Patricia Cunningham

Email: pcunningham@marjon.ac.uk

Moving the debate on partnership in Initial Teacher Education forward: compromise or innovation?

Patricia Cunningham, University College Plymouth St Mark and St John, Plymouth, UK.

Academic biography:

Patricia Cunningham is a Senior Lecturer in Education at the University College Plymouth St Mark & St John. Patricia is the B. Ed. (Hons) Early Years Programme Leader.

Abstract

This paper explores the degree to which partnership models reflect 'real life' practice. It focuses on whether a three year B.Ed (Hons) Early Years degree programme, with qualified teacher status, at an English Higher Education Institute (HEI) has made significant inroads into the concept of partnership between schools and Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Through researching what constitutes an effective partnership a comparison is made between the partnership 'in practice' and the three key models of partnership that have emerged and been developed by Furlong et al (1996 & 2000). The paper concludes by recognising that the partnership in practice is unique and innovative and pushes the boundaries of the existing three models of partnership. However it also acknowledges that more research is needed to investigate whether the success of the partnership outweighs any doubts as to its sustainability

Key words: partnership, collaboration, mentoring, assessment, reciprocal, shared goals, HEIs, host schools, Training Schools, Training School status, partnership agreement(s), Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) Standards, quiet revolution, contractual relationship, legitimation, consistency, communication, documentation, theory, negotiation, personalisation, triangulation, key players, supportive leadership, shared aims.

Introduction

This paper explores whether a 3 year B. Ed. (Hons) Early Years degree programme has made significant inroads into the concept of partnership between schools and Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). The route was developed as a result of close collaboration between a group of 3 training schools and a HEI, in response to a national shortage of Early Years trained teachers. It was validated in July 2004 and the first cohort of 10 student

teachers started the course in September 2005. A key feature of the degree is the significant reduction in the traditional HEI based input. The student teachers spend 2-3 days a week in school and join the Primary B. Ed. programme for 4 modules over the three years. Since 1994, Initial Teacher Training (ITT) in England has been managed by a regulatory body answerable to the Government. It was firstly named the Teacher Training Agency and then, in 2005, became the Training and Development Agency (TDA). The requirements laid down by the TDA included the stipulation that student teachers spend 120 days in school on a three year undergraduate Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) programme. However, student teachers on the Early Years programme spend in excess of 200 days, over the three year course, based in school. Therefore, much of their experience takes place in school and includes teachers delivering some of the modules. School based mentoring underpins all aspects of the course. The question arises, however, as to whether this innovative and challenging partnership route is yet another compromise in which ultimate control still lies with HEIs. Consideration also needs to be given as to whether this Early Years degree programme, developed over a six year period, is sustainable in the long term.

The Concept of Partnership

Partnership, in its strongest form, is positive, empowering and meaningful. It is, ideally, reciprocal, where all parties gain from the arrangement. The concept is underpinned by the idea that collectively more can be achieved by working together than alone (Dhillon 2009). In relation to social partnerships, used by government and non-government agencies, Billet et al (2007) identify shared goals, relations with partners, capacity for partnership work, governance and leadership, and trust and trustworthiness, as key requisites for maintaining and sustaining effective partnerships. In analysing a partnership between an Educational Institution and a Healthcare Agency in California, Huckabay (2009), similarly, came to the conclusion that realistic goals, awareness and avoidance

of pitfalls, anticipation of challenges, and keeping the people involved in the partnership informed, were vital elements to making partnership work. However, on a different note, Lumby and Morrison (2006) researched the Pathfinder partnership (DfES 2002, 2003) established in England to educate and train fourteen to nineteen year olds. They conclude that although shared goals need to be sustained, the rate of change in educational policy threatens this element of partnership. They also suggest that the conditions to foster successful partnership need proper consideration if partnership is to work effectively.

Initial Teacher Training (ITT) in the UK did not escape the government's preoccupation with partnership. This has been well documented in the Primary Review Interim Report (McNamara et al 2008) and the General Teaching Council of Scotland Review (Brisard et al 2005). Both chart a series of rapid government interventions in response to political priorities in the UK. Although collaboration between HEIs and schools was a continuous theme throughout the twentieth century (Brookes 2006), it was not until the 1980s that the British Government began to promote partnership as an answer to raising standards, addressing recruitment issues and teacher shortage. There then followed the upheaval of the 1990s when it became an expectation that a formalised partnership should be established between HEIs and Schools. The focus began to move away from a Higher Education approach to educating prospective teachers through courses focused on theory and subject knowledge (Talbot 1991). Instead, the focus shifted to placement in the workplace and a greater involvement of schools in the training of student teachers. With this, changes to the power base of teacher training transpired due to the fact that the partnership involved some degree of joint responsibility for course provision (Furlong et al 2000). Brisard et al (2005 no.3) take this further in asserting that partnership in ITT includes two elements; one being theories about the nature of learning to become a teacher, and the other, the organisational aspects of

delivering an ITT Programme. All this inevitably impacted on the delivery and content of ITT teacher training programmes.

With these changes different models of partnership evolved, with the relative merits and disadvantages being weighed. By 1995 three key models of partnership had emerged forming a continuum from collaborative practice through HEI-led to complementary practice. Furlong et al (2000, p.80) define the collaborative model of partnership as:

> ...the commitment to developing a training programme where students are exposed to different forms of educational knowledge, some of which comes from school, some of which comes from HE or elsewhere.

This type of partnership has been classed as idealistic (Smith et al 2006) because in order to be successful, it would necessitate the full support of Government, HEIs and teachers. On the other hand, the HEI-led model has been seen as the most realistic model in terms of the partnerships that are taking place. The HEI leadership is largely viewed as essential (Edwards 1992; Wilkin 1999; Furlong 1996) due in large part to a belief in the reluctance of schools to take on more responsibility, with or without, the support of HEIs (Furlong et al 1996, Wilkins 1999). In the summary to the General Teaching Council (Scotland) (GTCS) report on models of partnership, Brisard et al (2005) recommend that all routes into teaching should retain partnership between HEIs, authorities and schools. This therefore rejects the 'complementary model' (Furlong et al 2000), exemplified by the School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT) route, in which control is totally in the domain of the school hosting the trainee teacher.

The Training and Development Agency (TDA) (2007) in England legally state the requirements of ITT providers regarding partnership in no uncertain terms. The roles and responsibilities of each partner should be set out in a partnership agreement (R3.1) and together they select, train and assess trainees against the Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) standards (R3.2). The

requirements are mandatory and it is therefore not a question of the merits or otherwise of partnership; it is more about what constitutes an effective, working partnership. Schulz and Hall (2004, p.263), in considering the inequality of partnership, point out that 'University staff cannot do their job without the ongoing cooperation of teachers. Teachers can do their jobs without the ongoing cooperation of university staff'. However, although teachers have no statutory responsibility towards ITT, they do have a vested interest in training teachers. In the long term, training effective teachers will have an impact on the quality of education provided by schools

In England, Government emphasis on the role of schools in ITT was further consolidated in the 1998 Green Paper, 'Teachers – meeting the challenge' (Smith et al 2006). This introduced the concept of Training Schools and established their role as one of innovation and dissemination of good practice in ITT, with a focus on training mentors and undertaking research. Schools that received Training School status were expected to have already shown a substantial commitment to teacher training. Schools interested in becoming a Training School had to submit a bid, and if accredited, received up to a £100,000 funding a year. As part of this, Training Schools had to have clear objectives related to their work with ITT. It has been suggested that a hidden agenda for Training Schools existed, and that a key aim was actually to promote the involvement of schools in ITT and encourage them to take a more leading role. Brookes (2006, p.391) went as far as naming this 'the quiet revolution, aimed at unseating HEIs and supplanting them with school-led training'. Even so, Ofsted (2003) reported on the largely positive impact that the work of training schools had on ITT. Mentor training was a key element of the three Training Schools' four year plan, with all staff being fully trained. The role of the mentor in the Early Years programme will be discussed more fully later in the paper.

Models of partnership

In comparing the Early Years degree programme with the models of partnership developed by Furlong et al (1996, 2000) it is possible to see where, on the aforementioned continuum, the Early Years degree programme lies, and also identify the issues that lie within this. The criteria used to depict the key features of the 3 models of partnership (Furlong et al 2000, p.45) give some idea as to what extent the training schools and HEI Institute have developed an effective partnership 'in practice' (Appendix 1). This paper will now address the following key elements that underpin current thinking: planning, Higher Education (HE) visits to school, documentation, content, mentoring, assessment, contractual relationship and legitimation.

Planning

From their comparison of models of partnership in ITT, Brisard et al (2005, p.95) conclude that:

> the mode of development will be critical to the success of any initiative. It is crucial that all stakeholders are involved and fully accept that each has a role.

From the beginning both the schools and HEI were involved in the writing of the validation documentation specifying content and outcomes of the course modules. This collaboration has continued with termly planning meetings of a core group of representatives from the schools and the HEI Programme Leader. In fact, this has developed with the inclusion of four more partnership schools who have become host schools for training. It is important that teachers are involved in planning ITT programmes in a collaborative model (Edwards 1992, Furlong 2000). Over the three years of the degree programme six modules, out of eighteen, are planned, delivered and assessed by teachers, with the guidance of the Programme Leader. This constitutes a third of the programme. Students' module evaluations convey how positively the students view the school-led input. For instance, a recent student evaluation of a school led module registered excellent in all categories. This covered content and experience, teaching and supervision, module support and resources. Furlong et

al (1996) put forward the idea that teachers are reluctant to take responsibility for marking and teaching curriculum subjects. However, contrary to this, the teachers are fully committed to involvement in all aspects of planning, teaching and assessment. In this area the partnership in practice goes beyond the criteria for the collaborative model in demonstrating full involvement and commitment to the route.

HE visits to school

In the collaborative partnership model the purpose of the HEI visits to school is to discuss professional issues together. This does not altogether fit with the role of the HEI visits in the partnership in practice schools. The role of the HEI is more one of facilitator or enabler, including maintaining relationships, organising documentation, and ensuring the smooth running of the programme. It also, as in the HEI-led model, involves monitoring and quality control. Ironically, the responsibility for the quality of the training by the HEI, in a sense, renders the partnership an unequal one. It must be remembered that in England it is the HEI that is inspected by the Office for Standards in Education (OfSTED) for their ITT provision, not the partnership schools. Thus the programme must adhere to the structures and quality assurance mechanisms of the HEI. Having said that, the programme also needs careful management to ensure that the aims are met (Furlong et al 2000). The teachers in the schools have responsibilities within the programme structure and therefore they also need support in planning and evaluating teaching sessions and modules. In order to enable teachers to mark assessments, training needs to take place. Therefore visits to school go beyond the remit of the three models of partnership. Likewise, the role of the HEI on assessed teaching practices is one of monitoring and trouble shooting, with each student teacher having one observation only by the HEI. So, although the nature of the partnership is restricted by the HEIs' responsibility for quality assurance, the role of the HEI remains crucial. Perhaps the role of the HEI becomes more vital as the programme becomes more school based (Hopper 2001).

Documentation

Communication between training schools, the HEI and students is vital for the successful running of the programme. Therefore, having clear documentation in place is important. Termly information booklets for students are written in collaboration, outlining agreed expectations and coverage of programme content. As in the HEI model the documentation for an assessed teaching practice is rigorous and in the domain of the HEI. This concurs with William and Soares' (2002) view that one area HEI must continue to be involved with is consistency of quality and standards. However, unlike the collaborative, HEI-led or complementary partnership, the involvement of the schools in documentation in the partnership in practice goes beyond codifying emerging practice, or defining activities or responsibilities. In delivering modules the schools have to work within the HEI's structures. Therefore, teachers who are module leaders are involved in writing the module programmes and evaluation reports, thereby meeting the expectations of the HEI sector.

Content

Contrary to either the collaborative, HEI-led or complementary partnership models defined by Furlong et al, decisions about content are shared as is the delivery of knowledge, therefore 'challenging the often rigid boundaries between these different phases of education' (Pring 1999, p.309). Support is given by the HEI in assuring that the knowledge, and research base is up-to-date and challenging. Although the knowledge and theory base of the HEI is valued (Wilkin 1999), theory is therefore not the sole domain of HEI. In this approach 'a balance of in-school and out-school experience is maintained and day to day teacher knowledge and educational theory stand, not in opposition, but in a complex inter-relationship' (Jones et al 1997, p.6). The content of the course is therefore not compartmentalised with the schools involvement being solely teaching practice based. Both Schools and the HEI make contributions to the theory and practice of Early

Years education, but with the HEI taking the responsibility to create the conditions in which teachers are able to contribute their expertise and knowledge (Pring 1999). The relationship is therefore a reciprocal one where all gain; HEI, teachers and students. In an article on the partnership, the head of one training school stated:

> Our teachers have developed their understanding of the theory behind teaching and learning; and the trainees get up-to-date, practical classroom experience from the classroom (ITT 2005).

Mentoring

On the Early Years programme the mentor has a key role to play throughout the three years of the course. The mentors have all been trained as part of their professional development by the training school managers. Ofsted (HMI 2003) found that teachers in training schools, had benefited from staff development, particularly mentor training. This fits very closely to what Furlong et al (1996, 2000) see as the mentor role in the collaborative model. The research of Jones et al found that 'mentors who provided regular time, immediate feedback and a sense of availability were seen as most effective'(1997, p.257).

A strength of mentoring on the Early Years programme is that the student teacher is assigned a mentor in year one who, ideally, supports them throughout the course. Although this can be affected by staff mobility, continuity is maintained through the host school remaining the same. This allows a deeper relationship to form and gives the mentor an opportunity to monitor and support the student teacher's progress over the whole course. For the year one assessed Teaching Practice, the school placements in year 2, and the assessed nursery placement in year 2, the mentor visits, observes, supports and assesses the student. In year 3 the student teacher returns to their host training school, thus effectively providing continuous, personalised support throughout the student's training. On the Early Years programme the student teachers have two

meetings a term with their mentor. Each meeting follows a structured agenda written by the HEI and the schools (appendix 2 and 3) which reflects both the experience in the classroom as well as module content and academic progress. Jones et al conclude that teacher knowledge and educational theory cannot be separated:

> although school-based training may come closest to addressing the discourses and regulative principles that are operating in the classroom, little is gained and much is lost from reducing theoretical input, and the opportunities that provide for rigorous critical reflection away from the immediate pragmatic demands of the classroom (1997, p.259).

The mentoring on the Early Years degree programme does not separate theory and practice. The mentor supports the student teachers' development, both professionally and personally, over the whole degree; therefore the role is not solely linked to the classroom. The mentor also has a sound knowledge base of the degree and the modules the students are studying and therefore discussion and reflection go beyond the classroom. This situation negates the separation of practice in schools and educational theory identified by Dunne et al (1996) within a collaborative partnership.

Assessment

Decisions regarding pass/fail are the responsibility of the student's host school mentor and the placement school. A HEI tutor is involved in one teaching practice observation visit and is available if issues arise within a practice. This level of responsibility for teaching practice assessment goes beyond the collaborative model advocated by Furlong et al (1996, 2000), based on triangulation.

Contractual relationship

Furlong et al (1996, 2000) define the relationships on the collaborative model as negotiated and personal. The partnership in practice arguably goes beyond this in that it is a team of people with designated responsibilities working towards training effective Early

Years teachers. Within this, the role of the Programme Leader is vital in maintaining and monitoring the quality of the student experience in the schools. Within each training school, teachers are designated to take responsibility for their school's involvement in the course. The level of commitment differs across the schools, but the three training schools have parity of responsibility, in that each school is responsible for two modules over the course.

Legitimation

The partnership is a unique one where the schools are fully committed to their involvement in ITT. Despite research showing that in the majority of cases teachers' are reluctant to deepen their involvement in ITT due to their commitment to their pupils (Furlong et al 1996, Wilkin 1999, Williams and Soares 2002), the Teachers' commitment is a key component of the degree programme. Without this the programme would falter. Each year the external examiner's report makes reference to the strength of the programme being the strong collaboration between the school based training and HEI, identifying this as 'best practice' worthy of dissemination. The success of the partnership is therefore dependent on a tight knit group with shared aims who are clear about their roles and methods of working (Talbot 1991, p.93). Motivation to play a key part in training effective Early Years Teachers is also a necessity. In their small scale comparative study of teacher education in Canada and England, Schulz and Hall (2004) found that in England there were 'many examples of selflessness of the participants on both sides of the partnership'. This level of commitment is also evident in the Early Years programme. For example, much of the communication and problem solving takes place by email after school hours. Overall, therefore, the commitment evident in the partnership in practice goes beyond that of the collaborative model; the involvement goes beyond support, into the realms of knowledge and understanding of the aims and objectives of the course, both practically and theoretically.

Sustainability

In view of this close collaboration it is therefore questionable as to what extent the programme is sustainable. Inevitably changes in staffing in schools have already had an effect on the key Early Years team. However, if anything, this challenge has strengthened the schools' commitment by involving new teachers. An unexpected bonus has been that through teachers gaining promotion in new schools the scope of the degree has widened. Hence there are now four new host schools, all with a key person who was involved with the route from its beginning.

Another issue is that of finance. Furlong et al (2006, p.50) identified financial constraints on programme design as a significant pressure on HEI's. In concluding that collaborative partnerships are 'resource hungry' Brookes (2006, p.391) sees profit as key to whether the role of the schools in the collaborative partnership could become dominant over HEIs. Smith et al (2006, p.150) comment on an alternative model of delivery, the Knowledge Building Community in Australia, pointing out that it is questionable how such innovative models that are resource intensive and make high demands on HEI and teachers 'can be resourced for more generalised implementation'. Furlong et al (2002, p.53) also concluded that financial constraints could affect the Programme Leaders' ability to maintain collaborative models of partnership. The Early Years programme is resource heavy, both from the point of view of payments to training schools and an initial small cohort of ten student teachers a year. Although the numbers have risen to 14, in order to remain financially viable the cohort needs to grow to at least twenty student teachers a year. On the other hand, widening entry to the programme could have a negative effect on its overall dynamics. More schools would need to be involved as host schools. In order to work this would have to be managed carefully, building on the close relationships already formed with schools where students are placed in Year Two of the programme. In this way the partnership could grow and evolve

naturally, as has happened in the case of the four new host schools.

Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to establish to what extent the partnership in practice has challenged the concept of partnership between HEIs and schools. In analysing the partnership in practice against the criteria of Furlong et al (1996, 2000), it is possible to come to some conclusions. In the area of planning, the partnership in practice goes beyond the remit of all three models. The schools are fully involved at all levels of planning, with the support of the Programme Leader. The HEI visits to schools cross all three models: collaborative, to discuss professional issues; quality control (HEI-led); and trouble shooting (complementary). Where the partnership goes further is in the inclusion of the schools in teaching theory and knowledge in a modular structure, which has traditionally been seen as the domain of the HEIs. This links to the content of the programme which is jointly owned and goes far beyond the three models of partnership identified by Furlong et al (1996, 2000). For instance, the schools were fully involved in the decisions made in the recent revalidation of the degree programme. In the realms of documentation, the need to ensure quality assurance means the documentation is in the domain of the HEI. However, as in the collaborative model, consultation with the schools takes place. The mentors have a key role to play in the partnership, and this enables continuity and personalisation to underpin the student experience, again, going beyond the practice in the three models of partnership. In the area of assessment, the programme also challenges the boundaries of the three models. The mentors have responsibility for assessing the student teachers, together with their placement school. The HEI only become involved, to assure quality, and if an issue is identified, or the mentor, student, or school need more support. The contractual relationships and commitment within the partnership is based on working as a team and shared aims. Both make a commitment to a group of students each year, and aim to support

their development into effective Early Years teachers. This again pushes the boundaries of the three models of partnership.

It could therefore be concluded that the partnership in practice is innovative and unique. On the other hand, these elements of innovation could perhaps be perceived as limited, in that it must be acknowledged, ultimately the HEI have overall, mandatory responsibility for the programme. However, if a more generic view of partnership is taken, then the prerequisites for successful partnership identified by Billet et al (2007) and Huckabay (2009) apply well to the partnership in practice. There are shared aims, good relationships, clear channels of communication, supportive leadership, and trust between the partners. It could well be that the particular context and the 'key players' (Williams and Soares 2002) are what drives the partnership. If that is the case then the inclusion of new host schools is creating an environment where the partnership and programme is sustainable. It is also worth considering whether, because of its uniqueness, the partnership could be replicated. If the success of the partnership is largely due to the small cohort and the natural evolvement of the partnership and the programme, then, given similar circumstances, replication may be possible. Brisard et al (2005, p.50), comparing England to other parts of the UK, conclude that:

> There have indeed been very significant initiatives, some of which have undoubtedly led to enriched professional experiences for student teachers, for serving teachers and for HE-based teacher educators.

Perhaps significant government bodies, such as the TDA, need to look more closely at these small, effective initiatives and consequently redefine the concept of partnership between HEIs and schools.

Finally, within this paper the schools have been presented as a homogenous group. In order to firmly establish what makes this partnership successful, research needs to be carried out to find out the views

and issues of individual schools in the partnership. To all intents and purposes, the programme is sustainable as long as it continues to develop and grow, both in response to external pressures and internal changes. Resource wise, HEIs have a vested interest in promoting good partnerships, and having a diverse portfolio of programmes, with personalised approaches, supports this. However, whether the success of the partnership substantially outweighs any doubts as to its sustainability needs further research.

References

Baxter, A. (2003) Who Teaches Teachers to teach? Investigating the role of the classroom teacher in teacher education. *NZARE/AARE Joint Conference*. Retrieved 27 May 2008 from: www.aare.edu.*au*/03pap/bax03694.pdf.

Billett, S.; Ovens, C.; Clemans, A. & Seddon, T. (2007) Collaborative working and contested practices: forming, developing and sustaining social partnerships in education. *Journal of Education Policy* 22 (6): 637-656.

Brisard, E.; Menter, I. & Smith I. (2005) *Models of Partnership in Programmes of ITE: a systematic review* Edinburgh: General Teaching Council of Scotland.

Brookes, V. (2006) A 'quiet revolution'? The impact of Training Schools in Initial Teacher training Partnerships. *Journal of Education for Teaching* 32 (4): 379-393.

Burnett, C. (2006) Constructions of professional knowledge among students and practising teachers: paradigmatic and narrative orientations. *Research Papers in Education* 21 (3): 315-333.

Department for Education & Skills (DfES) (2002) *14–19: extending opportunities and raising standards: summary document*. London: The Stationery Office.

Department for Education & Skills (DfES) (2003) *14-19: opportunity and excellence*. London: DfES.

Dhillon, J. K. (2009) The role of social capital in sustaining partnership. *British Educational Research Journal* 35 (5): 387-704.

Dunne, M. & Lock, R. (1996) 'Partnership in Initial Teacher training: After the Shotgun Wedding' *Educational Review* 48 (1): 41-53.

Edwards, T. (1992) Issues and Challenges in Initial Teacher Training. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 22 (3): 283-291.

Evans, A.; Holland, M.; Wolstenholme, C.; Willis, B. & Hawkesley, F. (2006) The role of the Initial Teacher Training Co-ordinator in the school based element of partnership. To what extent does the Co-ordinator undertake supervision of aspects of quality assurance? *Paper delivered at the Annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators in Europe* University of Ljubljana, Slovenia.

Furlong, J.; Whitty, G.; Whiting, C.; Miles, S.; Barton, L. & Barrett, E. (1996) Redefining Partnership: Revolution or Reform in Initial Teacher Training. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy* 22 (1): 39-56.

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

Hopper, B. (2001) The role of the HEI Tutor in Initial Teacher Education School-based placements. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning* 9 (3): 211-222.

Huckabay, L. M. (2009) Partnership between an Educational Institution and a Healthcare Agency – Lessons Learned: Part I *Nursing Forum* 44 (3): 154-164.

ITT Southwest (2005) A Revolutionary Partnership. In *Doing ITT Southwest.* London: Teacher Training Agency (TTA).

Jones, L.; Reid, D. & Bevins, S. (1997) Teachers' perception of mentoring in a collaborative model of Initial Teacher Training. *Journal of Education for Teaching* 23 (3): 253-261.

Kiggins, J. (2002) Understanding and Exploring the Relationships of a Knowledge Building Community in Teacher Education. Retrieved 27 May 2008 from: www.aare.edu.au/02pap/kig02280.htm.

Lumby, J. & Morrison, M. (2006) Partnership, conflict and gaming. *Journal of Education Policy* 21 (3): 323-341.

McNamara, O.; Webb, R. & Brundrett, M. (2008) *Primary Review Interim Report: Primary Teachers: Initial Teacher Education, Continuing Professional Development and School Leadership Development*. London and Cambridge: Esmée Fairburn Foundation and the University of Cambridge.

Ofsted (2003) *An Evaluation of the Training School Programme (HMI 1769)*. London: HMI.

Pring, R. (1999) Universities and Teacher Education. *Higher Education Quarterly* 43 (4): 290-311.

Schulz, R. & Hall, C. (2004) Difficulties in Promoting Inquiry in Teacher Education Partnerships: English and Canadian Perspectives. *Journal of Education for Teaching* 30 (3): 255-269.

Smith, I.; Brisard, E. & Menter, I. (2006) Models of Partnership Developments in Initial Teacher Education in the Four Components of the United Kingdom: recent trends and current challenges. *Journal of Education for Teaching* 32 (2): 147-164.

Talbot, C. (1991) Towards School Based Teacher Training. *School Organisation* 11 (1): 87-97.

Teacher Development Agency (TDA) (2007) *Professional Standards for Qualified Teacher Status and Requirements for Initial Teacher Training.* TDA Publications: London.

Wilkin, M. (1990) The Development of Partnership. In the UK. In M. Booth; J.Furlong & M. Wilkin (Eds.) (1990) *Partnership in Initial Teacher Training.* London: Cassell.
Wilkin, M. (1999) 'The Role of Higher Education in Initial Teacher Training' *UCET Occasional Paper No 12*. Retrieved 27 May 2008 from: www.ucet.ac.uk/downloads/384.pdf.

Williams, A. & Soares, A. (2002) 'Sharing Roles and Responsibilities in Initial Teacher Training: Perceptions of some key players' *Cambridge Educational Journal* 32 (1): 91-107.

Appendix 1

KEY FEATURES OF THE 3 MODELS OF PARTNERSHIP & the Early Years Degree

	Collaborative Partnership	Early Years Degree	HEI-led Partnership	Complementary Partnership
Planning	Emphasis on giving all tutors and teachers opportunities to work together in small groups	Collaborative from course design to module content and profession issues relating to course	HEI led with at most some consultation of small groups of teachers	Broad planning of structure with agreed areas of responsibility
HE visits to school	Collaborative to discuss professional issues together	Wider remit than TP, very few by HEI, QA and supportive role	Strong emphasis on quality control; monitoring that school is delivering agreed learning opportunities	None or only for 'trouble shooting'
Documentation	Codifies emerging collaborative practice	Strong emphasis but collaborative in decisions about documentation	Strongly emphasised, defining tasks for schools	Strongly emphasised, defining areas of responsibility
Content	Schools and HE recognises legitimacy and differences of each others' contribution to an on-going dialogue	Equal partnership, both schools and HEI involved in content and delivery of knowledge	HEI defines what students should learn in school	Separate knowledge domains, no opportunities for dialogue
Mentoring	Defined as giving student access to teachers' professional knowledge-mentor 'training' as professional development, learning to articulate embedded knowledge	Mentors key role, mentors trained as professional development	Mentors trained to deliver what course defines as necessary	Mentoring comes from knowledge base of school
Assessment	Collaborative, based on triangulation	Mentor responsibility for teaching assessment. HEI quality assurance.	HEI led and defined	School responsible for teaching assessment
Contractual Relationship	Negotiated, personal	Based on working as a team, also financial	Directive with lists of tasks and responsibilities	Legalistic, finance led with discrete areas of responsibility
Legitimation	Commitment to value of collaboration in ITE	Commitment to partnership and shared aim	Acceptance of HEI defined principles of ITE	Either principled commitment to role of school or pragmatic due to limited resources

Adapted from Furlong et al (1996, 2000)

Appendix 2

B.Ed (Hons) Early Years Mentor Conference outline – Year 1 Term 1.2

Discuss confidential nature of the mentor session, except in extreme cases where the trainee would be informed that the disclosed information would be passed on as appropriate.

Personal development

- Check relationships with staff, children and other trainees.

- Check attendance, time keeping and dress. Discuss becoming involved in setting up the classrooms in the mornings.

- Discuss organisational skills and how study time is being used.

- Check set up of learning log

- Management of assignments
    - resources, accessing the library etc.
    - time
    - clear about expectations, use of the handbook
    - clear about deadlines
    -

Teaching

- Review class teacher observation from story session. Trainees to ensure mentors receive copies of plans and observations.

- Discuss class management, interactions with children, delivery of teaching sessions, taking the initiative to be involved, follow the lead of the T.A.'s/other teacher when supporting.

- Organisation of resources, are you prepared for your teaching sessions?

- Planning – reinforce that the learning objective is what you want the children to have learnt, not what they have done.

- Discuss **reflections** on daily activities, including how this is informing progress.

Learning Log Linked with CO8

- Check for evidence of reading.

- Look for observations about teacher effectiveness.

- Discuss **reflections** on daily activities, including how this is informing progress.

Appendix 3

Mentor Conference – EY BEd 1 Term 1.2

Trainee   School

Target review: unsatisfactory / satisfactory / good
Personal development: unsatisfactory / satisfactory / good
Teaching and training session follow up activities: unsatisfactory / satisfactory / good
Learning log: unsatisfactory / satisfactory / good
Areas for development: 1. 2. 3.
Action for development 1. 2. 3.

Signed: Trainee_____   Mentor_____   Date _____
Unsatisfactory: Not meeting the minimum expectations required by the course.
Satisfactory: Meeting the minimum expectations required by the course.