Chapter 3
Professional Development

Introduction

Professional development represents the other half of any discussion of this study of teacher quality. As an issue it appears to evoke less controversy and teachers, in general, happily attend professional development days, some of which are self-initiated, but often at the direction of employers. One of the major difficulties is defining professional development, since it has come to encompass a broad range of events such as teacher academic learning, briefings on curricular change, conferences, and skills training such as first aid. This chapter seeks neither to examine professional development management in detail nor argue the merit of particular events. Rather, it focuses on the key issues that recur in research and which form the foundation of professional development effectiveness: objectives, responsibilities, and management. On the most basic level, if the aim of a professional development event is not defined clearly, then the desired outcomes may either not eventuate or be incomplete.

The chapter commences with the historical context of professional development in Australia, particularly focussing on the national inquiries conducted in the 1980's. This provides a useful indication of the requirements of professional development when it was established as a part of teaching, and reflects the shortfalls experienced in achieving the ideal requirements expressed. This historical discussion also functions as a benchmark against which subsequent developments and research can be compared and discussed. This historical background is followed by an examination of the organisational requirements for professional development, given the interplay of ongoing school demands and educational change. This section reveals that complex requirements are not easily met by a conference, workshop, or course, but rather that schools need to acknowledge the process of deeper development that is required if the twin demands of change and student needs are to be satisfied.

Stage theory is introduced into the professional development discussion because there appears to be an assumption by some that teachers are a homogeneous group that can be directed collectively to achieve a required result. At a time when teachers are being exhorted to differentiate the curriculum for the wide range of student educational needs, teachers themselves appear not to be accorded the same consideration. Stage theory is particularly useful in identifying the different kinds of teachers, their learning needs, and the consequent requirement for a diverse and specific professional development delivery. The role of the

individual is then examined, with particular reference to the process as the basis for individual standards enhancement, and teacher research. The discussion suggests that the ultimate issue may not be how teachers conduct their professional learning, but rather that they end up as active and reflective participants in the development of their own practice.

Professional development validation is selected for special attention as one of the fundamental measures to determine effectiveness regardless of the individual or collective context, because the verification of learning should be obvious to both teachers and professional development administrators. This leads in to an argument that the needs of the school and the individual must be mutually reinforcing for there to be any possibility of long term quality enhancement. Based on this analysis, a listing of design elements for effective professional development summarizes the analysis in this chapter and supports the similar listing for evaluation in the previous chapter.

Historical Overview

France (1990) considers the Professional Development Program (PDP) implemented following the 1973 Report of the Interim Committee of the Schools Commission (Karmel Report) as the main stimulus to teacher professional learning. He notes that 'from 1974 a large increase in short courses and other opportunities such as one-year library courses and study grants became available to teachers, many of whom to that time had neither involvement...nor saw its need' (France 1990, p112). Whilst the devolution of responsibility for the Professional Development Program was meant to empower teachers towards their own development, 'most initiatives came from employing authorities or their agencies' (France 1990, p.112). Nonetheless, by 1980, the *Report of the National Inquiry Into Teacher Education* (hereafter referred to as *Teacher Education*) found that professional development for teachers was a well-established part of the educational landscape with 3% of the total expenditure on school level education in 1977 allocated to in-service education. Around 13% of teachers were undertaking formal award courses (Auchmuty et al. 1980, pp.71, 76) The report noted that there was lack of comprehensive data on the levels of provision or frequency of attendance, but found that, whilst pre-1974 activity was directed to upgrading of qualifications, provision of funding had led to a tenfold increase in non-award courses in some states. Participation was subsequently fostered by Schools Commission funding under the Teacher Development Program, although in 1980 expenditure appeared to be declining from the highs of the mid-1970's (Auchmuty et al. 1980, pp. 73,75).

Teacher Education, whilst significant in charting the progress of professional development for teachers, and for making some important recommendations, such as the professional development release for a term after seven years service, was short on analysis of form or outcomes. For example, it identified schools as the predominant location for non-award based courses, but was concerned that:

> usually there are no assessments and course objectives are not always specified. It is therefore difficult for the purposes of recognition to make meaningful comparisons between these courses...Also it is rarely possible to estimate whether involvement in such activities leads to improvement in professional development in a cumulative and sequential way (Auchmuty et al. 1980, p.84).

Nonetheless, the report alluded to the need for much better co-ordination and that a 'comprehensive system of provision should take note of the needs of classroom teachers at all levels' (Auchmuty et al. 1980, p.77).   Furthermore, it reinforced the right of teachers to participate in professional development according to their needs.

The tone of *Teachers Learning*, the Report of the Inservice Teacher Education Project published by the Department of Employment, Education and Training [DEET] eight years later, was a significantly different document, commencing with the sentence 'The Commonwealth Government has called for a national effort to strengthen Australia's schools as part of the national economic readjustment. The nation is being asked to upgrade the skills of its workforce' (DEET 1988, p.3). Professional Development had thus moved to being part of the national training agenda; from what teachers did to cope with changes in society and education, to meet professional needs not covered in pre-service education, and to meet their new and emerging roles within the classroom (Auchmuty et al. 1980, p.70).   Schools were designated as 'a base upon which to build economic recovery' (DEET 1988, p.3).

Teachers Learning was complimentary of teachers' efforts to extend their professional knowledge, and forward-looking in its analysis of social and economic change and the way that teachers can contribute to helping students meet workforce demands. It specified that:

(a)   new knowledge for teachers was required in the technologies and media and new methods of assessment;

(b)   schools and teachers were to 'prepare generally educated young people capable of continuing to learn, adaptably and skilfully, throughout their working lives'; and that

(c)   teachers were required to be confident and knowledgeable so that they could inculcate self reliance and adaptability in students (DEET 1988, pp.3, 5).

However, the primary agenda was stated simply in a section headed Responding to Other Demands: 'society is demanding greater public accountability about student performance' (DEET 1988, p.6). This objective established the foundation for future discussion that revealed that, at the time:

(a)   Professional development in Australia remained piecemeal and lacked integration (p.9).

(b)   There was no structural integration of professional development and curriculum development, despite rhetoric to the contrary (p.11).

(c)   There was a failure to integrate staff appraisal systems and professional development (p.11).

(d)   The quality of professional development programs was patchy (p.11).

(e)   There were too many *one-off* offerings which neither reflected sound principles of adult learning nor generated school or classroom improvement (p.11).

(f)   Professional development topics frequently did not meet school priorities (p.12).

(g)   Professional development rarely addressed teachers' direct needs and concerns (p.12).

(h)   There was no recognition of particular school or regional requirements (p.12).

(i)   There was an absence of long-term planning to ensure professional development effectiveness (p.12).

(j)   The evaluation of activities was localised and haphazard (p.11).

Despite the offer of a new career structure incorporating the Certificate of Advanced Teaching, *Teachers Learning* was primarily a government directive for teachers to embrace the need for change by modelling the national training agenda for reform and doing so in ways more effective than before. The teaching profession is described as ageing and stabilising with fewer opportunities for promotion or mobility, and facing increasing autonomy and 'feelings of ineffectiveness or powerlessness, professional isolation, unacceptable student behaviours, time pressures and inadequate facilities' (DEET 1988, pp.6-7). Beside the criticisms, this appeared to imply that society was stuck with the present bunch of teachers, so they had better develop to meet its demands.

More recently Gregor Ramsey saw teacher professional development as a key issue in his report *Quality Matters* (2000). Ramsey joins the camp of Ingvarson and Chadbourne by linking

professional development to the need for standards. What comes through in his report is a sense of frustration at the failure of developments to flow from previous inquiries:

> The debate of the past 20 years about standards and how to improve the quality of teacher education has run its course. It is time to move forward. Most teacher educators and teachers are now at the point where they are disillusioned by seemingly endless debate and a repetitive chain of reviews which, in spite of their findings and recommendations in such critical areas as funding, standards of professional practice, accreditation of initial teacher education programs and teacher licensing, fail them (Ramsey 2000, p.31).

Ramsey perceived a critical connection between teaching as a profession, the establishment of standards, and the formation of a culture of ongoing learning that was embedded in teachers' practice throughout their careers (Ramsey 2000, p.124). Teaching, he felt, could not consider itself a profession until it proved it had standards and associated training to induct and advance its members:

> There should be a shift in teacher education to conceiving it as a continuum of learning, beginning in pre-service education and continuing in an integrated way throughout teachers' careers. The structures for this to occur do not presently exist; they need to be developed and implemented. Only through clear professional structures will teachers be able to exercise the professional responsibility they have for improving the quality of their individual practice (Ramsey, 2000, p.84).

Ramsey did not hesitate to criticise teachers for responding only to employer directed priorities, which were then seen as the bottom line of professional development participation (Ramsey 2000, pp.83, 161). He appreciated also the need for a particularly high level of motivation for a teacher to continue self-initiated learning, and it was for this reason that he identified the need for a culture where teachers could extend their professional knowledge with employer support rather than direction (Ramsey 2000, pp.83-84). More than the previous reviews, Ramsey saw the need for teaching to assume responsibility for its professional standards and learning. His comparison with other professions, such as nurses, is salutary in describing the functions of induction and professional learning throughout a career. The following call should have been heeded across the nation by all teachers:

> It is time that the debate about whether teaching is a profession was brought to an end. Its inconclusive nature is a contributing factor to the malaise

perceived by many as characterising teaching. Rather, the education community should emphasise and increase wider community understanding of the importance of teaching, the increased value which it should have in a "learning society" and how greatly the work of teachers adds to the sum of the State's and the nation's human capital. This will do far more to enhance perceptions of teaching in New South Wales than engagement in a fruitless debate about professional status. It should be a profession: let us get on and make it one (Ramsey 2000, p.33).

As will be shown later, Ramsey's calls (if they were heard at all) have remained unheeded in Tasmania, as much as the recommendations of reviews twelve years ahead of his fell similarly on deaf ears.

Hargreaves proposes a much broader historical perspective of teaching, seeing it as part of a progression that he terms the professional ages of teaching; pre-professional, autonomous, collegial, and post-professional. The pre-professional age valued order and control, with teachers as '(at best) enthusiastic people who know their stuff, know how to "get it across", and can keep order in their classes' (Hargreaves 1997b, p.91). Teaching was a case of mastering the process, after which little assistance is required and everything is confined to the classroom. In this age, ongoing education for teachers was not necessary and isolation the norm (Hargreaves 1997b, p.91). In the autonomous age, which corresponds to the forty years after World War 2, the academic enhancement of education involved ideological conflict between traditional and progressive forms of education. However the choice of classroom method remained with the teacher who strongly guarded against interference in the classroom (Hargreaves 1997b, p.94). Autonomy generated isolation flowing from the layout of schools, tradition and habit, and insecurities in the teachers themselves. Hargreaves explains failures of professional development to penetrate the classroom as partially flowing from an increased dysfunction between classroom realities and innovations that were not understood, particularly when they originated beyond the school (Hargreaves 1997b, pp.93-94).

According to Hargreaves, by the mid-1980's autonomous practices were increasingly unsustainable for coping with the major changes in society and the increasing complexity of schooling (Hargreaves 1997b, p.95; France 1990, pp.114-116). Collegiality was almost unavoidable as teachers responded to research and sought a sense of direction and mutual support to cope with increased role demands and educational reform (Hargreaves 1997b, pp.96-

97). In this age the demands of professional development are significant and within the school centred on collegial learning (Hargreaves 1997b, pp.96-97). It is notable that Hargreaves cautions that the age of the collegial professional may not be completely empowering, but rather impose management structures that exploit rather than empower. He suggests that central consultation in an environment of devolved management may indeed not be collaborative but technical in nature, thus narrowing rather than expanding participation (Hargreaves 1997b, p.98). Smyth (1995) adopts a left wing perspective to express the same concern. For Smyth, the recent apparent easing of management control over schools is accompanied by increased centralised ideological demands. External priorities are translated not only into policy by centralised governments, but the outcomes and evidences are prescribed, turning teachers into mere technicians and thus limiting their right to achieve broader educational outcomes (Smyth 1995, pp.78-82; Smyth 1998, p.1244; Fink & Soll 1998, p.298, 308-309). Smyth thus sees the enthusiastic professional development accompaniment as a mechanism for entrapment of teachers rather than liberation.

Fullan seems less pessimistic, but perhaps more cynical, when he argues that the failure to adopt innovative teaching practices is due not only to the limitations of the architecture of teachers' work, but also to contradictions within the methodologies of the changes themselves (Fullan 1982, p.116). These are often contradictory, arguing for innovative thinking and new problem solving skills whilst at the same time treating teachers as subservient technicians rather than those responsible for sharing understanding and knowledge, both of which have to be learned appropriately by the adult before they can be shared with the child (Fullan 1982, p.119). That is to say that Smyth's suggestion of the forces of capitalism undermining the teachers' autonomy intimates a measure of organisation and efficiency that does not exist. The subtle domination Smyth fears may in fact be countered by the nature of teachers' work and the inherent shortfalls of implementation of the collaborative professional development of which he is suspicious. The outcome is thus not control but inefficiency (Fink & Sol 1998, p.306-307). Nonetheless, Smyth's assertion is valuable in that it does highlight that manifestations of collegiality and autonomy do not necessarily mean teachers have achieved control of their professional development in recent years.

Organisational Requirements

The manifestation of the social agenda for education, the need to produce skills requirements to meet workplace needs, or changes to educational theory have generated a consistent flow of changes and reforms down through the education system. Because these ultimately are

directed to influence the education of children, they must needs pass through the hands of teachers and their work and thus attract a professional development requirement. The success or failure of any change rests both on the nature of the organisation and the professional development process that is applied. The ability of researchers to highlight the failure of loudly touted reforms illustrates that such requirements are not often met (Ingvarson 2002, p.8). At the same time, such experience should allow this study to better illustrate the organisational environment necessary for successful professional development.

Guskey and Sparks make the criticism initiatives often are devoid of content detail, representing broad directions of education policy which require teachers to translate it into daily practice, and they believe that greater chance of success for professional development exists when the size of the change is 'not so massive that typical users find it necessary to adopt a coping strategy that seriously distorts the change, but large enough to require noticeable, sustained effort' (Guskey & Sparks 1996, p.35). Any change requires alteration of teachers' knowledge and practices and professional development thus needs to be directed to their level rather than the global visions often generated by education departments (Darling-Hammond 1998, pp.646-647). Failure to do so may mean that the concept will be misunderstood, because teachers are unable to connect it with their classroom realities (Hawley & Valli 1999, p.137; Ingvarson 1998b, p.1012). Alternatively, the innovation may be open to condemnation as another fad, big on hype but devoid of relevance to education in the real world (Ingvarson 1998b, p.1007).

Hargreaves sees this issue as part of the process of accelerated change where 'Administrative mandates to teach in particular ways are being imposed and overturned at an ever increasing rate' (Hargreaves 1997b, p.95. See also: Guskey 1995, p.125; Collins 1991, p.13). Guskey and Sparks caution that use of the term "research-based" in innovations may mean that they are based on literature rather than systematically tested, so that the research evidence should be studied carefully before implementation (Guskey & Sparks 1991, p.74. See also: Guskey & Sparks 1996, p.36; Hawley & Valli 1999, p.137). Proposals short on relevance and practical application damage the professional development process in two ways. First of all, they fail and are revealed as deficient, justifying their "hype" label. However, they also undermine the process itself by establishing a mentality of suspicion, particularly among more established teachers who may have experienced the negatives from other poorly conceived proposals for change (Collins 1991, pp.16-17; Cooper 1991, p.86). Echoing Guskey, the professional

development 'has to have content that we know is to lead to positive improvement' (Asayesh 1993, p.26. See also DuFour 2004, p.64).

Guskey and Sparks point to the importance of what they call context; 'the organisation, system, or culture in which the staff development takes place and where the new understandings will be implemented' (Guskey & Sparks 1996, p.35. See also: Hopkins 1998, p.1044; Hirsh et al. 2000). There are two key aspects to this issue. The first is the assumption by curricular reformers or bureaucrats that all schools are equal. However, each school has its own culture and environment into which the change needs to be integrated. This requires schools to not just blindly to accept directives for change, but to examine critically, objectively, and locally each proposal and determine the implementation stages, learning requirements, timetable and adjustments necessary for success (Smyth 1998, p.1254; Darling-Hammond 1998, p656; Allen & Glickman 1998, pp.646-647; Hopkins 1998, p.1037; Garmston 2003, p.65; Hirsh, 2004, p.14). From a purely management point of view, the development of learning can be undermined by insufficient and inappropriate efforts in the wrong direction.

Secondly, the developmental culture of the school is significant if the learning is to be internalised by teachers and applied effectively. There is agreement in the literature that a cooperative and collegial environment is the most beneficial for effective professional development (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin 1999, pp.383-384; Nias 1998, pp.1260-1261; Hodkinson & Hodkinson 2005, p.116). This requires schools to support the breaking down of teacher individualism and isolation and encourage the sharing of teaching experiences and techniques (Guskey & Sparks 1996, p.36). However, this cannot be mandated in a hierarchical and bureaucratic fashion or else it will result in passive compliance or the construction of "contrived collegiality" (Hawley & Valli 1999, p.140; Allen & Glickman 1998, p.505). Guskey notes that in professional development initiatives, teacher 'discomfort that accompanies change is greatly compounded if the individuals involved perceive that they have no say in the process or if they feel isolated and detached in their implementation efforts' (Guskey 1995, p.120). Broad involvement of individuals from all levels of the organisation is suggested as the means to overcome this (Elmore & Burney 1999, pp.269, 272, 288). The problem here is that, particularly with government or department initiated change, the process of implementation is bureaucratic and its subsequent introduction into the school is through the hierarchy in a "banking" approach to teacher learning (Asayesh 1993, p.26; Hodkinson & Hodkinson 2005, pp.111, 120). The advocated broad involvement cannot just be implemented at such a time, as the opportunity does not exist to overcome established practice and suspicions. Additionally a

veneer of organisational openness might yield superficial improvements but cannot result in the change in teachers' knowledge and beliefs that will affect the teaching of students (Nias 1998, p.1263).

Furthermore, in order to create teachers who will be reflective and motivated to develop their own pedagogy, Richert argues that they need both time and opportunity to practice such reflection (Richert 1991, p.114; Borko & Putnam 1995, p.59; Guskey 1995, p.124). Given the diffusion of the teacher's role and increased administrative demands, such opportunity is generally absent with only the most motivated making the effort in their own time. Viadero's (2002) example of teacher research supported by schools and district administrations is perhaps a good example of what can be achieved. However, Smyth injects a note of caution arguing that the partnerships and cooperation when fostered by educational authorities may represent a new form of ideological control over teachers who are now being told how to relate to each other (Smyth 1995, pp.80-81). This is seen as flowing from greater pressures from above to meet national priorities, such as expressed in *Teachers Learning*, whilst at the same time professing greater teacher autonomy (Smyth 1995, pp.80-81). Ultimately, Smyth argues:

> If processes like collegiality are in fact being used as a managerial tool in the guise of a professional development process to coerce teachers into doing the bland work of economic reconstruction, then we should not be altogether surprised if the majority of teachers shun the processes (Smyth 1995, p.87).

Hargreaves asserts that in a process of change 'Teachers must learn to teach in ways they have not been taught' (Hargreaves 1997b, p.99). Such learning occurs most effectively not in lectures or workshops but within classroom situations and with small groups of colleagues (Hargreaves 1997b, p.98; Darling-Hammond 1998, p.644; DuFour 2004, p.63). The development of new teaching is not immediately successful, but requires trial and often error, and teachers will make mistakes as they try to cope with change. As mentioned previously, teachers may not engage with change if it seems too large and complex, but when they do so must feel secure enough to risk mistakes and learn from them (Asayesh 1993, p.26; Borko and Putnam 1995, p.59; Guskey 1995, p.118; Nia 1998, p.1260). Consequently, the school environment needs to be such that teachers are both confident enough to take risks and secure enough to share failure (Little 1999, p.255; Elmore & Burney 1999, p, 270; Smyth 1998b, p.1247). However, bureaucratic hierarchy, by its nature, is more likely to favour standardisation and conformity (Fink & Soll 1998, pp.303-304, 313).

The collegial atmosphere that supports effective development can be fostered and encouraged, but it cannot be imposed. Consequently, a secure culture of experimentation in pursuit of teaching excellence must be an established and ongoing part of the school (Borko & Putnam 1995, p.59; Guskey & Sparks 1996, p.36; Asayesh 1993, p.26; DuFour 2004, p.64). The difficulty for the school is accepting that it must resist imposing bureaucratic time frames and mandates which can pressure teachers to a point where implementation is stifled mid-stream; each school needs to take the time required to make the process work and be encouraging in their professional development process (Little 1999, pp.244-245; Nias 1998, p.1265; DuFour 2004, p.64). For school administrations, this means relinquishing their own control and conversely acting on behalf of teachers to defend their development (Hawley & Valli 1999, p.131; Little 1999, p.243; Allen & Glickman 1998, p.505). Such changes are what has prompted some researchers to argue that a true professional development culture based on the ideals of education as professed, namely child centred learning communities, in fact requires a transformation of the system as a whole (Ingvarson 2002, p.18).

Cooper (1991) points out that where teams have reconceptualized their ideal school, they often reproduce the current system in an improved form. However, as the current system is exactly that which hinders change, the opportunity for change in teaching itself is effectively stifled (Cooper 1991, p.87). Collins supports this view noting that:

> research shows that if we want effective professional development, what we
> are really facing is nothing less than the reconceptualizing and restructuring
> of schooling...the evidence is overwhelming that professional development
> requires teachers to work together. Structures which support collegiality are
> necessary...Yet schools are designed on a model which splits up teachers and
> keeps them isolated (Collins 1991, pp.17-18).

In the best context, professional development is not something that occurs only when people head off to workshops, when it is scheduled, or affects the few participating. It is a part of school life and is embedded in daily educational process (Asayesh 1993, p.24; Hopkins 1998, p.1037).

The Relevance of Stage Theory

Stage theory establishes two main strands relevant to any consideration of professional development. The first is an emphasis that adults are not complete, but continue significant cognitive development throughout their lives so that 'Any program that assumes that adults

have attained abstract operations in all aspects of their thinking is likely to encounter problems' (Oja 1991, p47).   Secondly, teachers change and develop through their professional life. Whilst an egg to butterfly analogy might seem appropriate initially, teachers may become stuck at any stage, some staying as eggs or larvae and never achieving true maturity. Meanwhile, the pace of progression is not set and individuals move at their own rate. If it is accepted that not all school students are created equal and that they require different levels and types of support to achieve cognitive outcomes, then it seems foolish to assume that teachers are all the same. The only differences in much of the research are the placement of the stages and the definition of the response or factors at play. Oja notes that:

> Knowledge of [stage] theory helps one to recognize and deal more effectively with individual differences. The value in knowing the progressions in adult development and these approximate sets of individual differences or world views will help one to be less dogmatic about any one solution's being appropriate for everybody (Oja 1991, p.41).

Professional development organisers must be cognizant of the fact that they are dealing with adult learners, something that is often overlooked in both schools and by governments driven by accountability or other agendas (Asayesh 1993, p25; Collins, 1991, p.17). Stage theory has researched and attempted to define career development in teachers, and focuses 'on underlying patterns of thought and problem solving that play a central role in determining an individual's approach to the world' (Oja 1991, p.41). Some attempt has been made to place these developmental stages within age ranges for easy identification, but the variation between individuals and the pace of movement within and between stages suggests broader categories are more useful (Fessler 1995, pp.171, 187). Fessler (1995) summarises well the work of various researchers in defining stage levels and characteristics. It is notable that some theorists identify various stages whilst others focus on the consequent behaviours manifested within them.

Hubermann defines the following stages:

- *Career Entry and Socialization*. Initial enthusiasm and discovery of teaching as an act. This then stabilizes into a set of repertoires that set the base for a professional identity.
- *Diversification and Change*. The consolidation of repertoires leads to attempts to increase one's effectiveness in the classroom, and there is an opportunity to look beyond the classroom. New ideas, challenges, and engagements are sought.

- *"Stock-Taking" and Interrogations at Mid-career.* This period corresponds to a mid-life crisis where either diversification has proved exhausting or questions about the future arise. It is generally placed in the 32 to 45 year age bracket and following 12 to 20 years of teaching experience. However, Fessler points to increasing frequency of this occurring earlier in teachers' careers (Fessler 1995, p.186).

- *Serenity.* A mellowing period where a decline in ambition and a level of investment is matched by greater instructional effectiveness.

- *Conservatism.* A period of increased rigidity and dogmatism accompanied by nostalgia for the past. This may be followed by a disengagement phase but the existence of such responses earlier in teachers' careers makes its nomination as a culminating phase problematical (Hubermann 1995, pp.196-203)

A model by Katz (1972), cited by Fessler, identified not just stages, but also the training assistance necessary to support them.

- *Survival.* Represents the early years of teaching where individuals feel inadequate and unprepared and need to reconcile their learning and anticipation with classroom reality. Training needs consist of on-site support and technical assistance.

- *Consolidation.* Consolidation of previous gains, development of sufficient confidence to focus on individual pupils, and differentiation of specific tasks and skills. Training needs are continuing on-site assistance, with access to advice from specialists and colleagues.

- *Renewal.* Development of confidence and familiarity with everyday requirements and interest in innovations in the field. Training needs include attendance at conferences, visits to demonstration projects, teacher's centres, journals, and critiques of videotaped lessons.

- *Maturity.* Teachers come to terms with themselves and ask deeper and abstract questions about education and their practice. Training needs consist of seminars, courses, degree programs, and conferences (Fessler 1995, p.174).

Joyce and McKibben, who focus more on behaviours, apply the following labels:

- *Omnivores.* Happy, self-actualizing people who rely on a broad range of sources and inputs toward individual and school growth.

- *Partial Omnivore/Active Consumers.* Operate at a similar level to omnivores but with more restricted sources.

- *Passive Consumers.* Those who 'are *there* when opportunity presents itself but who rarely seek or initiate new activities.'

- *Resistant.* Those less likely to seek out training, but, when they do in response to overt material benefit, will select areas where they already feel successful. 'Change to them means they are not doing a good job and therefore are threatened', and entrenched processes are defended with vigour.

- *Withdrawn.* These not only require a great deal of energy to engage, but are more likely to engage in very few self initiated activities whilst also minimizing informal workplace interaction (Joyce & McKibben 1982, pp.37-39).

These behaviours may not strictly correspond to career stages, but omnivore characteristics would more likely appear amongst early career teachers, passivity at mid career, and resistance and withdrawal in the pre-retirement group. Such responses could act as indicators of the potential success of professional development activities, particularly amongst older and well-established school staffs. However, these reactions might just as well suggest management weaknesses, or deterioration in staff morale or other aspects of the work environment. Nonetheless, Joyce and McKibben's behavioural descriptions are useful in alerting us to the fact that teachers are not homogeneous and react differently to their career experiences, and that further examination of stages might help better define their needs.

There may be debate about when particular stages exist or the progressions between stages, but the researchers agree that there is no such thing as *teachers* as a homogenous collective. Rather, just as with school students, the profession is made up of individuals at various stages of cognitive and emotional development, with different needs and interests and levels of receptivity, and requiring different forms of support and development. Any change in organisation or teaching, even with devised implementation stages and processes, cannot therefore just be presented to all teachers in a school with the expectation that it will be accepted and executed as laid down (Oja 1991, p.56). Inappropriate delivery to differing groups of the staff will generate defensive behaviours and undermine implementation (France 1990, p.116). In particular, research by Joyce & McKibben clearly illustrates how an entrenched resistant teacher can stultify development through strongly established skills of ridicule, obstruction, and disengagement or withdrawal:

Although she advertised herself as the best teacher in the school, her

teaching was in fact dull and monotonous...We concluded that a resistant

person had become the most powerful person in the informal system and was

using her power to protect herself and, hence, insulate the entire school from

attempts to improve it (Joyce and McKibben 1982, p.41).

Oja (1991) charts a similar stage structure to Katz, but with stage descriptions that can also be used to reflect responses to change and professional development programs; self-protective, conformist, conscientious, and autonomous (Oja 1991, p.54). A staff made up completely of the autonomous type teacher with characteristics of flexibility, creativity, and the ability to deal with complexity would make change an easy process. However, most teachers would experience a period of cognitive conflict and disequilibrium flowing from the introduction of new concepts. This can lead to anxiety and frustration, and ultimately rejection, if the conflicts cannot be resolved (Oja 1991, p.52). Meanwhile there is the danger that the most enthusiastic activists in ambitious school, or district wide, changes will gradually become exhausted and embittered as they watch innovations fail to impact on classrooms (Hubermann 1995, p.205).

The staff developer's role should be to recognise the differences between teachers at various stages of development and provide support appropriate to each, thereby minimising conflict and maximising the possibility of a successful outcome in both human and organisational terms (Oja 1991, p.56). As Hubermann found, 'Overall, few were happy with conventional inservice formats ("not aligned with my needs"...."specialists who never ran a class of kids"...."good exchange with colleagues, but then it was over and nothing was resolved.")' (Hubermann 1995, p.207). In practical terms, this may require the development of differing training environments for teachers at major stages (Ingvarson 1998b, p.1020). Those at more concrete levels of development could have a highly structured environment, whilst teachers at an increased mastery level for whom the benefits of workshops and *how-to* courses decreases could undertake less structured training (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin 1999, pp.398-399). In fact Hubermann found that teachers were most satisfied 'when they were able to tinker productively inside their classrooms or with two or three colleagues in order to obtain the instructional and relational effects they were after' (1995, p.206. See also: Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin 1999, pp.378, 380).

Professional development management within the school cannot just assume that organisational or educational changes can be automatically generated by slotting them into workshop or focus group formats. The change should firstly be examined within light of the particular school's circumstances and strategies developed to 'graft new learning into the school culture through school community within a coherent policy framework' (France 1990, p.121. See also: Fullan

1982, p.264; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin 1999, pp.393-394, 397). Then strategies need to be applied to strengthen individual and group commitment. This is where intimate knowledge of the staff in question is invaluable. A school with a high proportion of mid-career stock-taking teachers (a large proportion of the mid-40's contemporary teaching force, if stage theory age ranges are correct) will need a particular approach to secure the commitment of their experience at a time of potential personal disequilibrium (France 1990, p.116; Collins 1991, p.16). The presence of members of the conservative group in senior teacher positions amplifies the possibility of failure, particularly if there is a convergence of multiple changes. The complexity of the issue, what Fullan calls the *real crunch* is:

> in the *relationships* between these new programs and policies and the thousands of subjective realities embedded in people's individual and organisational contexts and their personal histories. How these subjective realities are addressed or ignored is crucial for whether potential changes become meaningful at the level of individual use and effectiveness (Fullan 1982, p.35).

Professional development management does not end with the structuring of the learning situation. There is plenty of agreement in the literature that teachers require on-going support and care over a long period of time if they are to successfully transform their knowledge and turn it into habit in their practice (Asayesh 1993, pp24-25; Cooper 1991, pp.85-86). Teachers need to develop ownership of the change through involvement in effective professional development (Fullan 1982, p.113). Thereafter, modification in teaching behaviours needs to be internalised by the individual and the institution so that they become mutually supportive and long term (Guskey 1995, p.124; Guskey and Sparks 1991, p.75; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin 1999, p.380). Whilst a lot of positives can result from collegial interaction in the first place, Hubermann highlights a tendency for teachers to ultimately have to work through their own version of change using experimentation over a long period. This is partially due to the architectural and social organisation of schooling (Hubermann 1995, p.207; Hawley & Valli 1999, p.144; Garmston 2003, p.65). Given stage theory, this means that, not only do teachers require differing inputs, but also the support forms will vary for differing periods, making arbitrary completion targets inappropriate. The message the professional development staff should transmit to teachers is that the learning for important changes cannot be achieved in a couple of days, but will be a continuing process that will vary according to their needs.

Fessler makes the point that supporters of stage theory often fail to adequately encompass environmental factors at work and that teacher development is a dynamic ebb and flow process rather than a linear progression (Fessler 1995, pp.171, 174-5). Hubermann supports this view by adding that teachers are neither marionettes, nor do they mature like ducklings; teachers in chronological periods face and respond differently to challenges of their era, and they are actors in their own destiny (Hubermann 1995, pp.194-195; Fessler 1995, pp.181-185). However, not only does Fessler's Teacher Career Cycle Model identify the broad range of influences that will move a teacher between career stages, but he also provides a much broader concept of professional development that sees support for personal needs and problem resolution (Fessler 1995, p.188). Indeed it could be argued that Fessler has defined a concept of teacher professional and personal support that moves significantly beyond the considerations of in-service training.

An appreciation of stage theory should both help teachers recognise their career position and needs, and guide professional development staff in how best to assist teachers overcome their reliance on external support. Whatever label is applied, conscientious, autonomous, or mature, teachers should be encouraged to progress to a position of self-confidence and honest self-criticism, where they are capable of establishing their own evaluation and development loop. The greatest danger in stage theory is that teachers too easily may be identified as withdrawn or resistant so that they are overlooked. Such a perspective, particularly if age-based, could marginalise mature teachers, exactly those best equipped to mentor younger colleagues through their own professional journey (Oja 1991, p.39).

The Role of the Individual Teacher

Because schools should be ideally about student learning and teaching practice that facilitates understanding, the success of professional development is ultimately reliant on it meeting the needs of the teacher and being translated into improved practice and learning in the classroom (Ingvarson 2002, p.5). For this reason, professional development must be both understood and applicable. Fullan cites research by Elliot that the tendency of consultants to dwell on underlying theoretical rationales in dealings with teachers often falls on deaf ears because, in advance of theoretical justification, teachers primarily assess applicability, and the time and effort to implement proposed changes (Fullan 1982, p.270). Fullan encapsulates it as: 'Nothing has promised so much and has been so frustratingly wasteful as the thousands of workshops and conferences which led to no significant change in practice when the teachers returned to their classrooms' (Fullan 1982, p.263. See also Ingvarson 1998b, p.1011). The

fault lies not just with the deliverers of the workshops and conferences, but also with the teachers who are supposed to be active learners themselves, rather than passive consumers of product. As such, individual teachers have a responsibility for their own development, both within the process of curricular change and as educational practitioners.

Teachers need to know what it is they require, and to become active participants in the development process (Asayesh 1993, p.26; Ingvarson 1998a, p.138; Ingvarson 1998b, p.1011). However, for this to occur, they firstly must overcome the individualism and isolation that undermines both their perception of, and results from, professional development opportunities. Teachers need to move to a position of true collegiality and away from the persistent position of the autonomous professional, one where independence is protected and interference resisted (Hargreaves 1997b, p.94; Smyth 1998, p.1250). Hargreaves cites a number of negative outcomes due to autonomous professionalism when applied to courses conducted external to the school. These include: focussing on short-term improvements, inconsistency in teacher expectations and programs for students, and impaired improvement due to lack of collegial exchange (Hargreaves 1997b, pp.93-94l; Ingvarson 2002, p.5). Ingvarson goes as far as to suggest that most professional development programs are equivalent to expecting teachers to build the Sydney Harbour Bridge after teaching them how to glue matchsticks together (Ingvarson 2002, p.8).

The lack of positive outcomes in isolated external course attendance is not just that the teacher attending the learning program may have difficulty integrating the material. Enthusiastic individuals returning to schools often have difficulties communicating their learning to colleagues who fail to absorb their ardour or see the relevance of the learning (Hargreaves 1997b, p.95; Allen & Glickman 1998, p.648). The shortfall in transmission of learning may be due to an excessively strong individualistic and isolated perspective, which rejects anything outside the particular classroom, or an inadequate collegiality, which inhibits effective sharing (Hawley & Valli 1999, p.128; Smyth 1998, p.1250; Nias 1998, p.1260). Fullan argues that, despite their increased number, professional development events remain divorced from everyday work and are not 'organically connected to teaching' (Fullan 1994, p.6).

Borko and Putnam argue that effective professional development requires a change in teachers knowledge systems: their thoughts, judgements, and perceptions of both pedagogy and subject matter. Teachers have to be willing to 'think in new ways about students, subject matter and the teaching-learning process' (Borko & Putnam 1995, p.38. See also: Hawley & Valli 1999,

p.138; Ingvarson 2002, p.5). Cooper supports this view by arguing that teachers have to be willing to recreate learning environments and to '...think about the structures and functions that are right for children' (Cooper 1991, p.86). However, as Guskey cautions, the process for achieving the necessary framework for this changed attitude is not clear:

> In the minds of many today there is a clear vision of what would be ideal professional development. The ideal sees educators at all levels constantly in search of new and better ways to address the diverse learning needs of their students. It sees schools as learning communities where teachers and students are engaged in inquiry and stimulating discourse. It sees practitioners in education respected for their professional knowledge and pedagogical skills. The exact process by which that vision may be accomplished, however, is much more blurred and confused (Guskey 1991, p.126).

It can be assumed that the development of one genuine positive element will enhance the extension of others. However, if this is imposed through professional development within an existing environment that has not proved effective, then the change could well be rejected (Hawley & Valli 1999, p.133). The prevalent view of the teacher as empty vessel, reminiscent of the "banking" approach to teaching, where 'Ideas exist outside the teacher, and the job of the staff developer is to "shovel them in"', needs to be replaced (Asayesh 1993, p.26). Ingvarson supports this view by criticising established professional development as infantilising the profession (Ingvarson 1998a, p.128; Smyth 1998, p.1248). Asayesh notes that participation in evaluating one's own learning encourages greater ownership and growth as compared to passive submission to development direction (Asayesh 1993, p.25). There is strong researcher support for teachers as the source for professional development, through inquiry or reflection on their own practice (Asayesh 1993, p.26; Richert 1991, pp. 114,122, 123: Hawley & Valli 1999, p.143). Simply put, enthused teachers who reflect on their own practice and seek to enhance their own professional skills are likely to be more active in participating in and sharing the development of their learning in response to external changes (Nias 1998, p.1261; Ingvarson 2002, p.11).

Ingvarson and Chadbourne have long championed the concept of professional standards along the lines of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards movement in the United States as the means for facilitating such a change in teachers. Ingvarson makes the criticism that 'the traditional system cannot help but convey the message that [the] in-service education

system is something done for, or to teachers. It may gain compliance, but the level of commitment may be low' (Ingvarson 1998a, p.131). He provides some guidance on a resolution by suggesting the complementary development of individual teacher's pedagogy and the training that employers need to provide to support change. A standards-based system owned by teachers would give them responsibility for their own development and standards, as occurs in other professions (Ingvarson 1998a, p.130; Hargreaves 1997b, p.100; Ingvarson 1998b, p.1007).

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards process seems to address a number of criticisms made of professional development effectiveness. It:

(a)   Is essentially conducted by teachers and associated professionals, with assessment by a panel of about 15 who are mainly practising teachers (NBPTS 2003a; NBPTS 2001, p.viii),

(b)   Is independent of interest groups and employer pressures (NBPTS 2003a).

(c)   Addresses both subject knowledge and pedagogy against agreed professional standards without making judgements about pedagogical styles (NBPTS 2003a; NBPTS 2003b).

(d)   Is an ongoing career process for teachers directed towards best practice and focussed on a continuing desire for professional growth (NBPTS 2003b).

(e)   Is directed to achieving the best outcome for students through enhanced teaching practice (NBPTS 2003a).

The standards proposal is fairly formal in its structure and, whilst occurring beyond the school, derives its validity from assessors being practising master practitioners organised along the same lines as other professional certification bodies. Its major strengths are that it is an ongoing career-long process that teachers engage in voluntarily, and, by being beyond bureaucratic and political processes, it is not subject to the vagaries of educational fads or particular employer policy goals (Ingvarson 1998a, p.130; Little 1999, p.251; Ingvarson 2002, pp.9, 13). Furthermore, as a voluntary activity, the responsibility lies with the individual teacher to pursue excellence. National Board for Professional Teaching Standards success and expansion thus relies on greater recognition for the capabilities of certified teachers by administrators, the academic community, and society in general (NBPTS 2003b). Notably, it also establishes a teachers' professional voice, a voice that is significantly absent in educational debate in Australia (NBPTS 2002a).

Viadero (2002) describes a completely different process whereby the teacher in question is motivated to undertake doctoral studies aimed at educational research to 'find out for herself the answers to all the pesky teaching questions that popped into her head at night' (Viadero, 2002). Prompted by a professor, she undertakes teacher research (also known as action research, practitioner inquiry, or collaborative inquiry) where practitioners form their own informal networks to address common issues in their teaching. The allocation of professional development credits and some funding support formally recognizes the value of this activity. There are some issues as to the academic legitimacy of some teacher research, but Viadero counters by quoting the view of the director of the George Mason University masters program, Leo C. Rigsby, that:

> Generally, education professors are trained in quantitative methods and come
>
> with educational psychology perspectives…And, generally, people who have
>
> those perspectives are unlikely to pay much attention to Mrs. Jones' 3rd grade
>
> class in Arlington (Viadero, 2002).

The more positive point being made is that teachers collegially identify an area to improve learning, devise teaching strategies, evaluate outcomes and revise the strategies (Hawley & Valli 1999, p.143).

The strength of the teacher research method is that it generates collegiality from focussing on common issues that force a rethink of student learning. It is school based and can generate further research in response to real time needs. Most significantly, teachers are in a position to measure outcomes, either in student performance or teacher behaviours, that which is missing from most traditional professional development forms (Viadero 2002; Asayesh 1993, p.26). Furthermore, student outcomes can factor in external influences that would not be reflected in test scores alone. Whilst Richert criticizes schools as falling short of being supportive environments for teacher learning, assistance to such teacher research initiatives by schools and school districts suggests that the means are there to transform the environment (Richert 1991, p.114). She advocates an alternative approach, the development of reflective practice by teachers examining cases of their teaching; what students need to know, what they are doing as teachers, and what they could do and why (Richert 1991, p.122). She argues that:

> As teachers learn to approach their work thoughtfully or reflectively, they
>
> learn not only to define problems, but also to work toward solving them. In
>
> learning to solve problems, teachers learn what knowledge is needed to

understand any particular situation and how to use that knowledge (Richert 1991, p123).

The excitement of the teacher research process is what Hargreaves refers to when he criticizes the standards based approach as 'full of knowledge, but virtually devoid of references to feeling, sentiment or passion: the very things that matter most to many teachers' (Hargreaves 1997b, p.106). However, in defence of the standards approach, Ingvarson does not rule out such spontaneous collegiality or the adoption of teacher research as part of reflection within the standards process. He encourages the establishment of support networks between teachers, but sets a standardised end point (Ingvarson 1998a, pp.135-136; Ingvarson 1998b, pp.1012, 1024). Put succinctly 'standards conceptualise what the profession expects its members to get better at over the long term' (Ingvarson, 1998a, p.128. See also Ingvarson, 2002, p.13).

One approach does not need to be more correct than the others; in fact they should be complimentary and continually enhancing teacher learning and practice (Ingvarson 1998a, pp.129, 136; Ingvarson 2002, p.16). They all involve reflection and collegial interaction at various levels. They also empower teachers to construct a better knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy, and enhance teacher self-confidence in becoming more effective (Ingvarson 1998a, p.135; Nias 1998, pp.1259-1260). Furthermore, they generate a 'more constructivist or student-mediated view of the learning process' (Borko & Putnam 1995, p.58). There is nothing to say that a teacher may not conduct action research on the way to professional standards certification or thereafter. The fundamental issue is that teachers recognise a professional responsibility to enhance their practice over the course of their careers. However, this has been easier said than done. As Ramsey commented with some disappointment: 'During the Review comment was made that at the heart of the present situation lies a fundamental irony: the business of teachers is student learning and yet so little importance seems to attach to their own learning' (Ramsey 2000, p.85).

Professional Development Validation

Guskey (2000) raises the issues of training validation as an essential, but often neglected, element of the professional development process. Champion refers to the role of professional development in many organisations being merely

> to motivate staff or expose them to the Next New Big Thing, and possibly to
> demonstrate some techniques that may increase student learning. The

measure of the program's success is often attendance records or teacher participation rather than results (Champion 2003, pp. 75-76).

The expenditure of time and money and the filling in of record sheets does not constitute sufficient evidence; they are simply records of time and expenditure, not evidences of outcomes (Guskey 2000 p.9; Guskey 1995, p.116; Champion 2004, p.65). Mizell suggests that many efforts that appear to be evaluation of professional development significantly misrepresent the true purpose of training validation:

> To date, many educators have only gone through the motions of evaluating efforts to increase what their colleagues know and can do. They have focused more on the delivery of staff development than on its results, often using the most rudimentary techniques for gathering data. Simplistic surveys and the use of the Likert scale are favorite techniques. What did participants think of the workshop leader? Was the setting comfortable? Did participants enjoy the refreshments? Did they find the experience helpful? (Mizell 2003, p.10).

In considering the questions that a professional development system needs to answer, Ingvarson includes the following:

- Who determines what teachers should get better at?
- Who evaluates whether teachers have developed and improved the quality of their practice? On what basis and how is this assessment of performance conducted?
- What are the incentives and rewards for teachers to invest their time and energy in professional development (Ingvarson, 1998a, p.129).

Scriven is more forceful, stating that 'teacher development is a sham unless based on evaluation', and follows on with 'You can hardly plan for - or tell when you have achieved - some kind of improvement if you can't determine improvement' (Scriven 1991, pp.25-26).

Mere claims that professional development will translate into changing how teachers teach and students learn are insufficient. Such changes need to be objectively verified. Furthermore, it is not sufficient just to check after professional development to determine that the desired outcome has been achieved, but monitoring during the professional development is also essential to determine the pace and progression of learning (Champion 2003, p.75; Mizell

2003, p.13). Fullan cautions that it is possible to superficially change 'by endorsing certain goals, using specific materials, and even imitating the behaviour *without specifically understanding* the principles and rationale of the change' (Fullan 1982, p.33). In this sense, the teacher's underlying knowledge system has not developed and the initiative will either remain ineffective or be displaced by previously entrenched practices. Guskey points out that increasing pressures for accountability mean that teachers and schools 'must be able to offer clear and understandable evidence to all interested parties to show that professional development makes a difference' (Guskey 2000, pp.7-8. See also Mizell 2003, p.11). However, to do so, there needs to be an audit process for the professional development operation as a whole. As Champion states simply: 'every professional development program should be held accountable for results at some level' (Champion 2004, p.65). Such an audit goes beyond just measuring inputs such as cost and attendance, and it certainly has to progress beyond mere self-congratulatory feedback for the organisers (Mizell 2003, p.11). It has to validate the training received by teachers and the processes by which the professional development took place, and set targets for the next stage for both the school as a whole and individuals (Killion 2003, p.19; Mizell, 2003, pp.11, 13). Ultimately, the measure of success is improved student learning, not necessarily through standardised tests, but more rigorous intellectual processes such as class case studies and teacher portfolios (Guskey & Sparks 1991, p.75; Guskey 1994, p.6; Guskey & Sparks 1996, p.36). Furthermore, such validation is not occasional, but an ongoing element of the learning cycle that allows early intervention and modification of professional development programs (Champion 2003, p.76). Asayesh cites a school reform consultant who stated that, in an effective professional development program

> people will have some sort of structure at the school site for continuing
> working on the implementation [of change] and solving any problems that
> result, and there'll be some sort of formative data collection and evaluation
> along the way so you can tell how you're doing and make adjustments
> (Asayesh 1993, p.25).

Validation is not just conducted by development staff. Teachers should also participate in this process as reflective individuals. In this way they become once again less recipients, and more participants, continuing to learn as they evaluate (Asayesh 1993, p.25; Guskey 1995, p.122; Richert 1991, p.129). Combined with management policy on broad directions for the organisation, it is through this process that higher order professional development objectives are established and reconstructed (Guskey 2000, p.17). Guskey stresses that

> Without clear ideas of what we wanted to accomplish or how we would measure success, professional development efforts floundered in uncertainty. Furthermore, just about any activity could pass as 'professional development'. Clearly defined goals based on student learning outcomes helped to establish more precise criteria for success, encouraged systematic evaluations, allowed progress to be carefully documented, and provided a basis for recognizing and honoring achievements (Guskey 2000, p.210).

The validation process should be of the system as a whole and not be restricted to the learning of teachers. The administration and the professional development management should be included to ensure that effective procedures are in place, that the learning of teachers is being fostered appropriately, and that they are changing as well (Guskey & Sparks 1991, pp.74-75; Little 1999, p.251; Elmore & Burney 1999, p.288; Killion 2003, p.20). However, this does not appear to be the case in general as Ramsey pointed out: 'Schools, by and large, do not do skills audits of their teachers, nor are they encouraged to do so. Few schools turn the professional learning of teachers into data to assist in planning in the area of teacher quality' (Ramsey 2000, p.84). Even the most beneficial change is unlikely to succeed if implemented inefficiently or obstructed by inappropriate management or procedures, or if starved of the necessary resources. Depending on the scope of the desired change, management and procedures may in fact have to be changed to facilitate success. Guskey points to findings which reveal that 'Unless individual learning and organisational changes are addressed simultaneously and support one another, the gains made in one area may be cancelled by continuing problems in the other' (Guskey 2000, p.21. See also: Guskey & Sparks 1996, p.36; Hawley & Valli 1999, p.141).

Professional Development as a Complementary Process
There is general agreement in the literature that teachers, administration, and development managers need to be mutually supportive for effective professional development to take place (Hirsh 2004, p.15; Hirsh 2001). Just like a tripod, removal of one leg will topple the edifice. Guskey emphasises that

> The key is to find the optimal mix of individual *and* organisational processes that will contribute to success in a particular context. In some situations, individual initiative and motivation might be quite high, but organisational structures stand in the way of significant improvement. In others, progressive and supportive organisational structures may be in place, but the lack of

personal incentives for collaboration and experimentation inhibits any meaningful change in classroom practice (Guskey 1995, p.119).

Whilst strongly advocating the standards based approach, Ingvarson similarly stresses that 'it is complementary to, not a replacement for, the in-service education that employers should provide to support the implementation of changes and reforms they have initiated' (Ingvarson 1998a, p.129. See also Hargreaves 1997b, p.100).

Cooper, Richert and others argue that the problems with effective integration rest partially with the mentality of professional developers and indeed teachers. Confronted with new visions of education, they often revert to established perceptions of professional development as the means to bring them about. Consequently, the immediate response to a major educational change is the holding of seminars, workshops, and all of the paraphernalia of the current professional development system, based on the assumption that the conduct of activities will achieve the aim (Cooper 1991, p.87; Fullan 1982, p273; Hawley & Valli 1999, pp. 133-134; Smyth 1998, p.1248; Fink & Soll 1998, pp.303-304; Champion, 2003, p.75). The problem is that so often professional development is focussed not on the need for *development* which inherently means *change*, but rather on meeting management or contractual and salary award demands (Guskey 1994, pp.4, 14; Hirsh et al. 2000). Ramsey judged that:

> Continuing teacher education now means participation substantially in programs designed to meet employer priorities rather than graduate, professionally related studies. For instance, a significant professional development input for many teachers are school development days, described more often in the wider community as student-free days. This resource, however, is seen by most, and especially by teachers, as being oriented more toward meeting employer priorities than being a significant professional development resource which targets quality teaching (Ramsey, 2000, p.83).

Guskey sees the outcome of such employer ownership as a devaluation of the process as a whole: 'When educators view their task as meeting these time-based mandates, they tend to think of professional development in terms of "How can I get in my hours?" rather than "What do I need to improve my practice and how can I get it?"' (Guskey 1994, p.15).

Both Cooper and Smyth urge staff developers to help people find new and creative ways to reconstruct the environment to best meet the needs of children (Cooper 1991, pp85-86; Smyth 1995, p86; Killion 2003, p.17). However, professional developers need to be able to reconceptualize teacher learning to enable them to assist teachers as learners (Cooper 1991, pp.87-89; Borko & Putnam 1995, p.38; Hawley & Valli 1999, p.137). Obviously, the hierarchy needs to be willing to give teachers the power to take risks, teach in new ways, and challenge the current structure whilst teachers themselves need to be encouraged to overcome their isolation, become truly reflective and assume ownership of their individual professional learning (Hawley & Valli 1999, p.139; Darling-Hammond 1998, p.661; Allen & Glickman 1998, p.644). Hargreaves emphasizes the impact of the post-modern era where institutional boundaries are being broken down and roles becoming less segregated; changes in schools and schooling requires re-examination of professional development approaches as well (Hargreaves 1997b, pp.101-102; Fink & Soll 1998, pp.306-307; Ingvarson 2002, p.12). Particularly where parental involvement increases through increased deregulation, and schools assume a greater role in regenerating community, all members of the professional development system will also have to learn with parents who are currently involved in schools to only a limited extent and whose views may differ significantly from the teachers and administration (Hargreaves 1997b, pp.102-104; Elmore & Burney 1999, p.271; Fink & Soll 1998, p.300; Allen & Glickman 1998, p.649).

The difficulties with professional development that manifest as unrealised hype and promises ultimately reflect that it may rarely have been done correctly. Individual and collective learning have not been connected and the professional development process has not been seen as a continuous cycle of school learning and improvement (Darling-Hammond 1998, p.648; Ingvarson 2002, pp.7, 17; Ramsey 2000, p.83). This has led to the assumption that schools or individual teachers could just switch on professional development as a panacea expecting a quick fix for systemic shortfalls; the professional development has been thus used to treat symptoms rather than causes. Furthermore, in the absence of a true ongoing developmental culture, schools probably have not fully understood their own learning environment, so that student learning difficulties may not have been related back to teacher professional knowledge shortfalls, thus leading to remedial attempts at the wrong end of the learning process (Killion 2003, pp.16-17; Ingvarson 1998b, p.1027; Ingvarson 2002, p.9). At the macro level, this generates changes to curriculum and syllabuses to fix perceived shortfalls without any consideration of changes to teaching inputs (Hopkins 1998, p.1039). In this respect, the

absence of an evaluation culture within school systems, and amongst schools and teachers is both a direct cause and evidence of inadequacies in professional development.

Professional development management is not a case of just managing funds or allocating staff to workshops. Rather, it should be a daily function for management and individual teachers, one that flows naturally from, and back to, the daily classroom process (DuFour 2004, p.63; Hirsh 2004, p.13). Setting student learning as the ultimate aim of professional development removes the focus away from the means of teacher learning to outcomes. Teachers working together in informal groups achieve a validity equal, and often beyond, the visiting expert, and expenditure of time and money are eliminated as a measure of professional development commitment (Ingvarson 2002, pp.12-13; DuFour 2004, p.63; Mizell 2003, p.12). Not only would professional development managers be on the lookout for means to support teacher development, they would be able to make the distinction between what are simple training or information dissemination functions, related to the work environment, and real pedagogical development needs and opportunities (Smyth 1998, p.1254; Ingvarson 2002, p.9; Champion 2003, p.75). Meanwhile teachers would assume professional development as part of their work function, done *by* rather than *for* them (Ingvarson 1998b, pp.1018-1019, 1027). Again, Ramsey, encapsulated it well:

> there is a need to view teacher education as being integrated into the careers of all teachers and educational leaders in a systematic, planned and developmental way. Structures, systems and immediate work environments have to be developed which will enable all teachers to work toward and practise at the highest possible standards of professional performance, and to be recognised for this. Building and promoting professional responsibility is the key to addressing many of the issues now confronting teaching (Ramsey 2000, p.38).

Design Elements for Effective Professional Development

As in the previous chapter, research and discussion on professional development provides a basis for establishing the requirements of effective teacher learning systems. Rather than providing an exhaustive and compulsory list to which professional development structures must all conform, such a distillation of the views of researchers and theorists generates a useful portrayal of the very best practice in the field of teacher professional development.

Purposes

(1)   Professional development should encourage teachers to take risks and allow them to experiment with teaching ways in they have not been taught.

If teachers are to meet the challenges of educating others in a changing society then they cannot continue to pursue outmoded methods and expect to succeed. However, they also cannot seek new ways if they are constantly looking over their shoulders, expecting censure for doing things differently, or blame if the implemented changes fail. A culture of experimentation leads to discovery, self-discovery, and true development (Hargreaves 1997b, pp.86, 99; Cooper 1991, pp.86, 88; Borko & Putnam 1995, pp.38, 59; Smyth 1995, pp.69-70, 86; Smyth 1998, p.254; Ingvarson 2002, p.23).

(2)   Professional development should increase teacher autonomy and help them become independent and reflective, yet collegial and open, professionals.

The individuality of teachers and the unique environment of each classroom event require teachers to see themselves as other than isolated process workers. Professional development should not assume teachers have equivalent collective needs. Nor should it create a *cargo cult* mentality where professional development occurs only when organised from above. Such an environment not only opens the way for the control against which Smyth warns, but it more nefariously undermines motivation to improve and enhance individual practice (Hargreaves 1997b, pp.94-95, 100, 106-107; Cooper 1991, p91; Richert 1991, p.114, 119; Borko & Putnam 1995, p.60; Guskey 1995. p.118; Smyth 1995, p.86; Ingvarson 1998b, pp, 1018, 1028; Ingvarson 2002, pp.13, 18,23).

(3)   Professional development should result ultimately in positive changes in the classroom.

Development by its very nature implies change. Whether collective or individual, professional development should enhance the learning of students in the classroom. If it fails to penetrate down to that level, then the professional development can be judged a failure. Consequently, success must engender reflection and mutual consultation amongst teachers and encourage them to seek new ways of teaching (Guskey & Sparks 1996, pp.36-37; Borko & Putnam 1995, pp.58-59).

Enabling Conditions

(4)   Professional development is an ongoing process of career-long learning embedded in what teachers do each day.

Whilst there may be some use in visiting speakers and workshops outside of schools, their utility rests completely on their relevance to the classroom. The best professional development may in fact rest in giving teachers the opportunity to talk together, to share experiences, and resolve issues in their own practice. The worth of professional development is not in the external display, but in the less visible, subtle, and progressive enhancements in teaching and learning. Professional development should not be an event, a day set aside, but something that teachers do and learn from in each class on each teaching day in a process of continual reflection and professional enhancement. (Hargreaves 1997b, p.99; Richert 1991, pp.122, 129; Smyth 1995, p.86; Guskey & Sparks 1991, p.73; Fullan 1994, p.6; Asayesh 1993, p.24; France 1990, p.121; Hawley & Valli 1999, p.140; Ingvarson 1998b, p.1012; Smyth 1998, p.1254; Ingvarson 2002, p.13; Ramsey 2000, p.38).

(5)   Sponsors of change should acknowledge the differing culture of schools and their varied developmental needs and approaches. Professional development managers need to be aware of external changes and develop implementation strategies that effectively support teachers within their particular environment.

Not only is there a difference between schools, but the changing culture of schools and the constant changes between generations of students means that there is no professional development process suitable for all schools or for all times. External innovations, be they mandated curricular reforms or variations in practice stemming from research, should be examined in light of the culture and needs of the school, and appropriate implementation processes developed to support teachers. Furthermore, development and management of professional development solutions should itself be an ever-evolving process, designed for, and made up of adult learners (Hargreaves 1997b, p.98; Guskey & Sparks 1991, p.74; Guskey & Sparks, 1996, pp.35-36; France 1990, p.121; Smyth 1998, p.1254).

(6)   Professional development should be a unified continual process involving both teachers and school management focussing on student learning as the ultimate objective.

Reflective teachers undertaking long term development of their pedagogy within a standards framework or working openly with their colleagues will not improve the quality of student learning unless it is within an environment where the management of change is systematic and cognisant of teachers' development needs. The reverse is also the case. Student learning as the focus of professional development efforts allows all involved in the teaching enterprise to focus consistently on identifying problem areas and applying the most effective remedial measures (Smyth 1998, p.1254; Ingvarson 2002, pp.5, 9, 13).

Structures

(7)   Professional development should take into account the different stages of teacher development.

Teachers are adult learners with differing needs, interests, and levels of experience. From research, the stages can be aligned generally to the position in a teacher's career.   However, the labelling of such stages is not a constant, with the receptivity and response of teachers to change varying along with their own classroom needs and personal development. Appropriate dynamic targeting of professional development programs based on an understanding of such stages not only should enhance acceptance of change and harness the respective capabilities of each group, but also assist greater understanding amongst teachers of their own career stage and the requirements for their own individual situation (Oja 1991, p.56; Fessler 1995, pp.187-188; Hubermann 1995, p.196).

(8)   Professional development should give teachers time to reflect on, and make changes to, their practice.

There can be no set number of days within which all teachers will absorb and understand a particular change. Each teacher needs time based on their age, career stage, teaching style, and the nature of the change they are undertaking. Insufficient time will either prompt rejection or a poor conclusion that can undermine any positive benefits. Against an increasingly crowded curriculum and financial constraints on relief staff, as well as the hierarchical top-down approach to curricular change, opportunities for teacher individual and collective reflection assume even greater importance if new challenges are to be met (Hargreaves 1997b, p.106; Oja 1991, p.52; Richert 1991, pp.113-114; Hubermann 1995, p.206; Hawley & Valli 1999, pp.143-144).

(9)   Professional development must be planned and formally validated.

It is not enough to point to time and money expenditures as evidence of quality professional development. If the ultimate aim is enhanced teaching and learning then objectives and outcomes need to be specified and tracked, and the processes that either contributed or hindered change should be identified.   In the absence of any positive outcome, either professional development management or the individual must question the approach taken and redirect the learning to achieve the aim. Organisationally, the process is one of validation. For the individual teacher, evaluation is necessary not just to see if the desired change has occurred, but also to identify the learning required both before and after (Stiggins & Duke 1988, p.22;

Richert 1991, p.129; Guskey & Sparks 1991, p.74-75; Guskey 1994, p.6; Asayesh 1993, pp.25-26; Scriven 1991, p.25-26; Little 1999, p.235).

Consideration of Design Elements

As has been mentioned previously, the design elements in these chapters are not intended to represent the ideal solution to all of the issues of evaluation and professional development. Rather, they summarise from research literature either as positives, or by extension from identified shortfalls in previous or established systems, significant considerations that ought to be acknowledged in the establishment or management of effective evaluation and professional development systems. A distillation of the categories from both sets of design elements further highlights common threads in the literature. There is a *Purposes* theme of teacher empowerment and increased autonomy, and the need to focus on teacher practices and enhanced learner outcomes in the classroom. The *Enabling Conditions* suggests the need for a constant and comprehensive process of quality assurance and learning and retraining to permeate the perspectives of both the individual and the school. Whilst there is less direct commonality in the *Stuctures* section, the elements nonetheless intimate the requirement for a balanced consideration of the capabilities of teachers, respect for the individual, and for the focus to remain on the work rather than the person.