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1. **Summary**

1.1 There is some limited synergy between the *Professional Standards* and the elements of the *Schools as Learning Organisations (SLO)* model. Although both have much to offer they also have shortcomings.

1.2 Providing these shortcomings are understood, acknowledged and addressed, they could usefully contribute to a *National Approach to Professional Learning* that underpins all aspects of the Welsh Government’s national mission for education.

1.3 The extent to which these two approaches could support each other is inextricably linked to the interpretation and enactment of these policies. Further clarity and guidance, both on what is to be achieved and how to achieve it is required.

1.4 In the absence of this clarity and guidance, there is a danger that in practice these policies could be translated into checklists of specific examples and become oversimplified. When this happens it can breed conformity, cynicism and the very opposite of the goal to support a new kind of professional responsibility.

2. **The Research Commission**

2.1 The research questions to be addressed were:

- What is the nature and extent of synergy between the Welsh Government’s *Professional Standards for Teaching and Leadership* (Welsh Government, 2017b) and the OECD’s *SLO* model (Kools and Stoll, 2016)?
- Do these two approaches support each other?
- Are there any areas of conflict or dissonance?
- How together can they add value to the *National Approach to Professional Learning*?

3. **Method**

3.1 The research was undertaken using the following methods:

- Analysis of the two key sources (Welsh Government, 2017b and Kools and Stoll, 2016) and the draft of the OECD survey on the pilot in Wales of the *SLO* model (OECD, 2018).

- Use of the wider knowledge base of the research team in this field of educational research as indicated in the references below.
4. The Welsh Government Professional Standards

4.1 In 2016-17 the Welsh Government undertook a review of the professional standards for teachers that had been published in 2011 (Welsh Government, 2011). The intention was to produce a new set of standards for both teachers and leaders that would support the Government’s wider education reform programme (Welsh Government, 2017a) including the development of a new school curriculum (Donaldson, 2015 and Welsh Government, 2016) and the reform of initial teacher education (Furlong, 2015). Subsequently, they have also influenced the creation of the National Academy for Education Leadership and ongoing developments relating to the professional learning of teachers.

4.2 The 2011 standards had replaced a range of professional standards which had been developed in a piecemeal fashion prior to that date including:

- National Occupational Standards for School Support Staff
- Standards for Higher Level Teaching Assistants
- Qualified Teacher Status Standards
- End of Qualified Teacher Induction Standards
- National Standards for Head Teachers
- Threshold, Excellent and Advanced Skills Teacher Standards.

4.3 These standards had all initially been developed in the period prior to devolution of government to Wales in 1999. The 2011 Standards were intended, therefore, to both synthesise these disparate sets of standards and to align them more closely to the discrete education policies which had been developed in Wales since devolution.

4.4 What did not change, however, was the nature of the standards. The 2011 standards continued to be expressed as a behaviourist series of competencies (‘know’ and ‘can do’) which emerging or established professionals would need to demonstrate to meet a required level of pre-determined professionalism.

4.5 The pre-2011 standards appear to have been developed by civil servants (often working within the Westminster Government’s Teacher Training Agency) drawing upon competency approaches that had been adopted in the private sector and other areas of the public sector, which were then consulted on with the teaching profession. There is no indication that they drew upon research knowledge, including the extensive international research that had been undertaken since the 1960s on learning and teaching pedagogy and effective teaching (Muijs and Reynolds, 2018).
4.6 The review of the standards undertaken by the Welsh Government in 2016/17 represented a paradigm shift in this regard. It was premised on the abandonment of the former competency-based approach and the adoption of the vision set out in the Donaldson and Furlong reports of teachers as active and creative professionals. Thus empowered, the intention was that they would exercise greater teacher agency in the development of entrants into the profession and identifying high quality teaching.

4.7 This intent has been facilitated through some teachers becoming involved as ‘pioneer schools’ in helping to develop, implement and assess the new school curriculum where the principle of ‘subsidiarity’ was used to signal the importance of teachers being able to make autonomous professional judgements (Welsh Government, 2015a).

4.8 The 2016/17 review was undertaken by a task and finish group chaired by Professor Mick Waters and made up of representatives of various areas of the education profession in Wales including teacher professional associations, the Education Workforce Council, Estyn, the Regional Education Consortia and higher education institutions. This was followed by consultation with the teaching profession.

4.9 The extent to which the Professional Standards reflect the outcomes of educational research on effective teaching and professionalism appears, however, to be minimal and incidental. Such referencing might have provided more explicit detail to clarify the meaning of the standards. Thereby the influential work of researchers and of major research projects such as the ESRC funded Teaching and Learning Research Project and publications from influential organisations do not appear to have been considered (Hattie, 2009 and 2012; Coe et al, 2014; Pollard, 2007; Sutton Trust, 2015).

4.10 The 2017 Professional Standards for Teaching and Leadership are organised around the following areas:

- The standard for effective pedagogy- teaching and learning is paramount.
- The standard for collaboration- enabling effective pedagogy to spread.
- The standard for innovation- moving pedagogy forward.
- The standard for leadership- helping effective pedagogy to grow.
- The standard for professional learning- taking effective pedagogy deeper.
4.11 Each standard is divided into elements, accompanied by descriptors. In the teaching area of the standards, the descriptors for professional learning cover the following:

- Wider reading and research findings.
- Professional networks and communities.
- Continuous professional learning.
- Welsh language skills.

4.12 There appears to be good alignment with the vision for teachers set out in the Furlong and Donaldson reports and the intention is that they will inform the new initial teacher education programmes being offered from 2019 and the development of the new curriculum. It could be argued, however, that this is generally implicit rather than explicit and could be more fully integrated and exemplified to avoid an infinite variety of local interpretations. In fairness, however, these system reforms have been ongoing since the publication of the Professional Standards and in time these might need further revision to take full account of the reforms.

4.13 Another issue which is likely to have implications for professional learning, is the extent to which the Standards are actually not ‘standards’ in the way that the term is most often used in educational contexts. They are each a headline behind which sit a range of descriptors and examples which allude to practices, understandings, plans and reflections. They are, perhaps ‘strands or areas of professional learning’, or ‘nodes’. They could be termed ‘criteria’ but are likely to share with that term a common problem.

4.14 Whereas the ‘architecture’ of concepts (such as pedagogy, or collaboration, and their sub-divisions) may come with the intention to be a vehicle for consideration and reflection, in practice (in busy schools, and in the hands of individuals who have not yet become enthused by a reform agenda) such things can be translated into checklists of specific examples and may acquire a spurious simplicity. When this happens it can breed conformity, cynicism and the very opposite of the goal to support a new kind of professional responsibility.

5. The OECD Model of ‘Schools as Learning Organisations’

5.1 The OECD model of ‘Schools as Learning Organisations’ offers the following explanation of the term and concept:

“ A learning organisation is a place where the beliefs, values and norms of employees are brought to bear in support of sustained learning; where a ‘learning atmosphere’, ‘learning culture’ or ‘learning climate’ is nurtured
and where ‘learning to learn’ is essential for everyone involved’. (Kools and Stoll, 2016 p 47).

5.2 Having brought together the evidence on learning organisations from outside and inside education, the OECD model aims to achieve a common understanding of what the term could mean for schools. They do this through presenting the model as having seven dimensions each of which includes a range of elements. The dimensions and elements can be seen in the table below (Kools and Stoll, 2016 pp61-63):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO dimensions</th>
<th>Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Developing a shared vision centred on the learning of **all** students | • A shared and inclusive vision aims to enhance the learning experiences and outcomes of all students  
• The vision focuses on a broad range of learning outcomes, encompasses both the present and the future, and is inspiring and motivating  
• Learning and teaching are oriented towards realising the vision  
• Vision is the outcome of a process involving all staff  
• Students, parents, the external community and other partners are invited to contribute to the school's vision |
| Creating and supporting continuous professional learning for all staff | • All staff engage in continuous professional learning  
• New staff receive induction and mentoring support  
• Professional learning is focused on student learning and school goals  
• Staff are fully engaged in identifying the aims and priorities for their own professional learning  
• Professional learning challenges thinking as part of changing practice  
• Professional learning connects work-based learning and external expertise  
• Professional learning is based on assessment and feedback  
• Time and other resources are provided to support professional learning  
• The school’s culture promotes and supports professional learning |
| Promoting team learning and collaboration among all staff | • Staff learn how to work together as a team  
• Collaborative working and collective learning – face-to-face and through ICTs – are focused and enhance learning experiences and outcomes of students and/or staff practice  
• Staff feel comfortable turning to each other for consultation and advice  
• Trust and mutual respect are core values  
• Staff reflect together on how to make their own learning more powerful  
• The school allocates time and other resources for collaborative working and collective learning |
| Establishing a culture of inquiry, exploration and innovation | • Staff want and dare to experiment and innovate in their practice  
• The school supports and recognises staff for taking initiative and risks  
• Staff engage in forms of inquiry to investigate and extend their practice  
• Inquiry is used to establish and maintain a rhythm of learning, change and innovation  
• Staff have open minds towards doing things differently  
• Problems and mistakes are seen as opportunities for learning  
• Students are actively engaged in inquiry |
| Embedding systems for collecting and exchanging knowledge and learning | • Systems are in place to examine progress and gaps between current and expected impact  
• Examples of practice – good and bad – are made available to all staff to analyse  
• Sources of research evidence are readily available and easily accessed  
• Structures for regular dialogue and knowledge exchange are in place  
• Staff have the capacity to analyse and use multiple sources of data for feedback, including through ICT, to inform teaching and allocate resources  
• The school development plan is evidence-informed, based on learning from self-assessment, and updated regularly  
• The school regularly evaluates its theories of action, amending and updating them as necessary  
• The school evaluates the impact of professional learning |
|---|---|
| Learning with and from the external environment and larger system | • The school scans its external environment to respond quickly to challenges and opportunities  
• The school is an open system, welcoming approaches from potential external collaborators  
• Partnerships are based on equality of relationships and opportunities for mutual learning  
The school collaborates with parents/guardians and the community as partners in the education process and the organisation of the school  
• Staff collaborate, learn and exchange knowledge with peers in otherschools through networks and/or school-to-school collaborations  
• The school partners with higher education institutions, businesses, and/or non-governmental organisations in efforts to deepen and extend learning  
• ICT is widely used to facilitate communication, knowledge exchange and collaboration with the external environment |
| Modelling and growing learning leadership | • School leaders model learning leadership, distribute leadership and help grow other leaders, including students  
• School leaders are proactive and creative change agents  
• School leaders develop the culture, structures and conditions to facilitate professional dialogue, collaboration and knowledge exchange  
• School leaders ensure that the organisation’s actions are consistent with its vision, goals and values  
• School leaders ensure the school is characterised by a ‘rhythm’ of learning, change and innovation  
• School leaders promote and participate in strong collaboration with otherschools, parents, the community, higher education institutions and other partners  
School leaders ensure an integrated approach to responding to students’ learning and other needs |

5.3 The dimensions and elements are supported by four themes: trust; time; technology and thinking together. All the dimensions, elements and themes must be adopted if a school is to become a SLO in line with the OECD model.

5.4 In Wales the SLO model has been further developed through joint work between the Welsh Government, pioneer schools, Estyn, the National Academy for Educational Leadership, the Regional Education Consortia and the OECD. Its refinement is represented in the diagram below:
5.5 This model has been piloted in Wales and 40% of schools have ‘engaged’ with it in some way. At a conference in July 2018 ‘early enablers’ presented their work to other schools. Welsh Government working with the Regional Education Consortia and the ‘early enabler’ schools plans to expand the work to all schools in Wales in the autumn of 2018.

5.6 An initial evaluation of the pilot undertaken by the OECD (OECD, 2018) has identified that:

- ‘The majority of schools’ in Wales appear to be developing as learning organisations.
Six out of ten schools that responded to the OECD survey had put five to seven dimensions of the SLO model into practice with one third of these having embraced all seven.

Two dimensions had been well developed: ‘promoting team learning and collaboration among all staff’ and ‘embedding systems for collecting and exchanging knowledge and learning’.

Two dimensions had been less well developed: ‘developing a shared vision centred on the learning of all students’ and ‘establishing a culture of inquiry, innovation and exploration’.

Primary schools appear to be making the greatest progress in achieving the seven dimensions, with secondary schools being more constrained by the strong accountability culture within the Welsh education system.

5.7 The claim in this in-house evaluation that ‘the majority of schools in Wales seem well on their way in developing as learning organisations’ (OECD, 2018, p3) seems highly questionable given limitations to the evidence they draw upon. It is based on a self-reported survey completed by less than 10% of schools in Wales and the authors of the evaluation report themselves caution against over-interpretation of this evidence. They found that ‘additional data and interviews with stakeholders by the OECD team on some occasions found discrepancies with the SLO survey data and as such support the conclusion that school staff need to be more critical and honest about their own performance and that of their schools for deep learning’ (OECD, 2018 p 4).

5.8 It may be that part of the difficulty being encountered here flows from ambiguity on how the SLO model is being understood and interpreted by schools. Allied to this, if the survey has been completed by the school leadership team, there may be the danger that an enthusiastic but managerialist adoption of the SLO approach, has led to this over-positive self-reporting.

5.9 This in turn could undermine progress towards the vision of professionalism envisioned by Donaldson and Furlong. The new Professional Standards are an attempt to foster ‘expansive learning’ (Fuller & Unwin, 2004) and have the capacity to ‘open up’ consideration and sharing of practice, knowledge and understanding: in the context of limited opportunities for staff, there could well be tensions here with the evidence provided by the survey.

5.10 The findings of the OECD survey certainly appear to be at odds with evidence presented by Estyn. The Chief Inspectors Annual Report
of 2015/16 noted that teaching was one of the weakest aspects of educational provision and that significant improvements in professional learning was one of the developments needed to address this (Estyn, 2017).

5.11 By comparison with the Professional Standards there is a clear research basis for the SLO model although most of this is drawn from the business and private sector. Whilst it is possible to conceive the purposes, goals and responsibilities of a private for-profit company as being ‘to create innovative products and services to meet customers’ needs (Watkins & Marsick, 1996, p. 10), those of a public service are likely to have greater necessary breadth.

5.12 Given this, the need to demonstrate that the research has applicability to the education system is paramount and the head of the OECDs education directorate accepts that there is a ‘paucity of empirical evidence on the impact’ of the learning organisations concept in schools (Schleicher, 2012).

5.13 Given this situation, it is perhaps surprising that the adaptation of the SLO model to Wales does not appear to have drawn upon research evidence on professional learning in Wales including:

- Reports published by Estyn including the Chief Inspector’s Annual Report for 2015-16 which had a focus on professional learning in Wales (Estyn, 2017).
- The research- based publications published by the Welsh Government on professional learning (Welsh Government, 2015 b, c, d and e).
- Research on the Welsh Government funded Professional Learning Communities programme (Harris and Jones, 2010; Welsh Government, 2013).
- Evaluations of the Welsh Government funded Professional Development Bursaries and Chartered Teacher Programme provided by the General Teaching Council for Wales (Egan and James, 2004; Egan, 2009).
5.14 The SLO model recognises the need for schools to work externally with a range of partners, particularly parents and families. The intention in Wales is for the SLO model to be expanded from its initial focus on schools to other parts of the education sector including the Regional Education Consortia, further and higher education.

5.15 This recognises that schools, in Wales as elsewhere, do not exist in isolation and are part of a wider ‘learning culture’. This could be seen to be a strength of the SLO approach compared to what might be viewed as the more insular perspective of the Professional Standards.

5.16 Whilst the SLO model recognises the importance of networking, collaboration and engagement with the ‘external environment’ outside of schools, its dominant focus is on the school as the locus of professional learning. This may under-estimate the extent to which teachers are members of wider ‘communities of practice’ which are not necessarily confined to schools.

5.17 Research on communities of practice points to the importance of the nature of the opportunities made available to professionals, including creating strong relationships and allegiances, as being important factors in persuading them of the value of professional learning.

5.18 Research on the pan-Wales experiences of mentors operating within the MEP highlighted eight principles to support the professional learning of mentors who are enacting an ‘educative mentoring’ approach (Daly and Milton, 2017).

5.19 As in the Professional Standards the importance of teachers and schools becoming engaged in and with research is highlighted within the SLO model. Its focus, however, is on the efficacy of research for improved school effectiveness within what is currently the dominant paradigm of self-improving school systems (Hargreaves, 2010 and 2012). It is likely that this significantly under-estimates the extent to which teachers are motivated to become involved in research as a way of enhancing their own professional self-efficacy and status.

6. Support and Dissonance

6.1 Based on the above analysis, in what ways do the Professional Standards and the OECD SLO model appear to support each other and where there might be areas of dissonance?

Support
6.2 If they are interpreted in the right way both offer the possibility of schools moving away from competency-driven approaches to the professional development of teachers.

6.3 Both allow for the type of teacher agency and enhanced professionalism advocated in the Donaldson and Furlong reviews and which are being sought in the new initial teacher education programmes and the development of the new school curriculum in Wales.

6.4 Both focus on the importance of effective professional learning for teachers being continuous, facilitated by collaboration and networking and engaging teachers in and with educational research.

6.5 Working together they could, therefore, provide a conceptually attractive and potentially productive approach to strengthening professional learning for teachers in Wales.

Dissonance

6.6 Whilst there is a stronger research basis for the SLO model than the Professional Standards, neither have a completely robust evidence base in relation to the education system. The SLO model has a much stronger provenance in research literature on business and the private sector than it does in education and its adoption in Wales has not taken account of relevant research evidence on the Welsh education system.

6.7 It could be suggested that because more extensive consultation was undertaken on the Professional Standards provides much stronger professional validation than that for the SLO model. This flows from the issues about the reliability of the evidence produced by survey of the SLO pilot as highlighted in the previous section.

6.8 The elements and descriptors included in the professional learning area of the Professional Standards may represent a much narrower vision of professional learning than those set out in the SLO model. The dimensions on ‘vision’; ‘inquiry and innovation’ ‘wider environment’ and ‘leadership’ in the SLO model are not included in the professional learning elements in the Professional Standards.

6.9 Unsurprisingly given their origin, the SLO dimensions do not include ‘Welsh Language Skills’ which are included in the Professional Standards professional learning elements.

6.10 There is much more implicit referencing in the Professional Standards and synergy with the vision explicit in the Furlong and Donaldson reports than is present in the SLO model.
6.11 There is a danger that if driven by performance management approaches that the use of both the Professional Standards and the SLO model could undermine the themes of ‘trust’ and ‘thinking together’ that underpin the SLO model. The limitations of the responses to the SLO survey in Wales may suggest that this is already an issue.

6.12 For these reasons and given the central role that both the Professional Standards and the SLO model are intended to have in future, it would seem appropriate to establish much greater alignment between them and to ensure that both can demonstrate that they have a sound basis in educational research, including evidence drawn specifically from the Welsh education system.

7. The National Approach to Professional Learning

7.1 If these areas of dissonance can be addressed, there would be no reason to think that the Professional Standards and the OECD SLO model could not contribute usefully to the future development of professional learning for teachers in Wales. It would seem essential that both are enablers for the vision of teachers as creative, inquiring professionals set out in the Furlong and Donaldson reports in a way which provides entitlement for professionals and not a performance management exercise.

7.2 A separate but related issue arises when considering how the standards and the OECD model can work together. It is suggested by the OECD report on the SLO pilot in Wales, which includes the following implementation issue (OECD, 2018 p22):

“Improve the communication on the justification and logic of Wales’ schools as learning organisations policy and how it forms an integrated part of the curriculum reform and relates to other policies”.

7.3 This proposal is made in the context of previous OECD reports on the Welsh education system (OECD, 2014) which have pointed to both a lack of policy coherence in the past and improvements that have been made in this regard more recently.

7.4 What, therefore, needs to be considered is how a National Approach to Professional Learning will incorporate and add value to the Professional Standards, OECD SLO model and the Education Workforce Council’s Professional Learning Passport.

7.5 If these are to be at the core of the model they should be supported by guidance on:
• How they are mutually supportive and integrated.
• How ‘professional learning blend’, ‘time’, ‘accreditation/recognition’ (the other elements in the current draft of the national model) can be considered by teachers and schools.
  o What approaches school should teachers and schools take towards providing/ accessing professional learning.

7.6 This might provide in a relatively straightforward and uncomplicated way the coherence required, particularly if this was linked to the new initial teacher education programmes that will be provided from 2019 and the inquiry-based approach to developing the new school curriculum and more generally the Welsh Government’s national mission for education.

8. Conclusions

8.1 There is some limited synergy between the Professional Standards and the elements of the SLO model. Although both have much to offer they also have shortcomings. SLO is based on a model from outside education and the Professional Standards position professional learning as an aspect of professionalism rather than the underpinning feature.

8.2 Providing these shortcomings are understood, acknowledged and addressed, then both the Professional Standards and the SLO model could usefully contribute to a National Model of Professional Learning that underpins all aspects of the Welsh Government’s national mission for education.

8.3 The extent to which these two approaches could support each other is inextricably linked to the interpretation and enactment of these policies. Without further clarity and guidance, both on what is to be achieved and how to achieve it, these policies could be performed anywhere on a continuum between highly managerial / techno-rational to more educative and supportive of the development of autonomy of professional judgment.

8.4 A cosmetic but superficial compliance with concepts (such as pedagogy, or collaboration) may have the potential to be a vehicle for consideration and reflection. In practice, however, in busy schools and in the hands of individuals who have not yet become enthused by a reform agenda, such things can be translated into checklists of specific examples and become oversimplified. When this happens it can breed conformity, cynicism and the very opposite of the goal to support a new kind of professional responsibility.
8.5 Within this context of busy schools working to meet multiple initiatives and agendas, teachers and school leaders exist in a highly pressured environment. These demands notwithstanding, they might wish to be wary of buying off-the-shelf programmes positioned to address teacher and learner improvement. Whilst these products can allow schools to believe they are meeting the requirements of the Professional Standard and the SLO model, they may in fact instead be facilitating the consideration of issues at a superficial level rather than offering a sustained approach to supporting a deep and critical consideration of practice.
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Analysis of the two key sources (Welsh Government, 2017 and Kools and Stoll, 2016) and the draft of the OECD survey on the pilot in Wales of the Schools as Learning Organisations model (OECD, 2018). Use of the wider knowledge base of the research team in this field of educational research.

Conclusions
Schools as Learning Organisations is based on a model from outside education (Schleicher, 2012) and the Professional Standards for Teaching and Learning position professional learning as an aspect of professionalism rather than the underpinning feature. In order to support the interpretation and enactment of both models further clarity and guidance, both on what is to be achieved and how to achieve it, will be essential. Without these policies could be performed anywhere on a continuum between highly managerial / techno-rational to more educative and supportive of the development of autonomy of professional judgments. A cosmetic but superficial compliance with concepts (such as pedagogy, or collaboration) may have the potential to be a vehicle for consideration and reflection. In practice, however, in busy schools and the hands of individuals who have not yet become enthused by a reform agenda, such things can be over simplified and translated into checklists of specific examples.

Within this context of busy schools working to meet multiple initiatives and agendas, teachers and school leaders exist in a highly pressured environment. These demands notwithstanding, teachers should be wary of buying off-the-shelf programmes positioned to address teacher and learner improvement. Whilst these products can allow schools to believe they are meeting the requirements of the Professional Standards for Teaching and Learning and the Schools as Learning Organisations model, they may instead be facilitating the consideration of issues at a superficial level rather than offering a sustained approach to supporting a deep and critical consideration of practice.

Further detailed guidance and cases to illustrate a range of approaches to the interpretation and enactment of these policies in alignment with the National Model for Professional Learning would be valuable to the sector.
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