

1 **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

2 **TITLE: BEGINNING TEACHER STANDARDS FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION:**
3 **PROMOTING A DEMOCRATIC IDEAL?**

4

5 **Authors:** Ní Chróinín, D.¹, Tormey, R.², O' Sullivan, M.³

6 ¹Department of Arts Education and Physical Education, Mary Immaculate College, Limerick,
7 Ireland. Deirdre.NiChroinin@mic.ul.ie

8 ²Department of Education and Professional Studies, University of Limerick, Limerick,
9 Ireland. Roland.Tormey@ul.ie

10 ³Dean of Faculty of Education and Health Sciences, University of Limerick, Limerick,
11 Ireland. Mary.O'Sullivan@ul.ie

12

13 **Corresponding Author:**

14

15 Dr Déirdre Ní Chróinín
16 Arts Education and Physical Education
17 Mary Immaculate College
18 University of Limerick
19 South Circular Road
20 Limerick

21

22 Tel: 353-61-204553

23 Fax: 353-61-313632

24 E-mail: Deirdre.NiChroinin@mic.ul.ie

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 **Abstract**

35 The framing of teaching standards within restrictive managerial or collaborative democratic
36 ideologies impacts significantly on initial teacher education. Semi-structured interviews were
37 used to explore teacher educators' (n=13) perspectives on beginning teacher standards for
38 physical education teacher education in Ireland. Teacher educators favoured a standards-
39 based approach to support consensus within the profession and clear expectations for
40 beginning teachers. They suggested that provision of quality assurance through increased
41 accountability and regulation could enhance the status of the profession based on a
42 democratic ideology of teacher professionalism. The potential of standards to foreground a
43 particular ideology of teacher professionalism is discussed.

44

45 **Research Highlights**

46 These beginning teacher standards for physical education are unique as they have been
47 developed from within the profession

48 Teacher educators are supportive of adoption of a standards-based approach

49 Standards will support consensus and set clear expectations for beginning teachers

50 Standards will support quality assurance and accountability

51 Standards will support a democratic ideology of teacher professionalism

52

53 **Key words:** physical education; teaching standards; teacher; professional; accountability

54

55 **1. Introduction**

56

57 Teacher quality is an essential component of an effective education system both
58 internationally (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005) and in Ireland (Coolahan, 2007a).
59 The expectation that initial teacher education can impact on teacher quality has made it a
60 focus of reform (Biesta, 2004; McKinsey & Company, 2007). There is widespread consensus
61 both internationally (Cochran-Smith, 2004a; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005), and in
62 Ireland (Coolahan, 2007a, 2007b) on the need for initial teacher education, including Physical
63 Education Teacher Education (PETE) (Collier, 2006), to demonstrate its contribution to
64 teacher development. A standards-based model has been adopted in initial teacher education
65 in many parts of the world, including Europe, Australia and the USA, to support
66 accountability and quality assurance (Ingvarson, 1998; Sachs, 2005; Wise & Leibbrand,
67 2000; Yinger & Hendricks-Lee, 2000). Since the early 1990's, Ministries of Education,
68 Teaching Councils and Quality Assurance Authorities, such as Teaching Australia (Teaching
69 Australia, 2009), the Training and Development Agency in the UK (Training and
70 Development Agency for Schools, 2008) and the National Council for the Accreditation of
71 Teacher Education (NCATE) in the USA, have led standards-based reform. Teachers and
72 teacher educators have collaborated in the development of content and assessment standards
73 for schools as well as teaching standards (Yinger & Hendricks-Lee, 2000). Standards are
74 typically developed at policy level and teacher educators are required to accommodate them
75 in their programmes. In Ireland, the initiation of mandatory accreditation of all teacher
76 education programmes in 2009 (The Teaching Council, 2009a, 2009b) represents a
77 significant shift towards increased regulation of initial teacher education (Harford, 2010). A
78 group of physical education teacher educators, aware of this regulatory shift in Ireland, have
79 developed a set of Beginning Teacher Standards for Physical Education (BTSfPE) which

80 detail what beginning teachers should know and be able to do in a physical education context
81 (Appendix 1) at the post-primary (secondary) level. Currently these standards are voluntarily
82 adhered to by the respective PETE programmes but are outside the formal accreditation
83 process.

84

85 There is much debate in the educational literature on the merits of a standards-based approach
86 to teacher education and the implications for the teaching profession (Bates, 2007;
87 Delandshere & Arens, 2001; Delandshere & Petrosky, 2004; Ingvarson, 1998, 2002, Newby,
88 2007). It has been suggested that the adoption of a standards-based model and the approach
89 taken to teaching standards impacts on the version of teacher professionalism that emerges.
90 Two distinct competing ideologies are evident within educational discourses at present
91 reflecting a managerial or democratic ideology of teacher professionalism (Sachs, 2001).
92 Though Sachs (2001) recognises that these ideologies are not entirely oppositional,
93 distinctions between these two ideologies can be usefully made through comparison. A
94 managerial ideology is reflected by a regulation-driven, top-down policy implementation and
95 associated discourses of efficiency, performance, compliance and accountability. In contrast,
96 a democratic ideology is grounded in collaboration and involvement of teachers in all aspects
97 of their professional practice with an emphasis on democratic values such as equality and
98 social justice. A democratic ideology is preferable for those within the profession: 'Teacher
99 professional standards when developed by the profession will be owned, agreed upon and
100 enacted' (Sachs, 2005: 7).

101

102 This paper explores teacher educators' perspectives on the purposes, benefits and drawbacks
103 of adopting a subject-specific standards-based approach in PETE in Ireland. It is anticipated

104 that the BTSfPE have the potential to impact significantly on PETE policy and practice and
105 on the physical education profession resulting in a discourse of teacher professionalism that
106 may reflect and promote one of the afore mentioned ideologies. In recognition of the
107 potential impact of teacher educators' conceptions and understandings of teaching standards
108 and how they fulfil their role within the education system (Delandshere & Arens, 2001), this
109 paper contributes to understanding the implications of adopting a subject-specific standards-
110 based approach in PETE in Ireland.

111

112 **2. Standards-based initial teacher education**

113

114 At a policy level, teaching standards reflect goals and outcomes on key aspects of
115 professional learning and are used as the basis for professional accreditation of programmes
116 in the licensing of individual teachers, and as a basis for revising teacher education
117 programmes (Conway, Murphy, Rath, & Hall, 2009; Darling- Hammond, 2001; Ingvarson,
118 2002). Beginning teacher standards may also have the potential to provide system-wide
119 support for early and continuing professional development (Furlong, et al., 2000). Standards
120 for advanced teaching are used for the appraisal and promotion of teachers (Ingvarson, 1998,
121 2002; Teaching Australia, 2007, 2009). Connections between quality assurance,
122 accountability, and autonomy of educators are at the heart of the debate around standards-
123 based reform. These issues are central as the approach taken to addressing these issues can
124 have a significant impact on teacher education and the teaching profession (Cochran-Smith,
125 2001a; Darling-Hammond, 2004; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Furlong, Barton,
126 Miles, Whiting, & Whitty, 2000; Ingvarson, 2002; Ingvarson, Beavis, & Kleinhenz, 2007;
127 Kårhus, 2010; Ohanian, 1999; Thiessen, 2000; Yinger & Hendricks-Lee, 2000).

128 2.1 *Benefits and Drawbacks of Standards-based approaches*

129 Supporters of a standards-based approach propose that teaching standards have the potential
130 to act as a rallying point for the profession, providing a mechanism by which the teaching
131 profession can define itself (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Ingvarson, 2002; Yinger
132 & Hendricks-Lee, 2000). Teaching Australia (2009) noted that standards:

133 ...set out what members of a profession know and are able to do. They provide a basis for
134 members of a profession to think about their practice and for the public to feel confident
135 in what the profession offers (Teaching Australia, website).

136

137 It is suggested by some (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Yinger & Hendricks-Lee,
138 2000) that teaching standards can enhance the status of the profession: consensus on a shared
139 knowledge base for practice provides a basis for the professionalisation of teaching and the
140 provision of quality assurance and accountability to those outside the profession (Darling-
141 Hammond, 2008). Much of the research supporting teaching standards in initial teacher
142 education comes from the USA (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Mitchell & Yamagishi, 2005;
143 National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2010a; Wise & Leibbrand, 2000)
144 and Australia (Ingvarson, 1998; Ingvarson, et al., 2007). They argue that standards can be a
145 lever for reform in initial teacher education (Diez, 1998) and Darling-Hammond and
146 Bransford (2005) use numerous studies to demonstrate how standards-based teacher
147 evaluation systems lead to enhanced professional learning.

148

149 However, these scholars also acknowledge that ‘teaching and learning are complex
150 endeavours contingent on many factors outside the control of schools and educators’ (Yinger

151 & Hendricks-Lee, 2000: 95). Many scholars are uneasy about the impact of standards-based
152 models on the teaching profession and initial teacher education because of what may be lost
153 by framing knowledge within teaching standards (Cochran-Smith, 2001a, 2001b, 2004a,
154 2004b; Thiessen, 2000). There is a view that the ‘checking’ of standards may lead to an
155 emphasis on what is immediately visible as teaching performance and de-emphasise or even
156 ignore learning that is crucial to teacher development outcomes such as ethical commitment,
157 theoretical understanding, critical thinking and political engagement (Cochran-Smith, 2001b).
158 They caution against oversimplifying the teaching and learning process, suggesting that
159 standards can be inflexible and fail to accommodate local culture and local context such as
160 access to resources (Apple, 2001a, 2001b; Bates, 2005b; Cochran-Smith, 2001b, 2004a;
161 Elliott, 2001; Sachs, 2001, 2003). Disquiet has been expressed about the increasing
162 prescription of teachers’ and teacher educators’ work and the limiting of their professional
163 autonomy to make decisions within their own contexts (Cochran-Smith, 2001a; Delandshere
164 & Petrosky, 2004; Kårhus, 2010; Ohanian, 1999; Thiessen, 2000).

165

166 In the context of this debate, the teacher educators in this study have developed the BTSfPE
167 voluntarily, without being required to do so, suggesting they see merit in the arguments in
168 favour of adopting a standards-based approach. However, in light of the cautions expressed in
169 relation to the possible negative and restrictive impact on individual and collective teacher
170 professionalism, the possible consequences of this approach require careful consideration.

171

172 *2.2 Teacher Professionalism and Standards-based approaches*

173 The contested nature of standards-based models represents, among other things, a struggle
174 over the character of teacher professionalism (Newby, 2007). Historically, the quality of
175 university degree qualifications was assumed and grounded in the professional judgments of
176 teacher educators (Furlong, McNamara, Campbell, Howson, & Lewis, 2008). This is no
177 longer the case (Furlong et al., 2000). The nature of teacher professionalism and teacher
178 professional identity, and whether teaching can be defined as a profession at all, are
179 contested. Teacher professionalism has become a 'site of struggle' (Sachs, 2001: 149) as it is
180 used in different ways by different stakeholders, with varying political agendas around policy
181 development and programme design: 'concepts of professionalism derive from ideological
182 concerns about the state and society' (Kennedy, 2007: 108). In this context, the professional
183 status of teachers and the value and contribution of teacher education (Hess, 2008) are
184 continually challenged with ongoing debate around regulation, deregulation and alternative
185 routes of teacher preparation. In the USA this is known as the 'teacher education wars' (Imig
186 & Imig, 2007: 102). Some suggest that 'external policy pressures on teacher education over
187 the years have resulted from the refusal of teacher educators to set standards or to enforce the
188 few standards that did exist' (Crowe, 2008: 991). Crowe (2008) suggests that teachers in
189 search of professionalisation now need to follow other professions by:

190 'putting scientific knowledge, credentialing, training programs, quality control, and
191 policy under a set of coherent values, enforcing standards that derive from these
192 values, and keeping focus on outcomes for which the public has respect. Acting on
193 these challenges is the hallmark of a real profession' (Crowe, 2008: 997).

194

195 Others within the teaching profession continue to try to promote the professionalisation of
196 teaching and shape how the profession demonstrates fulfillment of criteria that prefer

197 professional status (Darling-Hammond, 2005; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Dottin,
198 2009; Newby, 2007). Teaching standards are a key element of this professionalisation
199 agenda, though how standards are developed and implemented ‘to empower or to control
200 teachers’ (Kennedy, 2007: 96), seems to impact significantly on the version of teacher
201 professionalism that emerges. Sachs (2001) identifies two contrasting ideologies of teacher
202 professionalism that have been promoted within educational discourses: managerial and
203 democratic discourses. These discourses are aligned with ideological concerns. As Kennedy
204 (2007) observes: ‘the debate over contemporary notions of professionalism is the struggle
205 evident in social policy-making in general between the desire to promote education as a
206 means of increasing productivity in the global economic arena, on the one hand, and concerns
207 over promoting social justice and welfare on the other’ (Kennedy, 2007: 108-109).

208

209 A managerial discourse of teacher professionalism under neo-liberal influences frames
210 learner (client) needs in terms of universalistic skills and competencies that are measurable as
211 outcomes to which teachers are held accountable for their students’ learning, regardless of
212 context. Effectiveness and performativity are emphasised to maximize output and central
213 control is valued over individual teacher autonomy and decision making (Patrick, Forde &
214 McPhee, 2003). It seems that top-down policies around the form and content of teacher
215 education and the associated requirements of accountability have resulted in an emphasis on a
216 managerial version of teacher professionalism (Furlong et al., 2000). The emergence of this
217 managerial discourse has framed an alternative approach which represents a different version
218 of teacher professionalism where teachers are actively engaged in the development,
219 implementation and review of standards. This more democratic approach to standards
220 grounded in collaboration where teachers are active agents in defining what is important and
221 valued within their profession represents a democratic ideology of teacher professionalism.

222 While the teaching profession in Ireland continues to be well-respected and well-positioned
223 to meet the challenges of the 21st Century (Drudy, 2001), the recent establishment of The
224 Teaching Council (2006) can be viewed either as part of increased regulation of the
225 profession or as a significant step in supporting the professionalisation of teaching.

226

227 A managerial ideology in education has promoted ‘an international convergence toward
228 uniformity, conformity, and compliance’ (Delandshere & Petrosky, 2004: 2) and ‘a new set
229 of public policy demands for efficiency, accountability, effectiveness and flexibility’
230 (Maguire, 2010: 58). The increased managerialisation of education policy (Goodson, Moore,
231 & Hargreaves, 2006; Morris, 2008; Sachs, 2001; Shain & Gleeson, 1999) reflects wider
232 public policy (Clarke & Newman, 1997) and has been driven by a view of education as a key
233 factor in promoting a knowledge-based economy and subsequent demands by governments
234 for evidence of return on investment in education. Where a restricted conception of teacher
235 professionalism is articulated through a standards and accreditation process, teaching
236 standards reflect a passive, prescriptive, managerial professionalism focused on compliance,
237 regulation and control (Apple, 2001a; Bates, 2005b; Clarke & Newman, 1997; Furlong, et al.,
238 2000; Sachs, 2001).

239

240 Caution is suggested by the international evidence of the impact of standards-based models
241 in New Zealand (Codd, 2005), Norway (Møller, 2002), Belgium (Simons & Kelchtermans,
242 2008), Hong Kong (Kin-Keung Chan, 2002), the USA (Bullough, Clark, & Patterson, 2003;
243 Delandshere & Arens, 2001; Delandshere & Petrosky, 2004) and the UK (Furlong, 2005;
244 Furlong, et al., 2000; Gilroy, 1992; Goodson, et al., 2006; Kennedy, 2007; Newby, 2007).
245 Bullough (2003) highlights the potential of teaching standards to standardise teachers’ and

246 teacher educators' work and restrict their autonomy to make professional judgments when
247 standards alone are used as a measure of quality assurance regardless of context. Where
248 inflexible standards are linked to programme accreditation and non-compliance can result in
249 withdrawal of accreditation, teacher educators' ability to make choices in their own contexts
250 is restricted (Delandshere & Arens, 2001). Codd (2005) describes how increased centralised
251 control in New Zealand has resulted in a 'degradation' of the teaching profession based on
252 'managed' measurement, outcomes and distrust. It is argued that the dominance of reductivist
253 approaches to measuring teacher quality determines that 'the market and issues of
254 accountability, economy, efficiency and effectiveness shape how teachers individually and
255 collectively construct their professional identities' (Sachs, 2001: 159) and thus promotes a
256 managerial discourse of teacher professionalism.

257

258 Standards initiatives from within the teaching profession have articulated a different
259 conception of teacher professionalism compared to developments where outside agencies
260 have used their influence to determine the content of teacher professionalism (Furlong, et al.,
261 2000). Democratic professionalism (Sachs, 2001) reflects an informed and engaged
262 professionalism grounded in collaboration and co-operation where communities of practice,
263 including members of the profession and stakeholders in education, are involved in the
264 development of teaching standards as well as supporting accountability to the standards
265 (Bates, 2005b; Clarke & Newman, 1997; Furlong, et al., 2000; Sachs, 2001). This
266 collaboration allows those within the profession to guide the teaching standards. Teacher
267 ownership of their development may promote reflective practice and can enhance
268 professional recognition (Bates, 2005a; Furlong, et al., 2000; Sachs, 2001, 2005). Sachs
269 (2005) distinguishes standards that are designed to promote teacher professionalism based on

270 a democratic ideology as distinct from regulatory focused standards discussed above as
271 follows:

272 'Developmental standards, which seek...to build and hone teacher professional
273 judgment can effectively do so if they are used at the local and individual level to help
274 teachers understand their practice and improve it. When this is the focus,
275 conversations about pedagogy, classroom practice and so on become a professional
276 norm' (Sachs, 2005: 3).

277

278 Mayer et al. (2005) found teaching standards used in this way supported beginning teacher
279 learning and affirmed teacher professionalism.

280

281 'Teacher professional standards when developed by the profession will be owned, agreed
282 upon and enacted' (Sachs, 2005: 7). One recent example of this collaborative approach is the
283 Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium (TPAC) in the USA led by Linda Darling-
284 Hammond of Stanford University which includes planning, teaching, assessment and
285 reflection (scale.stanford.edu) as part of a teacher performance assessment. This initiative
286 promotes teacher engagement and involvement in demonstrating teacher quality within each
287 individual context. The Training & Development Agency's (TDA) *Teaching 2012* project in
288 the UK and the development of national standards framework by the Australian Institute for
289 Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) are other examples where a democratic approach
290 has been adopted involving wide consultation and collaboration with stakeholders. However,
291 the impact of these initiatives on the teaching profession is not yet clear.

292

293 Though adoption of a narrow approach to teaching standards has been criticised (Darling-
294 Hammond, 2004) it seems that with each revision, teaching standards, even where they have

295 initially been broad, are becoming more narrowly focused (Sachs, 2005). This represents
296 increased central control and an inevitable narrowing of the definition of teacher
297 professionalism. Sachs (2005) emphasises the implications of adopting one version of teacher
298 professionalism over the other: ‘developmental standards give promise to a revitalised and
299 dynamic teaching profession; on the other hand, regulatory standards regimes can remove
300 professional autonomy, engagement and expertise away from teachers, reduce diversity of
301 practice and opinion and promote ‘safe’ practice’ (p. 3-4). It is clear that the approach taken
302 to the development and adoption of teaching standards in teacher education contexts impacts
303 significantly on individual teachers, teacher educators and on the programmes to which they
304 contribute. In light of this evidence and the potential impact on the profession, the merits of
305 adopting this approach in PETE in Ireland should be interrogated. These insights can guide
306 policy development in Ireland as well as having the potential to inform the international
307 community. While the necessity and value of accountability is acknowledged (Furlong, et al.,
308 2000), it seems that how this accountability is demonstrated impacts significantly on teacher
309 autonomy and the discourse of professionalism that develops (Bates, 2007; Newby, 2008;
310 Hinchey, 2010). Does a standards-based approach have the capacity to sustain a version of
311 teacher professionalism based on a democratic ideology? Is it possible for the PETE
312 profession to shape their own version of teacher professionalism within the dominant
313 managerial discourses of education? While teaching standards may have the capacity to
314 enhance the professional status of teachers, the potential costs for individual and collective
315 teacher professionalism must be considered.

316

317 **3. Teaching Standards in Physical Education Teacher Education**

318 **(PETE)**

319

320 Lack of clarity about purpose and content has contributed to physical education's current
321 perception as a low status subject on school curricula (MacPhail, O' Sullivan, & Halbert,
322 2008), and contributed to its marginalised position with lack of academic recognition within
323 higher education contexts (Collier, 2006). Some argue that agreement on what is accepted as
324 good practice in PETE is essential to the avoidance of an 'anything goes' philosophical basis
325 for action even though others have questioned whether a core identity is possible or desirable
326 in PETE (Tinning, 2000). Although there is much debate on the content and features of PETE
327 programmes (Collier, 2006), subject associations have collaborated with state and national
328 organisations in the USA, Australia and Europe in the development and application of
329 teaching standards in physical education. In some countries, such as Australia, general
330 teaching standards are used to accredit Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE)
331 programmes and to certify newly qualified teachers of physical education. In the USA,
332 subject-specific teaching standards are linked to the more generic national or state standards
333 (Butler, 2006; Dodds, 2006). It is suggested that these standards can guide the content of
334 PETE programmes as well as the practice of beginning teachers (Mozen, 2005). However,
335 there is little research evidence to gauge the merits of subject-specific standards over generic
336 initial teacher education standards in PETE contexts. Sachs (2005) questions the value and
337 necessity of subject-specific teaching standards. For example, Macdonald et al. (2006) found
338 that physical education teachers in their study valued working with other educators across
339 disciplines using generic teaching standards. Generic teaching standards may help to unify
340 the teaching profession but subject-specific teaching standards may promote a unified
341 profession within subject areas (Chadbourne, 2001).

342

343 Policy formation based on managerial ideologies has impacted on the status of the physical
344 education profession and how PETE programmes are framed and delivered (O' Meara &
345 Macdonald, 2004). Kårhus (2010) describes how the content of Norwegian PETE
346 programmes is being shaped by market forces within this deregulated system where
347 individual insitutional strageies are focused on attracting students (Kårhus, 2010). In
348 Australia, Macdonald and Tinning (1995) used a case study approach to illustrate how PETE
349 experiences result in 'proletarianization': a disempowerment and deprofessionalisation of the
350 teacher (Macdonald & Tinning, 1995). Yet research on the impact of assessment and
351 standards in PETE is quite limited (Byra, 2009). In the USA, focus has been placed on issues
352 around programme alignment and assessment (Banville, 2006; Everhart & McKethan, 2008;
353 Metzler & Blankenship, 2008) as well as the role of teaching standards in developing and
354 inducting newly qualified teachers (Stroot, 2001; Stroot & Ko, 2006). Elsewhere, while
355 Macdonald et al. (2006) found that the standards provided a framework for reflection as well
356 as extension of teaching practices, they suggest that it is vital to consider issues of power and
357 privilege within teaching standards models. Macdonald & Hunter (2006) reinforce this point
358 highlighting the role of official documents in privileging certain discourses. Furthermore,
359 Rossi et al. (2009) highlight the gap between intentions embedded in curriculum documents
360 and teacher action. Within this context it is important to consider the role of subject-specific
361 standards in promoting a managerial or democratic discourse of teacher professionalism.

362

363 **4. Beginning Teaching Standards for Physical Education in Ireland**

364

365 The establishment of The Teaching Council in 2006 as a statutory body in Ireland and the

366 initiation of mandatory accreditation of all teacher education programmes (The Teaching
367 Council, 2009a, 2009b) represents a shift towards increased regulation of initial teacher
368 education (Harford, 2010). Accreditation documents outline criteria allowing scope for
369 consideration of inputs (e.g. staff qualifications, resources, programme allocation to
370 professional studies and teaching placements) and processes (e.g. approaches to teaching,
371 learning and assessment, promotion of lifelong learning and reflective processes) as well as
372 the outcomes of the programme. The decision not to adopt a standards-based approach has
373 been informed by recent debate around accountability and quality assurance within initial
374 teacher education in Ireland (Burke, 2007; Conway, et al., 2009; Coolahan, 2007b; Deegan,
375 2007; Moran, 2007). Generic required learning outcomes for student teachers are intended to
376 be applied to all teacher education programmes at primary/elementary level and post-
377 primary/secondary/high school levels. They relate to core aspects such as values, professional
378 conduct, knowledge and understanding of the education system and the teacher as lifelong
379 learner. This increased regulation will inevitably impact on the discourses of teacher
380 professionalism, particularly as the continuing professional development structures for
381 teachers are currently underdeveloped (Harford, 2010).

382

383 PETE in Ireland has experienced a period of rapid change and development over the past five
384 years with the introduction of new PETE programmes and the involvement of PETE
385 personnel with previous significant experience of standards development in other countries.
386 The introduction of re-accreditation policies for teacher education programmes in Ireland has
387 prompted the development, by a group of teacher educators, of Beginning Teacher Standards
388 for Physical Education (BTSfPE) for application in PETE at the post-primary level. These
389 standards were developed in reference to similar documents in other countries (National
390 Association for Sport and Physical Education, 2008). The BTSfPE are subject-specific and

391 focused on what a beginning teacher should ‘know’ and ‘be able to do’ upon exiting a teacher
392 education programme. The standards emphasise the importance of content knowledge and
393 pedagogical content knowledge, as well as skills such as the ability to plan, reflect,
394 communicate and manage the learning environment. These standards are an attempt to define
395 good teaching, setting out ‘the main areas of a teacher’s responsibilities and provide
396 elaborations [on] what each standard means in terms of teacher knowledge and practice’
397 (Ingvarson, 2002: 9). It is important to examine the motives for this national effort given the
398 far-reaching potential of teaching standards (Conway, et al., 2009). All three PETE
399 institutions at the post-primary level in the Republic of Ireland have agreed this common set
400 of content standards for their programmes. It reflects a democratic approach to shaping
401 teacher professionalism for physical education teachers, though this approach cannot be truly
402 democratic without teacher involvement in developing the standards as well as the
403 opportunity for teachers to apply and evaluate these standards in their contexts. Though the
404 BTSfPE currently have no legal status, this attempt to lead rather than follow at this ‘critical
405 juncture’ responds to Cochran-Smith’s (2004a) call for teacher educators to take ownership
406 of the outcomes of their teacher education programmes:

407

408 At this critical juncture in the reform and development of teacher education in many
409 nations across the world, if we do not take control of framing the outcomes question in
410 teacher education, then the outcomes question will surely frame us and undermine our
411 work as teachers, teacher educators, researchers and policy makers committed to a
412 democratic vision of society and to the vital role that teachers and teacher educators play
413 in that vision (Cochran-Smith, 2004a: 208).

414

415 Given The Teaching Council's role in accreditation, it is important to consider how these
416 teaching standards might be adopted, how and by whom they would be regulated and for
417 what purposes. The value of initiating these developments from within the profession, and in
418 particular, the design of these teaching standards as subject-specific to physical education
419 merits attention. Answers to these key questions influence whether a more democratic or
420 managerial discourse of teacher professionalism emerges and what the impact on PETE and
421 the physical education teaching profession may be.

422 **5. Methodology**

423

424 ***5.1 Research context and participants***

425 Ethical approval for this research study was obtained from the Faculty of Education and
426 Health Sciences Research Ethics Committee at the University of Limerick. Each institution
427 was invited to nominate physical education teacher educators to participate in the study.
428 Thirteen physical education teacher educators participated in the research including five
429 teacher educators in physical education at the primary/elementary level and eight teacher
430 educators at the post-primary/secondary/high school level. These participants were drawn
431 from nine teacher education institutions with PETE programmes on the island of Ireland
432 (both the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland) and included three PETE institutions
433 within the Republic of Ireland involved in the development of the BTSfPE, as well as
434 primary teacher education institutions from both Northern Ireland and the Republic of
435 Ireland, and post-primary teacher education institutions within Northern Ireland. Though the
436 BTSfPE were developed and intended for use at the post-primary level within the Republic, it
437 was decided to seek the perspectives of all those involved in PETE, including those at the
438 primary level and PETE educators from Northern Ireland. Participants had varying

439 knowledge and experience of standards-based education. A number of the post-primary
440 participants were members of the PETE Ireland group that developed the BTSfPE and were
441 involved to varying degrees in their development. Two of these post-primary participants
442 had extensive experience of teaching standards development and accreditation of teacher
443 education programmes using standards in other contexts, and brought considerable expertise
444 and experience to the development process. Many of the participants had some knowledge of
445 the use of standards-based education in other countries though most of the primary teacher
446 educator participants had little knowledge of the use of standards for beginning teachers and
447 the BTSfPE document in particular, or the process of its development as they are not part of
448 the PETE Ireland group. The majority of teacher educators involved in this study were not
449 familiar with the international literature on standards-based teacher education.

450

451 It is important to acknowledge that I am a teacher educator within the Irish context and that
452 my accumulated knowledge and experiences invariably influence my thinking. I recognise
453 the importance of being self-reflexive as ‘it provides a more complete and less distorting
454 view’ (Letherby, 2003: 97). It is also important to acknowledge a potential bias within the
455 sample for this study as it is possible that some teacher educators who volunteered may have
456 been motivated by an interest in or involvement in development of the BTSfPE. This means
457 that the teacher educators in the final sample may represent a particular type of teacher
458 educator. However, given the small size of the Physical Education teacher educator
459 population in Ireland (approximately 30 in total), it is reasonable to suggest that the findings
460 represent a significant proportion of the PETE population. Issues of anonymity and
461 confidentiality were addressed at all stages of the research. Each participant signed an
462 informed consent that outlined the purpose of the study and the involvement of each
463 individual. Each interview began with a reassurance that each participant would be

464 identifiable as a primary teacher educator or a post-primary teacher educator, but not by
465 institution. This assurance was significant because of the intimate nature of the PETE
466 community in Ireland. To protect the identity of individuals some identifying details have
467 been edited out or not fully reported.

468

469 ***5.2 Gathering the Interview Data***

470 A cross-sectional qualitative methodology employing semi-structured interviews was used to
471 allow flexibility for exploration of individual perspectives on a variety of issues and ideas and
472 to capture rich, detailed answers on the participants' views (Bryman, 2008; Denzin &
473 Lincoln, 1994; Fontana & Frey, 1994). The researcher prepared a detailed interview guide
474 that included open-ended invitations to talk, a series of prompts to explore questions further
475 and a reminder to the researcher to create spaces to extend the conversation by use of phrases
476 such as *Mmmm, really, why?, okay...?* The interview guide focused on the participants'
477 previous experience of teaching standards, involvement in the development of BTSfPE and
478 consideration of the benefits and drawbacks of standards-based education. Sample open-
479 ended questions included '*do you think the development of the BTSfPE is a good move for*
480 *PETE in Ireland?*' and '*how do we strike a balance in initial teacher education between this*
481 *need to be accountable and the autonomy of the teacher educator to make professional*
482 *decisions?*' The interviewer also prompted participants to respond to examples of drawbacks
483 of standards-based education from the literature, including the balance between individual
484 autonomy and accountability and social justice issues. Gathering the data involved ten one-
485 on-one semi-structured interviews of approximately forty-five minutes/one-hour duration
486 with each of the teacher educators. Three further interviews were conducted over the phone.
487 The interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed, and organised using *NVivo 8*
488 *Qualitative Analysis Package* (Crowley, Harré, & Tagg, 2002; Gibbs, 2002, 2007). Copies of

489 the transcripts were sent to participants to confirm the accuracy of the text, to allow for
490 clarification of thinking and to approve use of the text in the analysis phase.

491

492 *5.3 Analysis of the data*

493 An inductive approach to the analysis and interpretation of the interview transcripts was used
494 (Creswell, 2009). Initially, these data were selectively coded based on the research questions
495 and the themes used in the construction of the interview script. Data were then open
496 coded/broken down within this framework based on their apparent significance as interpreted
497 by the researcher using the constant comparison method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Reading
498 and rereading of transcripts allowed for understandings to emerge and memos were used to
499 avoid drift in code definitions (Gibbs, 2007). This also allowed for checking for discriminant
500 cases (Miles & Huberman, 1994) recognising that there can be a number of stories within the
501 data. The researcher was careful to avoid fragmentation of the data in this process and tried to
502 ensure that the social context of the data was not lost through the coding process.

503

504 **6. Findings and Discussion**

505

506 The findings of this study are presented and discussed in relation to teacher educators'
507 perspectives on the (a) purposes and (b) benefits and cautions of adopting a standards-based
508 approach in PETE in Ireland. The relationship between the teacher educators' motives and
509 the potential impact on the physical education profession is discussed. In particular, the
510 ideology of teacher professionalism reflected in and promoted by their perspectives is
511 considered.

512 *a. Purposes: Consensus and clear expectations*

513 The teacher educators were supportive of adopting a standards-based model in PETE at the
514 post-primary/ secondary/ high school level suggesting that this would promote professional
515 consensus and set clear expectations for new teachers. Though participants stressed that there
516 have always been implicit standards within teacher education and PETE which have guided
517 programme development, they saw a clear value in using teaching standards as a mechanism
518 to bring clarity of purpose and to act as an agreed framework to deliver consistency to the
519 physical education profession in Ireland:

520 *I think there would be perhaps, it might in one sense bring a bit of balance into what we*
521 *are delivering, in that, if we are all singing off the one hymn sheet then all the students*
522 *coming out ...are all confident, competent in X, Y, Z and Q (Participant 8, Primary).*

523

524 The participants suggested that agreement on a set of standards was valuable in the context of
525 the existence at present of three PETE institutions at post-primary level in the Republic of
526 Ireland (previously there had been only one). The teacher educators agreed that the standards
527 would not be appropriate for the primary PETE context as differences in time allocation
528 would make these standards unachievable, particularly in relation to content and pedagogical
529 content knowledge requirements.

530

531 Participants felt it was important to reach consensus through a consultation process with
532 stakeholders including teachers' professional organisations and the Department of Education
533 and Skills. On this point, it is important to acknowledge that a small number of physical
534 education teachers were involved in developing the standards. Two participants described
535 how, in their experience of standards elsewhere, achieving large-scale teacher involvement in
536 standards and development was challenging (You, 2011). Teacher involvement in finalising

537 the document was seen as crucial to avoid any perception of the standards being imposed.
538 Without consultation, the process of standards development by teacher educators could be
539 perceived by teachers as an imposition more aligned with a managerial discourse of teacher
540 professionalism than that intended by the developers of the standards. Participants stressed
541 that the teaching standards document should be shared as widely as possible to promote
542 shared understandings. The desire for agreement from all stakeholders would seem to
543 represent a democratic ideology of teacher professionalism (Sachs, 2001) and align with the
544 purposes of teaching standards in other contexts (Teaching Australia, 2007). However,
545 Cochran-Smith (2004a) challenges the merits of absolute consensus in initial teacher
546 education contexts:

547

548 the greater the supposed consensus and the tighter the alignment of all the pieces, the less
549 room there is for critique and questioning within the profession and especially in our
550 preparation of prospective teachers (Cochran-Smith, 2004a: 205).

551

552 Key questions such as the value of developing subject-specific standards for PETE at the
553 post-primary level in isolation from the rest of the post-primary subjects remain unanswered.
554 In addition, consideration must also be given to the links between PETE at primary and post-
555 primary levels. The teacher educators at the primary level questioned whether subject-
556 specific standards in isolation from the rest of the primary curriculum were a good idea.

557

558 As well as supporting consensus, the participants suggested that the teaching standards could
559 be used to set clear expectations for beginning teachers by describing the essentials that a
560 beginning teacher 'should know and be able to do' on completion of their teacher education
561 programme. Participants suggested that the BTSfPE could be embedded within the

562 programme to frame learning, thus providing beginning teachers with a structure for their
563 development and a shared language for their learning, as well as a benchmark to give insight
564 into their progress (Mayer, Mitchell, Macdonald, & Bell, 2005). The standards were seen as a
565 mechanism to promote teachers' continuing professional development in the context of the
566 teacher development continuum (Conway, et al., 2009; Coolahan, 2007a; Harford, 2010):

567 *They would have a vocabulary and standards they have worked to as an undergraduate,*
568 *that we would try and maintain as we go into schools... 'I know I reached those standards*
569 *and I look to maintain those standards throughout the profession' as opposed to...survival*
570 *of four years and then just throwing all caution to the wind and deciding you are going to*
571 *throw in the ball (Participant 1, Post-Primary).*

572

573 One participant outlined how the BTSfPE could provide a framework for teachers' early
574 career development and continuing professional development by 'switching them on' to
575 engaging with their own professional learning. This reflects Ingvarson's (1998) depiction of
576 how standards could support all teachers to take ownership of their own professional
577 development by providing a road map for learning and a framework to allow teachers to
578 evaluate their practice. The use of teaching standards to support professional learning can
579 align with a democratic ideology of teacher professionalism (Furlong, et al., 2000; Mayer, et
580 al., 2005; Sachs, 2005; Newby, 2008). However, some researchers have found that while the
581 teaching standards framework may support learning by beginning teachers it may ultimately
582 restrict rather than enhance their learning. They suggest that limiting their learning to the
583 areas prescribed in the standards may force subscription to a managerial ideology of
584 professionalism (Delandshere & Arens, 2001; Newby, 2003). All participants were eager that
585 the teaching standards be used to support rather than restrict beginning teacher learning. One
586 participant suggested the creation of a '6th space', an extra, unnamed standard that would

587 promote learning and facilitate acknowledgement of learning outside the named teaching
588 standards. The '6th space' acknowledges that the BTSfPE may not capture all the learning in
589 PETE and again reinforces the teacher educators commitment to promoting a physical
590 education profession aligned with a democratic ideology.

591

592 This possibility of standards reinforcing a managerial ideology is evident in some
593 participants' suggestions of how beginning teachers might show evidence of achieving
594 standards:

595

596 *It can begin to be used in your teacher education programme, so that if you are a student*
597 *graduating from our programme what we might be able to ask you to do at the end is say*
598 *'show us how you think you have achieved each one of these standards'. So that the*
599 *students would actually have to produce evidence of 'here's how students have learned*
600 *this' or 'here's how I delivered that', so that they actually have to kind of have to go*
601 *through themselves and say have I reached the benchmark. So I think from that*
602 *perspective they can be useful (Participant 2, Post-Primary).*

603

604 This, however, could force beginning teachers to subscribe to a passive and prescriptive
605 managerial ideology. Managed professionalism has in some cases marginalised the role of
606 initial teacher education in professional development (Furlong, 2005; Furlong, et al., 2008). It
607 is suggested that, for this process to be truly democratic, teachers themselves should draft,
608 select and evaluate their professional learning goals in collaboration with others within
609 communities of learning. This would allow greater emphasis on particular standards for
610 beginning teachers (McNally, 2008; McNally, Blake, Corbin, & Gray, 2008). However, given
611 the deprofessionalising impact on teachers in other contexts (Codd, 2005; Møller, 2002) and

612 the issues of power and privilege within standards models (Apple, 2001a; Maguire, 2010), the
613 realistic ability of physical education teachers, with relatively little power, to shape and
614 change standards in the future, must be questioned. While the process of standards
615 development seems to be motivated by democratic ideals, the potential for a shift towards
616 managerial discourses must be carefully monitored. The teacher educators in this study were
617 clear about the purposes for developing the BTSfPE document (Conway, et al., 2009). They
618 saw the BTSfPE as a mechanism for consensus within the profession, to set clear
619 expectations for beginning teachers and support teachers' professional development. Whether
620 these purposes are aligned with a managerial or democratic ideology of teacher
621 professionalism will depend on how teacher education programmes and beginning teachers
622 are held accountable for achieving the standards.

623

624 ***b. Benefits and Cautions: Proceed with caution***

625 It is suggested that standards can impact positively on the professional status of the teaching
626 profession (Cochran-Smith, 2001b; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 2004;
627 Ingvarson, 1998; Wise & Leibbrand, 2000; Yinger & Hendricks-Lee, 2000). Participants with
628 previous experience of teaching standards pointed to the positive impact of beginning teacher
629 standards in PETE and initial teacher education in other contexts (Darling-Hammond &
630 Bransford, 2005; Mitchell & Yamagishi, 2005; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher
631 Education, 2010a). Participants suggested that a standards-based approach would provide a
632 mechanism to increase the professional status of PETE within higher education contexts as
633 well as impacting positively on school physical education:

634 *It will straighten us out a bit and lets people take us a bit more seriously than they do*
635 *currently...for people outside the profession too, to I suppose see what we are like how are*

636 *we experts in our field (Participant 4, Post-Primary).*

637

638 Status was linked to the provision of accountability and quality assurance to those inside and
639 outside the profession. It was suggested that PETE programmes could demonstrate their role
640 in teacher development, ‘...quality assure the preparation’ (Participant 12, Post-Primary) and
641 support accountability within the PE community. They suggested that BTSfPE could provide
642 a model to guide programme design and implementation as well as providing a framework
643 for each teacher education programme to demonstrate its effectiveness based on an agreed
644 knowledge base for the profession, and a means to demonstrate that beginning teachers had
645 acquired this knowledge.

646

647 The participants saw numerous benefits in adopting a standards-based approach. While they
648 did not raise any specific drawbacks or negative aspects to adoption of this approach, they did
649 outline some cautions to be considered as the standards were developed and applied. Some of
650 the participants raised concerns about what might be lost if too much focus were placed on
651 requirements to meet the standards and the possible negative impact of framing teacher
652 learning in terms of outcomes (Apple, 2001a, Apple, Ball & Armando Gandin, 2010;
653 Cochran-Smith, 2001a, 2001b). Participants emphasised that the teaching standards should
654 have a flexibility and dynamism which would permit them to promote and support high
655 quality teaching and learning in local contexts and advance the profession (Conway, et al.,
656 2009; Sachs, 2005) reflecting a democratic ideology.

657 *I don't think we want to develop Physical Education teachers that all look exactly the*
658 *same (Participant 2, Post-Primary)*

659

660 They stressed that a common set of teaching standards should not overprescribe the content
661 or methodology of the teacher education programmes which would provoke too much
662 uniformity, and caution against the teaching standards being the sole content of the
663 programme:

664 *...surely there has to be a way of articulating standards which keep the professionalism of*
665 *the people in the Colleges of Education and allows us to have academic freedom with our*
666 *courses and with our students, and taking into account all their different abilities and their*
667 *baggage that they bring with them to the college and when they leave....I'm not sure how*
668 *that would work though... (Participant 9, Primary)*

669

670 This thinking seems to be calling for a version of democratic professionalism where teacher
671 educators make decisions in their own contexts. However, lack of clarity on how this would
672 operate in practice highlights the importance of proceeding cautiously, while maintaining a
673 strong vision for development of the profession within a democratic ideology of teacher
674 professionalism. Physical education in Ireland is currently a marginalised, low status subject
675 on the school curriculum (Houses of the Oireachtas, 2005; MacPhail, et al., 2008).
676 Participants believed that the use of standards for beginning teachers could have a significant
677 impact on the status and practices of school physical education by allowing for identification
678 and elimination of practices that did not meet the teaching standards, as well as creating the
679 possibility of acknowledging good practice.

680

681 Participants suggested the BTSfPE could also be used to impact on status by supporting
682 accountability of programmes and of individual teachers, through external monitoring outside
683 the PETE community. This willingness to adopt regulation from outside the profession seems
684 to go beyond the general trend towards greater accountability in initial teacher education and
685 PETE internationally (Dodds, 2006). Participants suggested that possible benefits for physical
686 education might accrue, including use of the BTSfPE as a minimum standard to make a case
687 for additional resources. For example, if all institutions would be required to meet the
688 standards it might help smaller institutions to make a case for more resources:

689 *I'm looking at standards forcing, if you the excuse the pun, the raising of standards at*
690 *college level, the raising of the value and perception and the credence of physical*
691 *education...the standards should also direct the quality of the time and the emphasis*
692 *within the college (Participant 10, Primary)*

693

694 However, this connection between teacher rights and teacher responsibilities in standards-
695 based models has not emerged in other contexts where in some cases programmes have been
696 penalised for not meeting requirements (Codd, 2005; Davis & Nichols, 2007; Furlong, et al.,
697 2000; Furlong, et al., 1996). In the USA, Delandshere & Arens (2001) found that a
698 managerial ideology dominated where teachers were forced to frame their programmes and
699 teaching in terms of standards to avoid the punitive consequences of non-compliance. Some
700 participants expressed reservations about the potential implications of external assessment:
701 *...there must be some sort of proviso there that you're careful of what you create; you could*
702 *create a monster... (Participant 4, Post-Primary)*. Careful consideration is needed on how
703 achievement of the BTSfPE might be demonstrated externally to ensure that standards are
704 written in such a way *'that they can grow with the organisation...not hold the profession back*
705 *(Participant 3, Post-Primary)*. However, it is questionable whether external regulation of

706 standards can address physical education's status issue where external regulation would seem
707 to align better with a managerial ideology of teacher professionalism. While these teacher
708 educators caution against an adoption of a managerial approach, there is a risk that external
709 assessment of the teaching standards may represent a restricted version teacher
710 professionalism that would contradict a democratic ideology.

711

712 A democratic approach to teaching standards is more desirable for the teaching profession
713 and for teacher educators and their students. While this attempt to shape the future of the
714 profession seems to be motivated by democratic ideals, how teachers are included in the
715 refinement of the teaching standards may determine the achievement of these aspirations. It is
716 important to closely monitor how these standards are used (McLaughlin & Shepard, 1995) to
717 support the teacher educators' desire to impact on the status of physical education.

718

719 **7. Conclusion**

720 The teacher educators in this study were overwhelmingly supportive of adopting a standards-
721 based approach - grounded in a democratic ideology - to increase accountability, enhance
722 professionalism and improve the status of physical education in higher education and school
723 contexts. These motives are similar to the reasons cited for adopting a standards-based
724 approach in other contexts (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Sachs, 2005). However, in light of the
725 international trend towards a managerial ideology of teacher professionalism and the
726 unlikelihood of systemic inequities being addressed (McLaughlin & Shepard, 1995), we
727 suggest that 'we need to preserve a place for critique in the face of consensus' (Cochran-

728 Smith, 2004a: 208). Reflecting a democratic ideology, it is important to debate the merits of
729 adopting a standards-based approach in PETE and initial teacher education in Ireland in order
730 to challenge and clarify thinking and also to prompt reflection on current practice. The merits
731 of adopting a set of subject-specific standards for beginning teachers needs further
732 consideration where there is a possibility that this could marginalise physical education
733 professionals from the rest of the teaching profession rather than enhance the status of the
734 profession. This debate may serve to strengthen the PETE and physical education profession
735 by viewing standards as:

736

737 ...a means for teachers to develop shared norms and values about improving teaching,
738 learning and establishing a professional community, through robust debate about the most
739 effective means to achieve this (Sachs, 2005: 8).

740

741 Through development of the BTSfPE these teacher educators have taken a leadership role in
742 shaping an active and engaged profession aligned with a democratic vision of teacher
743 professionalism. The teacher educators cautioned against narrow or restrictive regulation of
744 the standards, emphasising the importance of flexible application in each institution and
745 reflecting a desire to promote a democratic ideology of teacher professionalism within
746 physical education in Ireland. However, while the standards may allow for greater
747 accountability and quality assurance there is a possibility that the mechanism by which this is
748 demonstrated and by whom it is regulated may result in a greater emphasis on managerialism
749 and compliance rather than the benefits anticipated by the participants. Prescriptive standards
750 may result in a tension between teachers' autonomy to make decisions in their own contexts
751 and an obligation to be responsive to wider societal needs (Furlong et al., 2000). This
752 highlights the challenge of finding a system that allows for quality assurance without

753 straitjacketing the teacher educators and their programmes (Hinchey, 2010), or forcing
754 educators to ‘teach to the standards’. Their intention to impact on the status of physical
755 education seems to involve both elements of a democratic collaborative approach as well as
756 elements of managerial regulation. Given The Teaching Council’s role in accreditation, how
757 these teaching standards might be adopted and regulated will influence to what extent a
758 managerial or democratic ideology of teacher professionalism emerges in PETE in Ireland.

759

760 **References**

- 761 Apple, M. (2001a). Markets, Standards, Teaching, and Teacher Education. *Journal of*
762 *Teacher Education, 52*, 182-196.
- 763 Apple, M. (2001b). *Educating the "Right" Way*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- 764 Apple, M., Ball, S. J., & Armando Gandin, L. (2010). *Global Crises, Social Justice, and*
765 *Education*. New York: Routledge.
- 766 Banville, D. (2006). Analysis of Exchanges Between Novice and Cooperating Teachers
767 During Internships Using the NCATE/NASPE Standards for Teacher Preparation in
768 Physical Education as Guidelines. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport, 77*, 208-
769 221.
- 770 Bates, R. (2005a). On the future of teacher education: challenges, context and content.
771 *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy, 31*, 301 -
772 305.
- 773 Bates, R. (2005b). *The Context for Teacher Standards: A Global Analysis*. Paper presented at
774 the Association for Teacher Education in Europe, 13th annual conference. Amsterdam
775 22-26 October.

- 776 Bates, R. (2007). Regulation and Autonomy in Teacher Education: System or Democracy?
777 Definition. In T. Townsend & R. Bates (Eds.), *Handbook on Teacher Education,*
778 *Globalization, Standards and Professionalism in Times of Change.* (pp.127-140).
779 Dordrecht: Springer Press.
- 780 Biesta, G. (2004). Education, Accountability, and the ethical demand: Can the democratic
781 potential of accountability be regained? *Educational Theory*, 54, 233-250.
- 782 Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research methods* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 783 Bullough, J. R. V., Clark, D. C., & Patterson, R. S. (2003). Getting in Step: accountability,
784 accreditation and the standardization of teacher education in the United States.
785 *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 29, 35.
- 786 Burke, A. (2007). Crosscurrents in the competencies/ standards debate in teaching and
787 teacher education. In R. Dolan & J. Gleeson (Eds.), *The Competences approach to*
788 *teacher professional development: Current practice and future prospects (SCoTENS*
789 *Annual Report, 2007)* (pp. 67-97) Armagh: Centre for Cross Border Studies.
- 790 Butler, J. (2006). An introduction to NCATE and NASPE/NCATE beginning teacher
791 standards: report guidelines, teacher standards, unit standards, and sundry revisions
792 make a convoluted history--now clarified. *The Journal of Physical Education,*
793 *Recreation & Dance*, 77.
- 794 Byra, M. (2009). Tracking R-PETE from 1980-2000: Research on Programmatic Change,
795 Participants' Perspectives, and Control of PETE Programs. In L. D. Housner, M. W.
796 Metzler, P. G. Schempp & T. J. Templin (Eds.), *Historic Traditions and Future*
797 *Directions of Research on Teaching and Teacher Education in Physical Education.*
798 (pp. 315-324). West Virginia University: FIT.
- 799 Chadbourne, R. (2001). Professional teaching standards: Generic, subject specific or third
800 wave? *English in Australia*, 129/ 130, 65-74.

801 Clarke, J., & Newman, J. (1997). *The Managerial State*. London: Sage Publications.

802 Cochran-Smith, M. (2001a). Learning to Teach Against the (New) Grain. *Journal of Teacher*
803 *Education*, 52, 3-4.

804 Cochran-Smith, M. (2001b). The outcomes question in teacher education. *Teaching and*
805 *Teacher Education*, 17, 527-546.

806 Cochran-Smith, M. (2004a). Defining the outcomes of teacher education: what's social justice
807 got to do with it? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 32, 193-212.

808 Cochran-Smith, M. (2004b). Taking Stock in 2004: Teacher Education in Dangerous Times.
809 *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55, 3-7.

810 Codd, J. (2005). Teachers as 'managed professionals' in the global education industry: the
811 New Zealand experience. *Educational Review*, 57, 193-206.

812 Collier, C. (2006). Models and curricula of physical education teacher education. In D. Kirk,
813 D. Macdonald & M. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *Handbook of Physical Education*. (pp. 386-
814 406). London: Sage Publications.

815 Conway, P. F., Murphy, R., Rath, A., & Hall, K. (2009). Learning to Teach and its
816 Implications for the Continuum of Teacher Education: A nine-country cross-national
817 study. Retrieved 1st July, 2009, from
818 [http://www.teachingcouncil.ie/ fileupload/Publications/LearningToTeach-](http://www.teachingcouncil.ie/fileupload/Publications/LearningToTeach-ConwayMurphyRathHall-2009_10344263.pdf)
819 [ConwayMurphyRathHall-2009_10344263.pdf](http://www.teachingcouncil.ie/fileupload/Publications/LearningToTeach-ConwayMurphyRathHall-2009_10344263.pdf).

820 Coolahan, J. (2007a). A review paper on thinking and policies relating to Teacher Education
821 in Ireland, Position paper commissioned by The Teaching Council. Retrieved 1st
822 March 2009, from
823 [http://www.teachingcouncil.ie/ fileupload/TC_EdCtee/Continuum_ppr_PositionPaper](http://www.teachingcouncil.ie/fileupload/TC_EdCtee/Continuum_ppr_PositionPaper)
824 [JohnCoolahan_18feb2009_ck_61560932.pdf](http://www.teachingcouncil.ie/fileupload/TC_EdCtee/Continuum_ppr_PositionPaper).

825 Coolahan, J. (2007b). The operational environment for future planning in teacher education:
826 OECD and EU Initiatives. In R. Dolan & J. Gleeson (Eds.), *The Competences*
827 *Approach to Teacher Professional Development: Current Practice and Future*
828 *Prospects (SCoTENS Annual Report, 2007)*. (pp. 7-14). Armagh: Centre for Cross
829 Border Studies.

830 Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design, Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods*
831 *Approaches*. New York: Sage.

832 Crowe, E. (2008). Teaching as a profession: A bridge too far? In M. Cochran-Smith, S.
833 Feiman-Nemser & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on teacher*
834 *education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.). (pp. 989-999). New
835 York: Routledge/ Taylor and Francis Group and the Association of Teacher
836 Educators.

837 Crowley, C., Harré, R., & Tagg, C. (2002). Qualitative research and computing:
838 methodological issues and practices in using QSR NVivo and NUD*IST.
839 *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 5, 193-197.

840 Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How Teacher Education Matters. *Journal of Teacher*
841 *Education*, 51, 166-173.

842 Darling- Hammond, L. (2001). Standard setting in teaching: Changes in licensing,
843 certification and assessment. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on*
844 *teaching* (4th ed). (pp. 751-776). Washington, DC: American Educational Research
845 Association.

846 Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Standards, Accountability, and School Reform. *Teachers*
847 *College Record*, 106, 1047-1085.

848 Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). Teaching as a Profession: International Lessons in Teacher
849 Preparation and Professional Development. *Phi Delta Kappa* 87(3), 237-240.

850 Darling- Hammond, L. (2008). Knowledge for teaching: What do we know? . In M. Cochran-
851 Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser & J. D. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on teacher*
852 *education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.). (pp. 1316-1323). New
853 York: Routledge/ Taylor and Francis Group and the Association of Teacher
854 Educators.

855 Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World*.
856 San Francisco: Josey- Bass.

857 Davis, R., & Nichols, K. (2007). New Physical Education Teacher Standards: What does this
858 mean for Indiana? *Indiana Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation &*
859 *Dance Journal*, 36, 6-10.

860 Deegan, J. (2007). Challenging, confronting and choosing, "new appraisal" in initial teacher
861 education in the primary sector in the Republic of Ireland. In R. R. Dolan & J.
862 Gleeson (Eds.), *The Competences approach to teacher professional development:*
863 *Current practice and future prospects (SCoTENS Annual Report, 2007)* (pp. 15-25).
864 Armagh: Centre for Cross Border Studies.

865 Delandshere, G., & Arens, S. A. (2001). Representations of teaching and standards-based
866 reform: are we closing the debate about teacher education? *Teaching and Teacher*
867 *Education*, 17, 547-566.

868 Delandshere, G., & Petrosky, A. (2004). Political rationales and ideological stances of the
869 standards-based reform of teacher education in the US. *Teaching and Teacher*
870 *Education*, 20, 1-15.

871 Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks,
872 California: Sage.

873 Diez, M. E. (1998). *The role of standards and assessment: Introduction*. Washington, DC:
874 American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Conference.

- 875 Dodds, P. (2006). Physical education teacher education (PE/TE) policy. In D. Kirk, D.
876 Macdonald & M. O' Sullivan (Eds.), *The Handbook of Physical Education*. (pp. 540-
877 562). London: Sage Publications.
- 878 Dottin, E. S. (2009). Professional judgment and dispositions in teacher education. *Teaching*
879 *and Teacher Education* 25(1), 83-88.
- 880 Drudy, S. (2001). The teaching profession in Ireland: Its role and current challenges. *Studies:*
881 *An Irish Quarterly Review* 90(360), 363-75.
- 882 Elliott, J. (2001). Making Evidence-Based Practice Educational. *British Educational*
883 *Research Journal*, 27, 555-574.
- 884 Everhart, B., & McKethan, R. (2008). Using an Online Assessment System to Support the
885 Program Report Process in Physical Education Teacher Education. *JOPERD: The*
886 *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 79, 41-45.
- 887 Fontana , A., & Frey, J. H. (1994). Interviewing, The Art of Science. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S.
888 Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. (pp. 361-376). Thousand Oaks,
889 California: Sage.
- 890 Furlong, J. (2005). New Labour and teacher education: the end of an era. *Oxford Review of*
891 *Education*, 31, 119-134.
- 892 Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C., & Whitty, G. (2000). *Teacher education in*
893 *transition Re-forming professionalism?* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- 894 Furlong, J., McNamara, O., Campbell, A., Howson, J., & Lewis, S. (2008). Partnership,
895 policy and politics: initial teacher education in England under New Labour. *Teachers*
896 *& Teaching*, 14, 307-318.
- 897 Furlong, J., Whitty, G., Whiting, C., Miles, S., Barton, L., & Barrett, E. (1996). Re-defining
898 Partnership: revolution or reform in initial teacher education? *Journal of Education*
899 *for Teaching*, 22, 39-56.

- 900 Gibbs, G. R. (2002). *Qualitative Data Analysis, Explorations with NVivo*. Maidenhead: Open
901 University Press.
- 902 Gibbs, G. R. (2007). Analyzing qualitative data. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The Sage qualitative*
903 *research kit*. London: Sage.
- 904 Gilroy, D. P. (1992). The political rape of initial teacher education in England. *Journal of*
905 *Education for Teaching*, 18, 5.
- 906 Goodson, I., Moore, S., & Hargreaves, A. (2006). Teacher Nostalgia and the Sustainability of
907 Reform: The Generation and Degeneration of Teachers' Missions, Memory, and
908 Meaning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42, 42-61.
- 909 Harford, J. (2010). Teacher education policy in Ireland and the challenges of the twenty-first
910 century. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 33, 349-360.
- 911 Hess, F. (2008). Teacher education and the education of teachers. In M. Cochran-Smith, S.
912 Feiman-Nemser & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on teacher*
913 *education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.). (pp. 1324-1328). New
914 York: Routledge/ Taylor and Francis Group and the Association of Teacher
915 Educators.
- 916 Hinchey, P. H. (2010). Getting Teacher Assessment Right: What Policymakers Can Learn
917 from Research, National Education Policy Center. Retrieved 1st March, 2011, from
918 <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/getting-teacher-assessment-right>.
- 919 Houses of the Oireachtas. (2005). *Third Report, The Status of Physical Education*. Dublin:
920 Government of Ireland.
- 921 Imig, D., & Imig, S. (2007). Quality in Teacher Education, Seeking a Common Definition. In
922 T. Townsend & R. Bates (Eds.), *Handbook on Teacher Education, Globalization,*
923 *Standards and Professionalism in Times of Change*. (pp. 95-112). Dordrecht: Springer
924 Press.

- 925 Ingvarson, L. (1998). Professional development as the pursuit of professional standards: the
926 standards-based professional development system. *Teaching and Teacher Education*,
927 *14*, 127-140.
- 928 Ingvarson, L. (2002). Development of a national standards framework for the teaching
929 profession: ACER Policy Briefs. Retrieved 10th March 2010, from
930 http://works.bepress.com/lawrence_ingvarson1/6.
- 931 Ingvarson, L., Beavis, A., & Kleinhenz, E. (2007). Factors affecting the impact of teacher
932 education programmes on teacher preparedness: implications for accreditation policy.
933 *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *30*, 351-381.
- 934 Kårhus, S. (2010). Physical education teacher education on the education market – who's
935 defining what physical education teachers need to know? *Physical Education & Sport*
936 *Pedagogy*, *15*, 227 - 241.
- 937 Kennedy, A. (2007). Continuing professional development (CPD) policy and the discourse of
938 teacher professionalism in Scotland. *Research Papers in Education*, *22* (1), 95-111.
- 939 Kin-Keung Chan, D. (2002). Policy Implications of Adopting a Managerial Approach in
940 Education. In J. Ka-Ho Mok & D. Kin-Keung Chan (Eds.), *Globalization and*
941 *Education: The Quest for Quality Education in Hong Kong* (pp. 243-258). Hong
942 Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- 943 Letherby, G. (2003). *Feminist Research in Theory and Practice*. Buckingham: Open
944 University Press.
- 945 Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. New York: Sage.
- 946 Macdonald, D., & Tinning, R. (1995). Physical Education Teacher Education and the Trend
947 to Proletarianization: A Case Study. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *15*,
948 98-118.

949 MacPhail, A., O' Sullivan, M., & Halbert, J. (2008). Physical Education and education
950 through sport in Ireland. In G. Klein & K. Hardman (Eds.), *Physical educaiton and*
951 *sport education in the European Union* (Vol. 2). Paris: Editions Revue E.P.S.

952 Maguire, M. (2010). Towards a sociology of the global teacher. In M. Apple, S. J. Ball & L.
953 Armando Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge International Handbook of the Sociology of*
954 *Education*. (pp. 58-68). London: Routledge.

955 Mayer, D., Mitchell, J., Macdonald, D., & Bell, R. (2005). Professional standards for
956 teachers: a case study of professional learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher*
957 *Education*, 33, 159-179.

958 McKinsey, & Company. (2007). How the world's best-performing school systems come out
959 on top. Retrieved 15th March, 2009, from
960 [www.mckinsey.com/clientservice/socialsector/resources/pdf/Worlds_School_Systems](http://www.mckinsey.com/clientservice/socialsector/resources/pdf/Worlds_School_Systems_Final.pdf)
961 [_Final.pdf](http://www.mckinsey.com/clientservice/socialsector/resources/pdf/Worlds_School_Systems_Final.pdf).

962 McLaughlin, M. W., & Shepard, L. A. (1995). *Improving Education through Standards-*
963 *Based Reform. A Report by the National Academy of Education Panel on Standards-*
964 *Based Education Reform*. Stanford, CA: National Academy of Education.

965 McNally, J. (2008). *Enhanced Competence-Based Learning in Early Professional*
966 *Development: Full Research Report ESRC End of Award Report, RES-139-25-0122*.
967 Swindon: ESRC.

968 McNally, J., Blake, A., Corbin, B., & Gray, P. (2008). Finding an identity and meeting a
969 standard: connecting the conflicting in teacher induction. *Journal of Education Policy*,
970 23, 287 - 298.

971 Metzler, M. W., & Blankenship, B. T. (2008). Taking the next step: Connecting teacher
972 education, research on teaching, and programme assessment. *Teaching & Teacher*
973 *Education*, 24, 1098-1111.

974 Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded*
975 *Sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

976 Mitchell, A., & Yamagishi, Y. (2005). The results are in: What deans and NCATE
977 coordinators think about the NCATE unit standards. Retrieved 15th March, 2010,
978 from <http://www.ncate.org/documents/articles/TheResultsAreIn.pdf>.

979 Møller, J. (2002). Democratic Leadership in an Age of Managerial Accountability. *Improving*
980 *Schools*, 5, 11-21.

981 Moran, S. (2007). An alternative view: the teacher as Phronimos. In R. Dolan & J. Gleeson
982 (Eds.), *Burke, A. (2007). Crosscurrents in the competencies/ standards debate in*
983 *teaching and teacher education. The Competences approach to teacher professional*
984 *development: Current practice and future prospects (SCoTENS Annual Report, 2007).*
985 (pp. 60-66) Armagh: Centre for Cross Border Studies.

986 Morris, P. (2008). Teacher Professionalism and Teacher Education in Hong Kong. In D.
987 Johnson & R. Maclean (Eds.), *Teaching: Professionalization, Development and*
988 *Leadership* (pp. 119-138). Netherlands: Springer.

989 Mozen, D. (2005). Best Practices of Effective Student-Teacher Supervision Based on NASPE
990 Standards. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance (JOPERD)*, 76, 40-
991 45.

992 National Association Sport Physical Education. (2003). National standards for beginning
993 physical education teachers. 3rd Edition. Retrieved 15th March, 2009, from
994 [http://www.aahperd.org/naspe/grants/accreditation/loader.cfm?csModule=security/get](http://www.aahperd.org/naspe/grants/accreditation/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&pageid=11875)
995 [file&pageid=11875](http://www.aahperd.org/naspe/grants/accreditation/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&pageid=11875).

996 National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010a). ETS Study Says Strong
997 Teacher Education Programs Should be Emulated. Retrieved April 5th, 2010, from
998 <http://www.ncate.org/public/ETSSStudyStrongTeacher.asp?ch=48>.

- 999 Newby, M. (2003). Getting in Step: Accountability, Accreditation and the Standardization of
1000 Teacher Education in the United States: A Comment from England. *Journal of*
1001 *Education for Teaching*, 29, 53-54.
- 1002 Newby, M. (2007). Standards and Professionalism: Peace Talks? In T. T. Townsend & R.
1003 Bates (Eds.), *Handbook on Teacher Education, Globalization, Standards and*
1004 *Professionalism in Times of Change*. (pp. 113-125). Dordrecht: Springer Press.
- 1005 O' Meara, J., & Macdonald, D. (2004). Power, prestige and pedagogic identity: a tale of two
1006 programs recontextualizing teacher standards. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher*
1007 *Education*, 32, 111-127.
- 1008 Ohanian, S. (1999). *One size fits few: The folly of educational standards*. Portsmouth:
1009 Heinemann.
- 1010 Patrick, F., Forde, C. & McPhee, A. (2003). Challenging the 'New Professionalism': from
1011 managerialism to pedagogy? *Journal of In-Service Education*, 29(2), 237-254.
- 1012 Sachs, J. (2001). Teacher professional identity: competing discourses, competing outcomes.
1013 *Journal of Education Policy*, 16, 149-161.
- 1014 Sachs, J. (2003). Teacher Professional Standards: controlling or developing teaching?
1015 *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 9, 175-186 (112).
- 1016 Sachs, J. (2005). *Professional standards: quality teachers for the future*. Paper presented at
1017 the Sharing Experience: ways forward on standards conference NIQTSL, Hilton
1018 Hotel, Melbourne, August 21st, Retrieved 15th March, 2009, from
1019 <http://www.aitsl.edu.au/ta/webdav/shared/Judyth%20Sachs%20Keynote.pdf>.
- 1020 Shain, F., & Gleeson, D. (1999). Under new management: changing conceptions of teacher
1021 professionalism and policy in the further education sector. *Journal of Education*
1022 *Policy*, 14, 445-462.

- 1023 Simons, M., & Kelchtermans, G. (2008). Teacher professionalism in Flemish policy on
1024 teacher education: a critical analysis of the Decree on teacher education (2006) in
1025 Flanders, Belgium. *Teachers & Teaching, 14*, 283-294.
- 1026 Stroot, S. A. (2001). Once I Graduate, Am I an expert? *Teaching Elementary Physical*
1027 *Education, March*, 18-20.
- 1028 Stroot, S. A., & Ko, B. (2006). Induction of beginning physical education educators into the
1029 school setting. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald & M. O' Sullivan (Eds.), *The Handbook of*
1030 *Physical Education* (pp. 425-448). London: Sage Publications.
- 1031 Teaching Australia. (2007). National professional standards for advanced teaching and school
1032 leadership. Retrieved 15th March, 2010, from <http://www.aitsl.edu.au/ta/go>.
- 1033 Teaching Australia. (2009). National Professional Standards: Recognising accomplished
1034 teachers and principals Retrieved 21st December, 2009, from
1035 [http://www.teachingaustralia.edu.au/ta/webdav/site/tasite/shared/Standards/National%](http://www.teachingaustralia.edu.au/ta/webdav/site/tasite/shared/Standards/National%20Professional%20Standards%20brochure.pdf)
1036 [20Professional%20Standards%20brochure.pdf](http://www.teachingaustralia.edu.au/ta/webdav/site/tasite/shared/Standards/National%20Professional%20Standards%20brochure.pdf).
- 1037 The Teaching Council. (2009a). *Draft Review and Accreditation Strategy, Review and*
1038 *Professional Accreditation of Programmes of Initial Teacher Education on a pilot*
1039 *basis*. Dublin.
- 1040 The Teaching Council. (2009b). *Pro Forma and Guidelines for Programme, Providers*
1041 *submitting documentation as part of the Review and Accreditation of Programmes of*
1042 *Initial Teacher Education*. Dublin.
- 1043 Thiessen, D. (2000). Developing Knowledge for Preparing Teachers: Redefining the Role of
1044 Schools of Education. *Educational Policy, 14*, 129-144.
- 1045 Tinning, R. (2000). Unsettling matters for physical education in higher education:
1046 implications of "New Times". *QUEST, 52*, 32-48.

1047 Training and Development Agency for Schools. (2008). Professional Standards for Qualified
1048 Teacher Status and Requirements for Initial Teacher Training. Retrieved 26th April,
1049 2009, from <http://www.tda.gov.uk/standards>.

1050 Wise, A. E., & Leibbrand, J. A. (2000). Standards and teacher quality: Entering the new
1051 millennium. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81, 612-621.

1052 Yinger, R. J., & Hendricks-Lee, M. S. (2000). The Language of Standards and Teacher
1053 Education Reform. *Educational Policy*, 14, 94-106.

1054 You, J. (2011). A self-study of a national curriculum maker in physical education: challenges
1055 to curriculum change. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43, 87-108.

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068 **Appendix 1: Beginning Teacher Standards for Physical Education**

1069 **What a beginning teacher should KNOW and BE ABLE TO DO upon exiting a teacher**
1070 **education programme.**

1071 1. Commitment to students and their learning

1072 a. Education and learning focused

1073 b. Identify steps to develop as a competent, caring and reflective practitioner

1074 c. Seek connections with the community to stimulate and support student
1075 opportunities

1076 d. Work within a community of practice with the goal of enhancing student
1077 growth and development

1078

1079 2. Reflection

1080 a. Personal / professional development through use of a reflective cycle that
1081 allows understanding teaching practice and making changes to meet
1082 thoughtfully identified goals

1083 b. Make use of colleagues, professional organizations, and resources to develop
1084 as a reflective practitioner

1085

1086 3. Content knowledge

1087 a. Good knowledge of the major skills and tactics central to the various strands
1088 of the relevant curricula.

1089 b. Prioritise content appropriate to the needs of the students.

1090 c. Ability to demonstrate correctly, or provide a correct demonstration through a
1091 third party, of all major skills and tactics central to the relevant curricula

- 1092 d. Ability to recognise and correct errors in performance of major skills and
1093 tactics areas central to the relevant curricula
- 1094 e. Knowledge of and ability to debate current educational issues related to
1095 physical activity
- 1096 f. Ability to describe and apply physiological and sociological concepts to
1097 physical activity
- 1098
- 1099 4. Pedagogical content knowledge
- 1100 a. Knowledge of relevant curricula (e.g., sport education, TFFU, adventure
1101 education, etc)
- 1102 b. Knowledge of JCPE, SCPE, LCPE standards and their application
- 1103 c. Knowledge of the learner
- 1104 d. Knowledge of approaches that may be taken to teach content of relevant
1105 curricula
- 1106
- 1107 5. Communication
- 1108 a. Who
- 1109 1. With students
- 1110 2. With staff members
- 1111 3. With parents
- 1112 4. With the wider community
- 1113 b. How
- 1114 1. Oral, written, and electronic skills
- 1115 2. Listening skills
- 1116 3. Verbal and non-verbal

- 1117 4. Visual / media
- 1118 c. What
- 1119 1. Managerial information
- 1120 2. Instructional information
- 1121 3. Sensitivity to all learners
- 1122 6. Planning for teaching, learning, and assessment
- 1123 a. Recognise the importance of both short and long term planning that is linked
- 1124 to programme goals and student needs
- 1125 b. Develop a coherent, cohesive and instructionally aligned programme
- 1126 c. Progressive learning experiences aligned with programme and lesson goals
- 1127 and allow learners to integrate knowledge and skills
- 1128 d. Identify appropriate cues and prompts to support learning
- 1129 e. Design appropriate explanations and demonstrations to reinforce learning
- 1130 f. Encourage critical and varied types of assessment of the physical education
- 1131 curriculum
- 1132
- 1133 7. Teaching ALL learners
- 1134 a. Recognise the importance of inclusion in the PE class
- 1135 b. Knowledge of inclusion principles and practices
- 1136 c. Knowledge of approaches that may be taken to adapt content of relevant
- 1137 curricula to suit all needs / understand how individuals differ in their
- 1138 approaches to learning
- 1139 d. Ability to monitor individual and group performance to design safe and
- 1140 appropriate learning experiences
- 1141

- 1142 8. Lifelong learners
- 1143 a. Commitment to the profession by actively participating in the professional
- 1144 physical education community
- 1145 b. Commitment to ongoing professional development through the design of a
- 1146 professional development plan to guide your own growth as a physical
- 1147 education teacher
- 1148 c. Actively advocate for physical education in the school and beyond in the
- 1149 community
- 1150
- 1151 9. Managers of learning environment
- 1152 a. School, community, classroom
- 1153 b. Design of preventive management routines that facilitate a smoothly
- 1154 functioning learning experience
- 1155 c. Manage resources in ways that provide equitable experiences for all learners
- 1156 d. Facilitate learners becoming self managers of their own behaviour and
- 1157 physical activity experiences
- 1158 e. Design an effective behaviour management strategy
- 1159
- 1160 10. Change agents
- 1161 a. Ability to persevere
- 1162 b. Practicalities of teaching within the Irish system
- 1163 c. Strategic change management skills
- 1164