the tensions inherent in the standards-based approach, warning that 'the Standard

[Standard for Full Registration] itself may be seen as a useful scaffold for professional development or as a source of pressure for uniformity' (p. 221).

There is clearly capacity for standards to be used to scaffold professional development and to provide a common language, thereby enabling greater dialogue between teachers, but these advantages must be tempered by acknowledgement of the potential for standards to narrow conceptions of teaching, or indeed to render it unnecessary for teachers to consider alternative conceptions outwith those promoted by the standards.

The coaching/mentoring model

The coaching/mentoring model covers a variety of CPD practices which are based on a range of philosophical premises. However, the defining characteristic of this model is the importance of the one-to-one relationship, generally between two teachers, which is designed to support CPD. Both coaching and mentoring share this characteristic, although most attempts to distinguish between the two suggest that coaching is more skills based and that mentoring involves an element of 'counselling and professional friendship' (Rhodes and Beneicke, 2002, p. 301). Indeed, mentoring also often implies a relationship where one partner is novice and the other more experienced (Clutterbuck, 1991).

The mentoring or coaching relationship can be collegiate, for example 'peer coaching', but is probably more likely to be hierarchical, as in, for example, the new induction procedures in Scotland (GTCS, 2002) where every new teacher is guaranteed a 'supporter' who supports the CPD process and is involved in the assessment of the new teacher's competence against the Standard for Full Registration. Key to the coaching/mentoring model, however, is the notion that professional learning can take place within the school context and can be enhanced by sharing dialogue with colleagues.

In contrast to the novice/experienced teacher mentoring relationship, Smyth (1991) argues for a model of 'clinical supervision', which is collegiate in nature and is used by teachers for teachers. These two ends of the spectrum indicate a clear difference, in conceptual terms, of the purpose of mentoring. The novice/experienced teacher model is akin to apprenticeship, where the experienced teacher initiates the novice

teacher into the profession. This initiation, while including support for the novice in gaining and using appropriate skills and knowledge, also conveys messages to the new teacher about the social and cultural norms within the institution. In direct contrast, where the coaching/mentoring model involves a more equitable relationship, it allows for the two teachers involved to discuss possibilities, beliefs and hopes in a less hierarchically threatening manner. Interestingly, depending on the matching of those involved in the coaching/mentoring relationship, this model can support either a transmission view of professional development, where teachers are initiated into the status quo by their more experienced colleagues, or a transformative view where the relationship provides a supportive but challenging forum for both intellectual and affective interrogation of practice.

Robbins (cited in Rhodes and Beneicke, 2002) defines peer coaching as:

A confidential process through which two or more colleagues work together to reflect upon current practices; expand, refine and build new skills; share ideas; conduct action research; teach one another, or problem solve within the workplace. (p. 298)

So, while Robbins acknowledges the key characteristic of the one-to-one relationship, his particular definition of the relationship focuses on confidentiality as opposed to accountability. This adds a very different dimension to the relationship as the introduction of the condition of confidentiality shifts the power relationship quite significantly from that described under the induction type relationship where the purpose is dual: support and assessment. Robbins' definition also militates against peer coaching as a form of accountability, instead placing it firmly within a transformative conception of CPD.

Regardless of the fundamental purpose of the coaching/mentoring model as mutually supportive and challenging or hierarchical and assessment driven, the quality of interpersonal relationships is crucial. In order for the coaching/mentoring model of CPD to be successful, participants must have well-developed interpersonal communication skills (Rhodes and Beneicke, 2002). It is interesting to note, then, that while the new induction arrangements in Scotland require that each new teacher has a designated 'supporter', there are no requirements for that person to have particular strengths in

terms of interpersonal communication or to be trained in the role of supporter. However, recent research into the experiences of probationer teachers in the new induction scheme in Scotland suggests that ‘for the optimum relationship the supporter must want to do the job and should be trained’ (Draper et al, 2004, p. 219).

So, while the key characteristic of the coaching/mentoring model is its reliance on a one-to-one relationship, it can, depending on its underpinning philosophy, support either a transmission or a transformative conception of CPD.

The community of practice model

There is a clear relationship between communities of practice and the mutually supportive and challenging form of the coaching/mentoring model discussed above. The essential difference between the two is that a community of practice generally involves more than two people, and would not necessarily rely on confidentiality. However, the other form of the coaching/mentoring model of CPD discussed above – the hierarchical, assessment driven model - is perhaps not as closely related to the communities of practice model.

Wenger (1998) contends that while we are all members of various communities of practice, learning within these communities involves three essential processes: evolving forms of mutual engagement; understanding and tuning [their] enterprise; and developing [their] repertoire, styles and discourses (p. 95). Central to Wenger’s thesis is a social theory of learning, recognising that learning within a community of practice happens as a result of that community and its interactions, and not merely as a result of planned learning episodes such as courses.

However, participants’ awareness of the existence of the community is surely central to their internalisation of such learning. Depending on the role played by the individual as a member of the wider team, learning within such a community could be either a positive and proactive experience or a passive experience where the collective wisdom of dominant members of the group shapes other individuals’ understanding of the community and its roles. Yeatman and Sachs (cited in Day, 1999, p. 183) highlight this in relation to a particular case study in Australia, where they observe

that the successful community of practice ‘has developed as a formal and explicit relationship between practising teachers and teacher educators’.

Although not using the term ‘communities of practice’, Boreham (2000) considers a social conception of learning in relation to the medical profession, when he argues that:

When the professional activity is collective, the amount of knowledge available in a clinical unit cannot be measured by the sum total of the knowledge possessed by its individual members. A more appropriate measure would be the knowledge generated by the richness of the connections between individuals. (p. 505)

Boreham makes explicit the added value of learning in communities, viewing the existence of individual knowledge and the combinations of several individuals’ knowledge through practice, as a powerful site for the creation of new knowledge.

Fundamental to successful CPD within a community of practice is the issue of power. Wenger (1998) argues that a community of practice should create its own understanding of the joint enterprise, therefore allowing the members of that community to exert a certain level of control over the agenda. For professional learning to take place within this context, it should be neither a form of accountability nor of performance management. Indeed, Wenger (ibid.) argues that ‘negotiating a joint enterprise gives rise to relations of mutual accountability among those involved’ (p. 81), therefore arguably promoting greater capacity for transformative practice than a managerial form of accountability would allow.

It is therefore argued that while communities of practice can potentially serve to perpetuate dominant discourses in an uncritical manner, under certain conditions they can also act as powerful sites of transformation, where the sum total of individual knowledge and experience is enhanced significantly through collective endeavour.

The action research model

Somekh (cited in Day, 1999, p. 34) defines action research as ‘the study of a social situation, involving the participants themselves as researchers, with a view to improving the quality of action within it’. The ‘quality of action’ can be perceived as the participants’ understanding of the situation as well as the practice within the situation.

Advocates of the action research model (Burbank and Kauchack, 2003; Weiner, 2002) tend to suggest that it has a greater impact on practice when it is shared in communities of practice, or enquiry, and indeed, many communities of practice will engage in action research. However, collaboration of the nature found in a community of practice is not a prerequisite of the action research model.

Weiner (2002) discusses one particular example of research based professional development set within the particular national context in Sweden. Key to this national context is an agreement among partners (universities, government and professional groups) that national education research needs to be more relevant to practitioners, and that in supporting teachers to carry out action based research the problem of relevance will be addressed. Weiner acknowledges that this agreement could potentially point to a number of agendas, but she concentrates primarily on this move as a means of supporting ‘greater participation, relevance and democracy’ (p. 3). Indeed, she claims that ‘action research has practitioner development and transformation as its main aim’ (p. 5). However, this particular move must be seen against a background of increasing decentralisation in the Swedish education system where local authorities and schools are responsible for their teachers’ CPD, with no overall national strategy to adhere to. In addition, the move away from universities as sole producers of research could be seen as an attempt to weaken their power base.

Burbank and Kauchack (2003) argue that collaborative action research provides an alternative to the passive role imposed on teachers in traditional models of professional development. They advocate teachers being encouraged to view research as a process as opposed to merely a product of someone else’s endeavours. It is also, arguably, a means of limiting dependency on externally produced research, instead

shifting the balance of power towards teachers themselves through their identification and implementation of relevant research activities.

Action research as a model of CPD has been acknowledged as being successful in allowing teachers to ask critical questions of their practice. However, Sachs (2003) queries the extent to which it allows teachers to ask such critical questions of the political determinants that shape the parameters of their practice. Nevertheless, an action research model clearly has significant capacity for transformative practice and professional autonomy.

The transformative model

What is termed in this paper as a ‘transformative model’ of CPD involves the combination of a number of processes and conditions – aspects of which are drawn from other models outlined in this paper. The central characteristic is the combination of practices and conditions which support a transformative agenda. In this sense, it could be argued that the transformative model is not a clearly definable model in itself, rather it recognises the range of different conditions required for transformative practice.

Hoban (2002) provides an interesting perspective on this notion of CPD as a means of supporting educational change. He draws comparisons between the knowledge focused and contextually void model of a training approach with the context specific approach of a communities of practice model which does not necessarily embrace new forms of formal knowledge. He suggests that what is really needed is not a wholesale move towards the teacher-centred, context specific models of CPD, but a better balance between these types of models and the transmission focused models. Hoban’s description of the two ends of the spectrum do not, however, include communities of enquiry which might be based on partnerships between teachers, academics and other organisations, and which can involve both the context and the knowledge required for real and sustainable educational change. Such communities take ‘enquiry’ as opposed to merely ‘practice’ as their uniting characteristic, thereby asserting a much more proactive and conscious approach than is necessarily the case in communities of practice.

It could be argued, then, that the key characteristic of the transformative model is its effective integration of the range of models described above, together with a real sense of awareness of issues of power, i.e. whose agendas are being addressed through the process. While examples of this model might not be much in evidence, except for limited small-scale research activities (Nieto, 2003), it features increasingly in academic literature. Indeed it appears to provide an antidote to the constricting nature of the standards, accountability and performance management agenda, and could arguably be categorised as a poststructuralist approach to CPD.

However, an explicit awareness of issues of power means that the transformative model is not without tensions, and indeed it might be argued that it actually relies on tensions: only through the realisation and consideration of conflicting agendas and philosophies, can real debate be engaged in among the various stakeholders in education, which might lead to transformative practice.

A proposed framework for analysis

While each of the above models describes a set of characteristics, it is not suggested that the models will, or should, stand alone; rather they describe the dominant characteristics of particular approaches to CPD. This allows the creation of a framework through which CPD policies and practice can be analysed and compared.


What is critical to the analysis of CPD models is not just the obvious structural characteristics, but also the underpinning influences, expectations and possibilities. Five key questions used in the interrogation of literature on CPD in this paper are therefore proposed as tools for the analysis of models of CPD:

1. What types of knowledge acquisition does the CPD support, i.e. procedural or propositional?
2. Is the principal focus on individual or collective development?
3. To what extent is the CPD used as a form of accountability?
4. What capacity does the CPD allow for supporting professional autonomy?
5. Is the fundamental purpose of the CPD to provide a means of transmission or to facilitate transformative practice?

This fifth question provides a spectrum along which the nine models outlined in this paper can be placed. The perceived purposes of CPD, as represented by either end of this spectrum, can be identified in literature which links CPD to reforms in education and schooling (Little, 1994; Villegas-Reimers and Reimers, 2000), namely, that it can serve either to equip teachers with the requisite skills to implement such reforms as decided by others (usually government) or to inform, contribute to and provide critique of the reforms themselves. Little (1994) argues that because teachers' CPD is often viewed as a means of implementing reform or policy changes, this can serve to mask questions relating to the fundamental purpose of such activity. She therefore suggests that one test of teachers' CPD is 'its capacity to equip teachers individually and collectively to act as shapers, promoters, and well-informed critics of reforms' (ibid., p. 1).

These two distinct purposes for CPD would necessitate very different models of CPD. For example, CPD which is conceived of as fulfilling the function of preparing teachers to implement reforms aligns itself with the training, award-bearing and deficit models discussed earlier supporting a 'transitional' model of CPD. On the other hand, CPD which is conceived of as supporting teachers in contributing to and shaping education policy and practice would align itself more naturally with the action research and transformative models. The other three models outlined in this paper: the standards-based model; the coaching/mentoring model; and the community of practice model, can be considered 'transitional' in the sense that they have the capacity to support underlying agendas compatible with either of these two purposes of CPD. Table I below presents the nine models organised into these three broad categories: traditional, transitional and transformative:

Model of CPD	Purpose of model
The training model The award-bearing model The deficit model The cascade model	Transmission
The standards-based model The coaching/mentoring model The community of practice model	Transitional
The action research model The transformative model	Transformative



Increasing capacity for professional autonomy

Table I. Spectrum of CPD models

This above categorisation and organisation of CPD models suggests increasing capacity for teacher autonomy as one moves from transmission, through transitional to transformative categories. While this can be justified on one level in terms of the potential opportunities available for teachers to influence the agenda, Burbank and Kauchak (2003) argue that even within many collaborative forms of CPD, which might be represented in the 'transformative' category above, the parameters of the activity are defined by some external party, usually in a position of power. So while the capacity for professional autonomy is greater in transformative models, this does not in itself imply that the capacity will necessarily be fulfilled.

It is not suggested that this is the only way in which models of CPD can be organised, or indeed that the above representation is exhaustive, but in proposing such a framework for the analysis of models of CPD, it is hoped that issues of purpose and power will form a greater part of policy debate: that the 'why' of policy will be given as much attention as the 'how'.

References

- Beyer, L. (2002) The Politics of Standardization: teacher education in the USA, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 28(3), pp. 239–245.
- Boreham, N. (2000) Collective professional knowledge, *Medical Education*, 34, pp. 505–506.
- Boreham, N. (2004) A Theory of Collective Competence: Challenging the neo-liberal individualisation of performance at work, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 52(1), pp. 5–17.
- Burbank, M.D. & Kauchak, D. (2003) An alternative model for professional development: investigations into effective collaboration, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19(5), pp. 499–514.
- Clutterbuck, D. (1991) *Everyone needs a mentor*. London: Institute of Personnel and Development.

Draper, J., O'Brien, J. & Christie, F. (2004) First Impressions: the new teacher induction arrangements in Scotland, *Journal of In-service Education*, 30(2), pp. 201–223.

Day, C. (1999) *Developing Teachers: The Challenges of Lifelong Learning*. London: Falmer Press.

Eraut, M. (1994) *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence*. London: Falmer Press.

General Teaching Council for Scotland (2001) *Achieving the Standard for Full Registration: Guidance for Schools*, Edinburgh: GTCS.

Hoban, G.F. (2002) *Teacher Learning for Educational Change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Henderson, D. (15 March 2002) *Rift over path to chartered teacher status*, Times Educational Supplement Scotland.

Kelly, P. & McDiarmid, G. W. (2002) Decentralisation of Professional Development: teachers' decisions and dilemmas, *Journal of In-service Education*, 28(3) pp. 409–425.

Kirk, G., Beveridge, W. & Smith, I. (2003) *Policy and Practice in Education: The Chartered Teacher*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.

Little, J. W. (1994) *Teachers' Professional development in a Climate of Educational Reform*, Systemic Reform: Perspectives on Personalizing Education, accessed on the worldwide web on 8 September 2004:
<http://www.ed.gov/pubs/EdReformStudies/SysReforms/little1.html>

Marker, W. (1999) The Professional Development of Teachers, in T.G.K. Bryce and W.M. Humes (Eds.) *Scottish Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Nieto, S. (2003) Challenging current notions of “highly qualified teachers” through working a teachers’ inquiry group, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(5) pp. 386–398.

Purdon, A. (2003) A national framework of CPD: continuing professional development or continuing policy dominance? *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(4) pp. 423–437.

Rhodes, C. & Beneicke, S. (2002) Coaching, Mentoring and Peer-networking: challenges for the management of teacher professional development in schools, *Journal of In-service Education*, 28(2), pp. 297–309.

Rhodes, C. & Beneicke, S. (2003) Professional Development Support for Poorly Performing Teachers: challenges and opportunities for school managers in addressing teacher learning needs, *Journal of In-service Education*, 29(1) pp. 123–140.

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

Smyth, J. (1991) *Teachers as Collaborative Learners*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Solomon, J. & Tresman, S. (1999) A Model for Continued Professional Development: knowledge, belief and action, *Journal of In-service Education*, 25(2), pp. 307–319.

Villegas-Reimers, E. & Reimers, F. (2000) *The professional development of teachers as lifelong learning: Models, practices and factors that influence it*. Paper prepared for the Board on International Comparative Studies in Education (BISCE) of the National Research Council, Washington, D.C.

Weiner, G. (2002) *Professional Development, Teacher Education, Action research and Social Justice: a recent initiative in North Sweden*, Paper presented at the annual conference, In-service and Professional Development Association, Birmingham, 1-3 November 2002.

Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.