

Organisation responses to the consultation on the draft Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers

1.0 Introduction

This paper presents key findings from the organisation responses to the General Teaching Council (GTCE)'s consultation on a draft Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers (hereafter the Code/draft Code). Over 250 organisations were invited to participate in a structured written consultation, and to provide their views on the content, language, use and dissemination of/communication about the Code. The consultation period ran for three months, from November 2008 to February 2009. 54 responses were received. In addition, from these 250 organisations, the views of 11 partner organisations and teacher unions were elicited via face to face semi-structured interviews with senior representatives.

The views of these organisations are presented below in order to inform the next stage and final revision of the Code development.

2.0 Background

This paper reports on one of several strands of consultation undertaken by the GTCE in respect of the draft Code. As such, the findings from this exercise sit alongside those emerging from a broader consultation that has included an online public questionnaire and a range of stakeholder workshops with teachers, pupils, governors, parents and GTCE council members. The organisation responses here reported reflect a range of stakeholder interests and perspectives and together contribute to the wider evidence base for Code revision.

3.0 Approach

The analysis of the organisation responses to the draft Code has involved a thorough process of reading and re-reading the submissions received, coding and categorising the evidence throughout. For the interviews, a similar process of coding analysis was undertaken to record and interpret the responses. This detailed undertaking has highlighted key themes emerging within the responses as well as revealing areas of broad consensus and disagreement. It has also allowed for those

responses not structured around the formal consultation questions to be mapped according to key issues and themes where appropriate.

4.0 Context

The organisation responses to the Code consultation differ widely in terms of both the depth and scope of the consultation issues covered, ranging from detailed and complete submissions incorporating suggested models for the final Code, to single paragraph emails acknowledging receipt or commenting on one particular aspect.

At various stages during the consultation period, the draft Code was subject to media attention, particularly in relation to Principles 4 and 8. Several organisations commented on these aspects of the Code in their responses; others contributed to the consultation explicitly as a result of these debates.

The findings from the organisation responses are discussed, in the first instance, within the outline structure of the draft Code; specific suggestions relating to principles and values are included where appropriate. An overview of key themes emerging from the analysis is then presented, from which some observations and concluding remarks follow.

5.0 Consultation responses to the GTCE's draft Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers

5.1 Principles

The majority of organisations agree that the principles of conduct and practice as set out in the draft Code capture those aspects of teachers' roles and responsibilities that they hold to be important. A single organisation felt this was not the case, arguing that the principles do not embody the *distinct* aspects of roles and responsibilities unique to teaching. Several of the principles are explicitly welcomed by one or more organisations. These include those relating to the wellbeing of children (Principle 1), the importance of partnerships with parents and carers (Principle 5), and working with other colleagues (Principle 7). Individual comments relating to the principles range from "extremely valuable" to "worthy but dull". One response noted the helpful elaboration of each principle as a professional action; another called for greater elaboration in terms of how the principles might be enacted.

Several organisations made suggestions as to what elements of a teacher's role and responsibilities are missing from the draft principles. Taking responsibility for their own learning was the most commonly cited omission, followed by teachers' responsibility for the support and well-being of their colleagues, a focus on teaching and learning, and 'professionalism'. Other suggestions referred to a "passion for teaching", teachers' responsibility to be innovative and resourceful, and the importance of teachers' recognising the value of a "mature, functioning democracy". One response suggested that in not including a 'citizenship' provision, the view of the teacher posited was "a little restrictive". In total, seven organisations felt that the

principles capture fully the range of teachers' roles and responsibilities, and that no elements of such are missing.

A number of suggestions were made throughout the responses in respect of each specific principle and aspects thereof. Generally, no clear consensus emerges from these suggestions - not least because they often represent the unique interests and viewpoints of the specific stakeholders presenting them. Many of the suggestions recommend specific amendments to principles, either in terms of the language used, or in extending/developing their scope and/or content. Some challenge perceived assumptions within the principles; others call for clarification, either on detail or in terms of context. Whilst these points represent a range of ideas and interests, it is worth noting that the majority of the suggestions are concerned with adding to the principles and developing them further, reflecting a concern to ensure that each principle goes far enough and fully encompasses the stakeholder interests represented. These individual recommendations/comments form part of the wider evidence base generated by the consultation. Each will be considered equally in terms of final drafting and code revision.

Discussion in the remainder of this section is restricted to Principle 4 and Principle 8. These two principles are of particular interest due to the intense media coverage and public discussion generated around them throughout the consultation period, and the extent to which that may have impacted on organisations' consideration of them. It is certainly the case that both principles sparked debate within the responses, although it is worth noting that neither received substantially more comment or attention than that generated by any of the other principles in the Code.

Principle 4

For Principle 4, the thrust of media attention focused on the perceived intention to force teachers (particularly, Christian teachers) to actively promote beliefs and lifestyles that contradicted their own, and several organisations referenced their unease in relation to this being an unacceptable requirement on teachers. A couple of responses challenged the underlying assumption that promoting equality and valuing diversity are necessary goods in themselves, acknowledging that 'beliefs' can include extreme political and destructive/prejudiced views, about which teachers should be necessarily discerning.

There was also some endorsement for the principle within the legal framework, where it was seen as being about treating everyone fairly and as something that should sit comfortably within schools' ethos. Two organisations urged the GTCE to keep the provisions of Principle 4 in place. One suggested the principle might be strengthened such that teachers modelled commitment to equality and diversity, beyond promoting and valuing it.

Notwithstanding these discussions, it is worth noting that the majority of suggestions/comments in relation to Principle 4 are actually concerned with ensuring it goes far enough in terms of specific stakeholder interests, and, subsequently, with adding to its provisions. Community cohesion, positive references to language (including linguistic diversity), communication in respect of technology, local communities and the importance of global diversity are all cited in this respect. Two responses also indicate that tensions between individual

responsibility and the whole school environment may impact upon teachers' capacity to meet the requirements of this principle.

Principle 8

For Principle 8, the majority of media discussion during the consultation period emphasised the perceived intrusion of the draft Code into teachers' private lives, and several organisations focused on this in their responses. There was some agreement that the honesty and integrity espoused within this principle could only be considered within the context of the professional role; several organisations expressed strong concern over the "unreasonable expectation of public scrutiny into every aspect of teachers' lives". A single organisation explicitly supported the principle as it stands, imploring the GTCE to neither elaborate nor 'weaken' the provision, suggesting it "asserts an essential feature of what it is to be professional". Another supported the principle, recognising that it might need clarification to emphasise that it was included not to erode civil liberties, but to recognise the impact of teachers' behaviour on children and young people. Others considered the potential impacts of the principle, were it to be enacted. One argued that teachers' contracts of employment would have to be re-written; another, that such a provision would have serious consequences for lesbian, gay, bi-sexual and trans teachers. Others questioned the legitimacy of the GTCE's pronouncements in this area, suggesting it was acting outwith the bounds of its legislative remit.

The boundaries of teachers' professional/private lives engendered considerable debate around the legitimacy of Principle 8. As with Principle 4, however, much of the comment generated in the organisation responses focused on a broader range of aspects than that described in the media coverage, and included the need to clarify, or add to, the provisions of the principle. Explicitly emphasising the need to avoid inappropriate relationships with pupils, adding references to 'professionalism', and outlining the distinction between safeguarding and confidentiality were all cited in this respect.

As may be expected, then, the issues generated under Principles 4 and 8, mirror, to some extent, the focus of media coverage during the Code consultation period, and the organisation responses highlight the strength of feeling in relation to these. Yet, they also indicate an engagement with the broader scope of the principles in relation to stakeholder interests. Whilst no clear consensus emerges from these wider issues, they will nonetheless serve as useful comparators with those suggestions emerging from other evidence strands where participants also considered the principles in detail.

5.2 Values

The majority of organisations see the inclusion of values in the Code as helpful and important, although there was some agreement that further explication is needed both in terms of their content and possible use. One organisation endorsed the values set out because values underpinned principles and it was thought important that these values be explicit.

Another organisation felt it was appropriate to include values in the Code only if they were not to be used for disciplinary purposes; another that they were in danger of being 'buzz words' rather than actual values. A concern was expressed that one

or two of these values involved environmental factors beyond individual teachers' control. Notwithstanding these remarks, there was also widespread agreement that the particular values outlined in the draft Code are, in fact, the appropriate ones; as one organisation noted, it would "trust a teacher with these values". This agreement was again underpinned by calls for clarity. In particular, several organisations felt that the sheer brevity of the values left them open to interpretation, and, importantly, *misinterpretation*. Others felt they were grouped arbitrarily, and some questioned whether they could really be described as values at all, suggesting they in fact constituted a set of behaviours or characteristics.

There was less consensus as to what values might be missing from the Code. Learning, an aspiration to wisdom, child protection, responsibility for one's own teaching and respect for colleagues were among the suggestions given. One response indicated that the values should reference the distinctiveness of teachers *as professional educators* (and therefore as different from teachers of floristry, or teachers of horse-riding); a consideration echoed more widely in several organisations' perceptions that the values in the draft Code are very generic and could apply to almost any profession. Further, aside from a question as to whether continual development could be seen in the same terms as excellence and integrity, and a reflection that valuing excellence might not make it a value, there were no concerns expressed that the list of values includes anything it shouldn't.

As with the principles of the Code, several organisations made specific suggestions or comments in relation to each particular value. The majority of these reiterate the points above in terms of calling for greater exemplification of the values ("empathy with whom?"; "commitment to what?"; "what is self-regulation?") and perceptions that what is being described is an attribute or characteristic rather than an underlying value. Value 8 drew the most consensus, where 'responsiveness to change' was perceived as implying a reactive, rather than a proactive profession and as denoting a lack of critical analysis and interpretation, giving the impression that all change is good and necessarily to be acted upon. One organisation felt this would make the teaching profession "hostages [sic] to fortune and party politics".

5.3 Language and tone

There was general agreement within the organisation responses that the draft Code is clearly written and that it uses concise, appropriate language. One response described the language as "positive and aspiration[al]"; another labelled it "unexceptional". Several organisations felt the Code was written in language for professionals involved with young people and that, as such, it would need to be made more accessible for other audiences; another suggested adopting terms that will keep their currency, highlighting a risk that some of the terminology used in the Code reflects "current jargon".

In addition, most organisations felt that the tone of the draft Code is clear and generally appropriate, although several pointed to a 'hectoring'/'directive'/'understandably admonitory' tone. One suggested that the positive tone would be enhanced by the removal of the section about the GTCE at the beginning.

A couple of organisations drew comparisons with their own codes of practice. One felt the GTCE's draft Code falls short of the "clarity and stringency" of their own standards, whilst another suggested that the wording "you must" in their own 'standards of performance' leads to a "more instructive" document.

Notwithstanding these comments, it is worth reiterating that reaction to this aspect of the consultation, in terms of both language and tone, was overwhelmingly positive.

5.4 *Teacher professionalism*

The majority of organisations agree that the draft Code is successful in setting out clear statements about teacher professionalism that apply to all teachers in England. One attributes this to the clarity of language employed; another, to the clear structure of the Code where the principles embody statements of teacher professionalism. A few responses suggested the Code would benefit from greater exemplification in terms of its use, scope and status, whilst one laments the lack of a "rallying cry" that teachers can unite behind.

Behaviours falling short of standards

There is also agreement within the responses that the draft Code is largely successful in explaining behaviours in relation to standards. However, several organisations felt that more clarification is needed about the types of behaviours that constitute falling seriously short of standards. Whilst Appendix 2 of the draft Code is seen as helpful in this respect, several responses indicated it would be more beneficial were it to be positioned within the main body of the Code. One response described its current location as appearing to be "hiding" important information. Alongside calls for clarity as to how the draft Code will be used in practice, and as to how the exemplified behaviours relate to the principles, one response called also for clarity about those behaviours that may fall short of standards even where there is no evidence of previous malpractice.

Supporting teachers' professional judgements

The draft Code is considered largely successful in setting out clear statements of expected norms and practice that inform teachers' professional judgements and decisions. There was some support for enhancing this further through the addition of practical examples and illustrations. One organisation felt the Code was successful in providing statements but suggested that teachers might feel pressured, rather than supported, by a Code that holds them to account on everyday actions and "leaves less room for individualised judgements".

Communicating outside the profession

Most organisations agree that the draft Code is successful in communicating the nature of teachers' role and responsibilities to people outside the profession. Different stakeholders referred to the Code's success in explaining teachers' role in contributing to the wellbeing of children and young people, in illustrating to parents the value placed on their relationship with teachers, and in helping people generally to understand the expertise that teachers bring to young people's learning. Whilst a couple of responses noted that the wording of the draft Code would need to be amended for communicating with the general public and other audiences, clarity of language was also cited in some responses as contributing to the success of the

draft Code in communicating outside the profession. A single organisation expressed concern about the draft Code's capacity to do this, citing its inability to convey pedagogical expertise or to take into account local, social, political and cultural contexts.

5.5 *Appropriate channels for dissemination of, and communication about, the Code*

Organisations contributed a range of ideas and suggestions in terms of how the draft Code might best be disseminated and employed as an effective support for teachers. There was strong support for initial teacher education as one of the most appropriate forums for introducing the Code. The importance of working with partners/stakeholders was also seen as critical, with the teacher unions, subject associations, local and national education committees, professional associations, Local Authorities, NCSL, TDA and the DCSF amongst those organisations cited. Several organisations offered to assist the GTCE in this process (although some felt this was subject to the application of certain revisions to the draft Code). There was also some suggestion that the Code should be embedded within and across relevant documentation including School Teachers Pay and Conditions, Professional Standards and Performance Management guidance.

Some responses indicated that a copy of the Code should be sent to every school, to governors and to teachers; others felt that CPD activity should centre on the Code; others, that discussion should be stimulated in classroom and teacher/parent settings. One suggested it would benefit from an accompanying CD-Rom outlining the background to the Code and how it would be used in practice.

There was general agreement that the Code should be available in both hard and digital formats. Suggested audiences included teachers, governors, parents and children. Two organisations felt the Code should be made available in a range of community languages.

The responsibility of the GTCE in disseminating the Code was also acknowledged through suggestions that included use of the GTCE website and journal, a 'high-profile ministerial launch', 'information events', a programme of engagement with stakeholders and introducing an advertising headline on staff e-signatures.

5.6 *Additional comments*

Several organisations raised additional suggestions in respect of the draft Code. There was some agreement on the need to 'future-proof' the Code through a system of allowing updates to aspects of the Code without having to revise the entire document. Examples of what constitutes behaviour falling seriously short of standards, for instance, was one area that it was felt would need regular updating. The proposed inclusion of positive examples of good behaviour and practice received explicit support within a couple of responses.

Two responses queried whether there was an intention to produce an 'easy-read' version of the Code for young people; another asked whether the Code related to teaching younger pupils or adult learners. Several organisations pointed to a need to update the reference to List 99 (in Appendix 1) to reflect the role of the newly created Independent Safeguarding Authority.

Other suggestions in this section included shortening the Code; re-naming Appendix 1 to more accurately reflect its content; and including reference to the appeals process and to examples of disciplinary measures invoked by the GTCE other than removal from the register. One response indicated that further advice was needed on how to achieve cooperation with other professional colleagues; another, that sufficient clarity was needed within the Code to enable decisions about teachers' conduct to be reached swiftly. Finally, one organisation suggested that the Code make appropriate use of images and illustrations to reflect England's rich diversity.

6.0 Key themes

A number of key themes emerge from the organisation responses to the GTCE draft Code consultation. Those around which there is most consensus are outlined, in order of support, below.

The **use of 'supporting evidence'¹ in the draft Code is unhelpful**. There is widespread agreement that the comments described as 'supporting evidence' within the Code are confusing, unhelpful and unnecessary. There was also significant concern expressed that the comments could be perceived as patronising to, and critical of, teachers, and therefore as potentially offensive. They were seen also as detracting from the formality of the statement of guiding principles, and as subsequently detrimental to how the Code would be received. The GTCE is urged, by several organisations, to remove these comments from the Code.

There is a need to **clarify the relationship between the draft Code and the Professional Standards**. Several organisations pointed to a perceived overlap between the draft Code and the Professional Standards which was seen, variously, as confusing, an unnecessary duplication, and as requiring stronger cross-referencing. One organisation described the Code as "entirely reflective" of the Professional Standards document and suggested it should therefore stand alongside it; another suggested the GTCE should ensure the Code was reflected in the Standards. Several of the teacher unions challenged the need for what was seen as "an additional set of standards". One felt that some aspects of the Code are aligned to Post Threshold or Excellent Teacher standards, claiming, as such, they can be neither expected of all teachers, nor used to determine competency by the GTCE. It was also noted, however, that detailed cross-referencing within the Code, between sets of standards/other documents would be confusing and unhelpful for teachers and the public.

The **relationship in the Code between the core values and principles needs clarifying**. There is general agreement within the responses that the relationship in the draft Code between the core values and principles could benefit from further explication. There is also widespread uncertainty as to the extent to which the two are intended to relate or be cross-referenced. The perceived interchangeability between the two was deemed, in one case, 'confusing'.

¹ Quotations from workshops held during the consultation

The Code is **perceived as idealistic/aspirational** and is therefore unhelpful. Whilst one organisation felt that the Code was “none the worse” for being aspirational, several responses felt it presents a set of absolute and unattainable requirements, or “counsels of perfection” as one organisation described them. Some called for the Code to acknowledge the impossibility of these being met by every teacher, whilst others pointed to an inherent tension created by using laudable aspirations as disciplinary standards.

There is a **tension in the Code between a beneficence and non-maleficence model**. The evidence from the organisation responses points to an inherent tension in the draft Code between what teachers should do, and what teachers should not do. One organisation describes the behaviours in Appendix 2 as indicative of a “deficit model” – something itself called for by two teacher unions who argue that the GTCE should restrict itself to outlining behaviours that teachers *should not* engage in. Several organisations, however, call for the Code to include more positive examples of behaviour to demonstrate not only the actions that fall seriously short of standards but also to illustrate what behaviours that satisfy the requirements of the draft Code actually look like. There was some agreement that several of the ‘negative’ examples in Appendix 2 of the draft Code could be worked up to ‘positive’ illustrations of behaviour in this respect.

The **legitimacy for revising the Code has not been established**. Largely – but not exclusively - a viewpoint expressed by the teacher unions, there was some challenge to the legitimacy of the Code revision itself, both in terms of the process of, and justification for, the current undertaking. Along with a concomitant belief that the present Code adequately serves its purpose, it was noted also that this latest version has not been in existence long enough for it yet to have become ‘out of date’. Two organisations questioned the premise that a new Code is needed to reflect changes in the policy environment, arguing that it should be possible to state required conduct via reference to a set of fundamental and consistent core principles that outlast policy administrations.

7.0 Reflections/observations

It is not within the remit of this paper to proffer recommendations as to proposed revisions to the draft Code. A number of observations, however, drawn from the process of analysis of the organisation responses, may usefully inform this process.

First, clear **areas of consensus can be identified within the responses**. The key themes outlined above point to areas of convergence across organisations’ thinking in relation to the draft Code that set in context the more structured consultation responses. It is also the case that, within the written questionnaire structure to which organisations were invited to respond, the weight of evidence is, in every case, more affirmative than negative in respect of the questions asked, suggesting an overarching consensus of opinion around the broad scaffold of the Code.

Second, there is nonetheless a **diversity of opinions and viewpoints** expressed within the responses that is to be expected – and, indeed, welcomed - given the plurality of organisations consulted. Support for the Code, where it appears, is not

necessarily unqualified and often reflects a 'yes and' or 'yes but' reaction, that is subsequently underpinned by consideration of the detail and scope to greater or lesser extents. The wealth of individual suggestions relating to aspects of each principle and value illustrate this well.

Third, at the heart of these divergent opinions are the **range of stakeholder interests, perspectives and futures** perceived to be at stake. Whilst there is inevitably no consensus around the content of these opinions, they are nonetheless deserving of equal consideration and raise an important question as to whose voice(s) and on what particular issues, the final Code revision will be premised in terms of the detail of specific adjustments.

Alongside the consideration of specific individual suggestions, two broader themes emerge from these stakeholder interests that, despite originating as specific stakeholder concerns, have the potential to extend beyond and therefore also merit due consideration. The first is an underlying recognition in some responses that, at best, the Code could go further in recognising the distinct needs of minority or other groups, and, at worst, that it is currently exclusive of them. One organisation argues that the needs of EAL learners and teachers, and bi-lingual students, for example, are not fully recognised in the Code, whilst another implies the same for young carers and their families. One calls for the role of specialist teachers to be more explicitly recognised, whilst another suggests that some elements of the principles, along with explicit reference to the National Curriculum, would present a barrier to membership of the GTCE for teachers in independent schools.

The second issue relates to concerns raised in respect of the implications of technology for the teaching profession. One organisation argued, for example, that discerning and effective use of technology should be seen as a 'given' within the Code; that teachers need to be especially alert in matters of e-safety and communication; and, that a number of issues arise in relation to technology in respect of data security, assessment, record keeping and data protection. Such concerns point to a perceived failure of the draft Code to account for the progressive technological era that is – and is likely to be – a feature of modern and future society.

Fourth, it should be noted that the **reaction of some of the teacher unions to the draft Code has been largely dismissive**. One seized the opportunity to denounce the work, legitimacy and existence of the GTCE. Another raised similar issues, but also explicitly engaged with aspects of the draft Code, if only to indicate its perceived and persistent overlap with the Professional Standards, and therefore to support its claims of redundancy. Whilst all questioned the legitimacy of the Code revision, many of the issues raised by these stakeholders far exceeded the remit of the consultation analysis. The issues articulated in these submissions have therefore been analysed, wherever possible, alongside those received by other organisations. Issues concerning aspects of the work, legitimacy and legislative scope of the GTCE outside of the draft Code consultation are not within the remit of this analysis and have been subsequently excluded from it.

Fifth, notwithstanding some of the union responses and the strength of feeling generated across organisations in respect of certain aspects of the draft Code, it

should be noted that **much of the comment and reaction to the Code is extremely positive**. Organisations explicitly welcomed the “rigorous consultation process” and the GTCE’s work “to develop, nurture and maintain high quality teacher professionalism and practice”. Others acknowledged the timely revision of the Code, its importance as a universally binding statement across all contexts in which teachers work, its “timely and accurate” proposals and its inherent “progressive” nature. The Secretary of State explicitly commended the GTCE for its “work on the Code to date”.

8.0 Concluding remarks

This paper has reported on the analysis of the organisation responses to the GTCE’s recent consultation on its draft Code. It has mapped the responses in relation to the questions that organisations were invited to respond to, and identified a series of key themes emerging from the analysis. It has presented a number of summary observations, drawn from this process, which, it is hoped, along with the other evidence presented in the paper, will usefully contribute to informing the next stage and final revision of the Code.

Notwithstanding the consensus emerging in this analysis on certain aspects of the draft Code, the 65 responses here reported represent a huge diversity of interests, priorities, and concerns. The resulting evidence reflects a broad base of stakeholder interest that embodies, to some extent, both the challenge of the task at hand for the GTCE, but also, critically, the widespread engagement of stakeholders with the process.

That the responses encompass meticulous consideration of both the broad and detailed facets of the draft Code indicate a breadth and depth of engagement that confirms both the importance of this evidence gathering strand in contributing to the wider consultation process, and the value that stakeholders themselves have attached to the process.

Appendix 1: Written Consultation questions

Q1a) To what extent do the principles capture the aspects of the teacher's role and responsibilities that are important to your organisation?

Q1b) Are any elements of the teacher's role and responsibilities missing from the principles? If so, what are they?

Q1c) Do the principles include any elements that should not be there? If so, what are they?

Q2a) The draft code sets out some values that underpin the behaviours described in the principles. How helpful is it to include such values in the code?

Q2b) Are the values the appropriate ones for the Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers?

Q2c) Is anything missing from the list of values?

Q2d) Does the list of values include anything that should not be there?

Q3a) Is the draft Code clearly written? Please give any comments that you may have on the clarity of the language

Q3b) Is the tone of the language in the draft Code appropriate? Please give any comments you may have on the tone of the language

Q4 a) Overall, how successful is the draft Code in setting out clear statements about teacher professionalism that apply to all teachers in England, no matter what subject or age of children they teach, their role or level of experience, or the context in which they work? (Please give reasons for your views)

Q4b) Overall, how successful is the draft Code in explaining the sorts of behaviours that have fallen seriously short of expected standards of conduct and practice and that may lead to a teacher's registration status being investigated and further action taken by the GTCEE? (Please give reasons for your views)

Q4c) Overall, how successful is the draft Code in supporting teachers' professional judgements and decisions by providing clear statements of the expected norms of conduct and practice? (Please give reasons for your views)

Q4d) Overall, how successful is the draft Code in communicating to people outside the profession the nature of the teacher's role and expertise? (Please give reasons for your views)

Q5) We would welcome your views on the most appropriate channels for disseminating the code, once finalised, and on how it can best be employed to make it an effective support for teachers in their professional lives, decisions and judgements.

Q6) Finally, please make any further comments that you would like the GTCEE to consider in revising the draft Code to produce the final version.

Appendix 2: Interview schedules

Interviews were conducted using the consultation questions listed above as a semi-structured interview schedule, and the schedule below.

1. Purposes of the Code

a) Any surprises in this draft material?

- Principles
- Values
- Exemplification
- Introduction and explanatory text

b) Any omissions?

- Principles
- Values
- Exemplification
- Introduction and explanatory text

2. Clarity of purpose

To what extent does the draft code meet the purposes that are set out in the Introduction to the Code?

3. Relationship between values and principles

In particular, we are wondering whether it is helpful or confusing to specify the values underpinning this code. Is the difference between the values and principles clear enough?

4. Communication of Code

What are the key messages which should be communicated from and about this draft code?

What are the main channels of communication which you think teachers will value?

5. Use of Code

What will make the code a touchstone to support teachers in their decisions and judgements?

Prompts, if needed:

- Training of teachers
- Development of code champions
- Induction of new teachers
- Development of schools' values/mission statements/policies
- Teachers continuing professional development
- Work with other professionals
- Work with parents and carers
- Linking code with other codes in children's workforce professions/ with children's workforce strategy

6. Any other comments