

Summary of the “Research Report on the Standards for Teacher Competence in Other Countries”

1. Purpose and Summary of the Research Study

(1) Purpose of the research study

In order to cultivate the competencies required in the future era, there is a need to rethink the teaching content and methods, and in order to be able to achieve this, one pressing issue is to reform the pre-service training, recruitment and in-service training of teachers who are to be responsible for fostering these competencies, and therefore in response, the Education Rebuilding Council released “The Competencies Required in the New Era, and the Education and Teachers Needed to Foster the Competencies” (Seventh Recommendations) (May 14, 2015). In response to these recommendations, the Central Council for Education set out in the “Report on Enhancing the Competencies of Teachers Responsible for Future School Education – Towards Building a Teacher-Training Community to Learn Together and Improve Together” (December 21, 2015) that with regard to the “teacher training indicators” which are commonly expected of teachers in their role as highly-qualified professionals, “each prefecture, etc. should develop teaching training indicators in order for teachers to be able to have an overall view of their entire teaching career in their role as a highly-qualified professional, and clarify the competencies that teachers should acquire according to the stage of their career”. Meanwhile, in other countries, there are many places where standards for teacher competence are being developed, and these are being used as indicators for pre-service training, recruitment, and in-service training, etc.

Therefore, the purpose of this research study is to obtain ideas which will be useful when forming teacher training indicators as standards for pre-service training, recruitment and in-service training by means of conducting comparative research on the current state and issues of the standards for teacher competence in other countries.

(2) Summary of the research study

In examining the standards for teacher competence in other countries, we conducted comparison and analysis utilizing the research studies of education experts in each country, and through study groups and e-mails. There were nine countries which took part in our research: the UK, Germany, France, Finland, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore and South Korea. We also gave an outline of early childhood education (in the United States, the UK, Germany and China).

Research period: 2015 - 2016, Research Representative: Akihide Osugi (Director of the Department for Elementary and Secondary Education Research)

2. Summary of the Research Outcomes

(1) International trends of the standards for teacher competence

We conducted a study into what kind of standards for teacher competence had been established in other countries and how they were being utilized. Table 1 shows the presence or absence of teacher competence standards in the target country. Competence standards had been developed for teachers in eight countries excluding Finland, while competence standards had been developed for teachers in managerial posts in six countries except Germany, France and Finland. In addition, with regard to the competence standards, broadly speaking, there were some countries that established standards for teachers in general while other countries had established standards according to the level of proficiency such as for novice teachers, ordinary teachers, and proficient teachers. Regarding managerial posts, there were countries which only had principals, and countries which set standards for each occupation rank or school type.

Table 1 Presence or absence of competence standards for teachers and managerial staff

| | Competence standards for teachers | Competence standards for managerial staff |
|---------------|---|--|
| UK | Teachers | Principal |
| Germany | Teachers | No standards |
| France | Teachers and staff | No standards |
| Finland | No standards | No standards |
| United States | Teachers | Principal, teachers' leader |
| Australia | Teachers (new graduates, proficient teachers, highly proficient teachers, position of leadership) | Principal |
| New Zealand | Teachers (pre-service training, teacher registration, novice teachers, teachers, proficient teachers) | Principal (primary, secondary), vice-principal etc. |
| Singapore | Teachers (novice teachers – ordinary teachers [ranks], advanced, proficient teachers) | Principal, deputy principal, department head, subject / grade leader |
| South Korea | Teachers (including head teachers, nutrition instructors, health instructors, librarian teachers, special school teachers, counseling teachers, etc.) | Principal , vice-principal |

Regarding use of the standards for teacher competence, diverse use was seen depending on the country as shown in Table 2. At the pre-service training stage, the standards were used as the criteria for teaching qualifications (UK, Australia, New Zealand), the criteria for teacher licenses (US), the criteria for the formation of teacher training programs (Germany), and as the criteria for certification (UK and US). At the recruitment stage, the standards were used as criteria for the teacher recruitment examination (France), and as criteria to determine skills at the time of completion of the examination (UK, Germany, New Zealand). At the in-service teacher stage, the standards were used as guidelines of professional development (UK, US, New Zealand, Singapore, Korea), the criteria for teacher evaluation (UK, USA, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, Korea), and other uses were for school audits (UK), to identify unfit teachers (UK), teacher registration certification (New Zealand), and teacher registration renewal (Australia). In particular, in the United Kingdom and the United States, standards are being developed which look over the entire teaching career from pre-service training, recruitment to in-service teachers.

Table 2 The role and functions of the standards for teacher competence

| | Student teacher and recruitment level | In-service level |
|-------------|---|---|
| UK | Acquisition of teaching qualifications, teacher training program certification, evaluation at the end of an examination | Professional development, teacher evaluation, school audits, identification of unfit teachers |
| Germany | Teacher training program formation, evaluation at the end of an examination | |
| France | Teacher recruitment examination | |
| Finland | | |
| US | Teacher training program certification, teacher's license | Professional development, teacher evaluation |
| Australia | Acquisition of teaching qualifications | Teacher evaluation, teacher registration renewal |
| New Zealand | Teacher registration certification, evaluation at the end of the examination | Professional development |
| Singapore | | Professional development, teacher evaluation |
| South Korea | | Professional development, teacher evaluation |

(2) Form and content of the standards for teacher competence

(i) Form of the standards for teacher competence

With regard to the features in terms of the form, first of all, focusing on the number of competence standards set for teachers, the number of standards which were set as 1, 2, 3 and had six to fourteen items. Second, many countries indicated the standards for teacher competence divided into areas according to the content groups such as 1) educational guidance, 2) daily living guidance (South Korea), and so on, and showed the corresponding relationships. Third, in addition to the standards for teacher competence, there were some countries that set subcategories for each standard and prepared rubrics (evaluation criteria tables).

(ii) Content of the standards for teacher competence

Regarding the contents, there were 1) educational guidance, 2) student guidance and daily living guidance, and 3) attitudes and ethics as a teacher. 1) Educational guidance included learners and learning, the contents of the subjects, etc., lesson planning and implementation, evaluations, etc. 2) Student guidance and daily living guidance included character development, subjective decisions and judgments, handling of tasks and needs, information provision, regular lifestyle habits, and prevention of problem behavior, etc. 3) Attitudes and ethics as a teacher included understanding the teaching staff, obligations and responsibilities, performance of duties, participation in school-wide activities, cooperation and collaboration with the parents and local communities, self-study and professional development.

(3) Suggested examples of standards for teacher competence

(i) Examples of setting standards to cover the entire teaching career

The standards for teacher competence in the United Kingdom and the United States were designed to be widely used at the respective stages of pre-service training, recruitment, and in-service training with a view to the entire teaching career. The InTASC (Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) standards in the United States give a concrete image of the path of proficiency of the

teachers through an indication of “performances”, “knowledge”, “dispositions” and “learning development”. It can be said that it has been designed for broad use as a desired teacher image, criteria for evaluation, and guidelines for professional growth overlooking the entire teaching career.

(ii) Examples showing standards divided into proficiency levels

Case examples indicating criteria where the teachers are classified into several levels of proficiency include Australia (new graduates, proficient teachers, highly proficient teachers, positions of leadership), New Zealand (novice teachers, teachers, proficient teachers), Singapore (novice to ordinary teachers [3 ranks], advanced teachers, proficient teachers), and others. In this way, when the standards are shown in stages, it is possible to know the goals at the next stage such as what is required and to what degree in order to achieve proficiency at the higher levels, and the standards function as guidelines in terms of self-development and functional development.

(iii) Examples of revision to simplified standards

In the UK, the problem was that the original standards formulated in 2007 were far too detailed, and so the standards were revised in 2010 to create simplified standards. The standards comprehensively describe the knowledge and skills absolutely necessary for teachers through the setting of detailed items. However this tends to fall into elementalism, and therefore, it becomes hard to grasp an overall image of the competencies, and moreover, limits the degree of freedom in the teacher’s teaching practices narrowing down their range of discretion. In addition, due to the large number of items, excessive labor and work are required to conduct the evaluation. Owing perhaps to such factors, the number of standards for teacher competence were generally kept to about 10 in the target countries.