



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Boon, A. and Fazaeli, T. (2014). Professional bodies and continuing professional education. In: Crowley, S. (Ed.), Challenging Professional Learning. (pp. 31-53). Oxford, UK: Routledge. ISBN 9780415816939

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/14737/>

Link to published version:

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

This is the author's final version of a paper appearing in S. Crowley (ed.) *Challenging Professional Learning* (London and New York, Routledge, 2014)

Chapter Three

Professional Bodies and Continuing Professional Development: A Case Study

Andrew Boon* and Toni Fazaeli¹**

"Learning consistently takes place when critical thinking is combined with relevance"

(Kindsvatter)

Abstract

This chapter focuses on the role of professional bodies in relation to continuing professional development (CPD) in two different professional spheres - further education and legal services. Similarities and differences between these two areas, and in particular the approaches to continuing professional development, are highlighted. The chapter concludes by identifying commonalities and differences in the trajectories, circumstances and regimes of the professions. We consider whether there are key features of CPD that should be common to all professions or whether models of CPD are contingent and dependent on circumstances. We propose a model that covers emerging factors in the conception of CPD. We argue that these findings have applicability to professions and their professional bodies more widely, as well as employers of professionals.

1. Introduction

Professionalism, the status accorded an occupation with special market privileges, has always been associated with learning, both informal and formal (Larson, 2013). In their early evolution, professions seek a monopoly of knowledge by developing curricula. They consolidate their learning in qualifications and elevate it by association with universities. Ultimately, the special status of this learning is accorded statutory recognition, often in the form of delegated powers to regulate the occupation. These later stages of professionalisation are often marked by an increase in informal education; public and private events, lectures and seminars. Meanwhile, it is assumed that a career in 'professional practice' involves an ideal of sophisticated process of knowledge acquisition, higher level skill development, increased problem solving competence and ethical sensitivity, all underwritten by a spirit of public service. For the individual professional, the post-qualification phase of professional learning is typically less formal. Indeed, there is little evidence that most professionals fully meet the ideal. As professions come under increased pressure to fulfil the promise of professionalism, the assumption that continuing development is an organic process is supplanted by formal mechanisms of continuing professional development (CPD).

* Professor of Law, City Law School, City University London.

** Chief Executive, Institute for Learning.

This chapter explores the relationship of professional bodies and CPD. This topic is relatively neglected, at least compared to the attention lavished on what constitutes effective CPD. We argue that it has important political, educational and theoretical dimensions going to the heart of the professional agenda. In this analysis we adopt the view that occupations seeking for recognition as professions seldom meet the ideal (Houle, 1981). In fact, they are typically moving towards or away from it. Therefore, while law and medicine in the UK are paradigm examples of professionalisation, their status derives from a popular conception based on a 19th century image; the practice of esoteric art by a closed group of people, each by himself, having individual clients and collecting their own fees (Houle, 1980). This image of professionalism, together with those defined by relatively unfettered self-regulation (Johnson, 1972), are in retreat in the UK (Boon, 2010).

In theory, a professional body's involvement with CPD may be limited to designing a framework, or it could include specifying activities, participation in an on-going process or undertaking assessment of learning. In practice, approaches are potentially extremely varied, reflecting diverse considerations. We speculate that an increasing focus on competence as a driving aim will shift the focus of CPD regimes towards the workplace, placing employers at the centre of the development nexus. This raises questions about the role of the professional body. Will they surrender any role in the operation of CPD and what additional value and challenge function should they bring to the process? We suspect that the solutions to these various problems often reflect diverse factors. These include the professional body's experience of CPD, the particular challenges facing the occupation and the influence of the wider environment, including perceptions of 'best practice'. Understanding how these factors affect professions requires looking in more detail at specific cases.

Professional bodies' approaches to CPD are explored by comparing the experience of CPD in two occupations, lawyers and further education teachers,² against a background of CPD development in UK professions generally. Our case studies show the types of roles, behaviours and attitudes that professional bodies hold towards continuing learning and the pressures and needs that impact on adoption and implementation. It also explores how professions create the community of practice through language, discourse, popular understanding and cultural fabric to support professional learning and concepts of professionalism. While our approach is exploratory at the policy level we are keen to consider what implications, if any, our analysis has for CPD across the professions. In this respect, we are encouraged by Houle's observations that learning processes in different professions are too often considered to be unique. We take seriously his proposition that '[a] study of similarities could result in an exchange of ideas, techniques, and solutions to problems that would greatly refresh and broaden practice in many professions' (Houle, 1980: 16).

Our data were collected in the course of research projects on the two professions concerned. Material on solicitors and barristers was gathered for a report on compulsory CPD for solicitors. Further material on barristers was published in a report recommending changes in the bar CPD scheme (Bar Standards Board, 2011). Evidence on further

² When describing lawyers and their professional bodies we refer to those in England and Wales rather than those in other jurisdictions in the UK. When referring to further education teachers we refer to those in England.

education teachers was collected by the professional body, the Institute for Learning (IfL), through interviews, surveys and data from large numbers of further education teachers and trainers, drawing on its published annual CPD Reviews (IfL 2012, IfL 2010, IfL 2009) together with other qualitative data, including material on what constitutes exceptional teaching and learning and CPD (IfL 2010). Our path through the issues is, initially, to outline the context in which the contemporary debate about CPD is set. We examine the professionalisation trajectories of both occupations and relationship between these trajectories and the functions and forms of their respective CPD regimes. Finally, we analyse emerging trends in the critical relationships between practitioners, employers and professional bodies. We conclude by considering the role of professional bodies in emergent regimes of CPD.

2. Context

Education is a central activity of professions. Typically, professionalisation of an occupation involves creation of formal initial training usually through a training school, establishment of core knowledge as a higher level discipline often within universities, establishment of a national association and statutory recognition of the profession by the state. The process of an individual becoming a professional normally involves a mixture of theoretical and practical knowledge, increasingly involving obtaining a degree, or equivalent qualification, and serving a formally recognised trainee period. These stages are developed because breadth of vision is necessary for an individual to exercise unsupervised and autonomous judgement, a key marker of professional practice. Although control of initial training and qualification is a key step in professional recognition and well established, the expectation of planned, regular and systematic continuing development over a working life is relatively new.

In the United Kingdom professional bodies embraced the idea of continuing professional development during the 1980s (Friedman, 2011). In the adoption phase professions generally used an 'input' model, measuring the numbers of conferences, workshops, lectures or practice sessions attended, awarding points or hours towards an official requirement accordingly. The first three years post qualification, which Eraut (1994) calls initial professional education, also follows this template, but is more likely to contain compulsory elements that are theoretical, dense and broad and so unrelated to immediate and specific aspects of practice. In contrast, learning from experience 'on the job', is often supported within organisations, for example, by appraisal, either in the pre-qualification phase or as preparation for new career challenges. While CPD is sometimes used as an umbrella term, incorporating initial professional education or training, subsequent CPD and learning in the workplace, there is potential for these different elements of post-qualification experience either to be formally merged or separated out in CPD regimes.

Nationally, the first generation CPD input model has been roundly criticised for dependence on didactic delivery by diverse and uncoordinated providers (Ceverro, 2000, Bolton 2002) and for failure to impact on recipients in meaningful ways. Focusing on the need to prove that members undertook CPD drove professions to adopt a restrictive interpretation of what counted. Providers of CPD, often with an accredited status and able to corroborate attendance, were given a captive market. Professionals, often tired after a long day, were forced to attend well-intended but dry lectures on possibly irrelevant areas of practice, paying through the nose for the privilege. CPD understandably gained a bad reputation with the very people it aimed to inspire, presenting theoretical and practical problems. These

were exacerbated by greater awareness, from the 1970s onwards, of the distinctive needs of adult learners (Knowles 1980). In the ideal context the informality of context harnessed the experience of adult learners, the enthusiasm of instructors and flexibility of the context to instil positive motivation towards learning (Knowles, 1975). The notion of self-direction in learning proved to be so powerful that it infiltrated the delivery of university education, but not the assumptions underpinning traditional CPD. First generation CPD was not encouraging positive attitudes towards education or equipping professionals to learn from experience. This awareness coincided with the emergence of new thinking on how people develop professional skills. The idea of reflective practice (Schon, 1987) offered a parallel path for CPD by focusing on problems that professionals actually faced every day.

Schon suggests that the habit of reflective practice can be inculcated through coaching and mentoring professionals by expert facilitators. Professionals able to articulate their approach to the problems of practice, and who think about their experience as they actually engage in it, learn more deeply and profoundly. This is the opposite of the typical, traditional experience of CPD, which functions as 'updating' on a general area without connecting with issues of concern to the practitioner *at that time*. Schon's theory, that experience, tacit knowledge or 'knowing in action', allows the practitioner to achieve artistry by exceeding the bounds of technical competence, is one of the most cited, as well as often criticised aspects of his work. Detractors focus on Schon's lack of clarity regarding the mechanics of 'reflection in action'. They also criticise '... the readiness of those engaged in professional education to rely so heavily on slogans such as 'reflective practice' (MacIntyre, 1994). Schon followed the increasingly accepted convention that it is learning that is self-discovered and self-appropriated that significantly influences behaviour. New approaches to professional learning have involved moving beyond individual and largely solitary reflective practice to find that collaborative reflective practice is more effective (Boud 2010).

Learners' motivations towards continuing education tend to be geared to achieving a goal, such as achieving a qualification, an activity, like the social experience of participation, where learning is not the primary motivation, or learning for its own sake (Houle, 1980). The last of these proved to be the most prevalent orientation (Courtney, 1992). Houle conceived of professional learning as a process of adjusting practice in the light of experience to be more efficient and effective; eliminating errors, adjusting performance, expanding potential. These insights might build until, ultimately, new or reformed practices and perspectives are introduced. This process is continuous in that learning new or better ways of fulfilling professional roles is an everyday occurrence. Self-directed learning is used by professionals to manage their practice performance as part of on-going personal development going beyond workplace competence. It extends to the possibility of CPD addressing personal development needs that are not restricted to the narrow work place performance of the professional, but to broader personal and social needs. This broad conception of CPD is captured in the definition advanced by Madden and Mitchell (1993): 'The maintenance and enhancement of the knowledge, expertise and competence of professionals throughout their careers, according to a plan formulated with regard to the needs of the professional, their employer and society'.

Broader understandings of the role and potential of CPD are reflected in a number of evolutions of the concept. Professions have attempted to convey that personal development activity is not a special event, but a day-to-day activity. A non-exhaustive list of permitted

CPD activities for dentists, for example, includes courses and lectures, vocational training or general professional training study days, educational elements or professional and specialist society meetings, peer review and clinical audit, distance learning, multimedia learning, staff training, background research, private study, journal reading and attending conferences. This breadth has driven a more flexible approach to documenting and reporting CPD, with the substitution of more flexible 'verification' requirements. So, for example, dentists must complete 250 hours over five years and 75 hours must be "verifiable", meaning that it must have concise educational aims and objectives, clear anticipated outcomes and quality control (i.e. provision for feedback). This in turn, has led to a more open attitude to proof of completion. Satisfaction of dentists' CPD requirements is not checked until the end of the five year cycle, by a declaration of completion, and only a sample is checked.

The adoption of more flexible approaches to formal requirements is one of several evolutionary changes in CPD. Ceverro (2000) noted four trends in the US during the 1990s. First, workplace education had grown to dwarf other kinds of provision. Second, there had been growth in provision by universities and professions, particularly in distance learning formats. Third, there had been an increase in the volume of collaborative arrangements, particularly between workplaces and universities. Finally, there had been an increasing use of CPD to regulate professional practice, including as a basis for licensure and recertification. Similar trends may be occurring in the UK, certainly in the areas covered by our case studies. There has been a growth of in-house staff development in large law firms for example, accompanied by much greater awareness of the economic advantages of in-house training and the opportunity presented to imbue the firm's cultural awareness. Much of this CPD is accredited where possible, offering double value for staff development. Universities have been encouraged to offer CPD within their discipline areas as part of a drive to attract 'third leg income' and there are high levels of activity in some areas. As our case studies show, some professions have explored, if not yet enacted, the use of CPD as a precondition of the right to practise or of entry to higher specialisms. Finally, there is growing interest in how the time and resource devoted to CPD might actually be used to enhance performance.

3. Professional histories and trajectories – lawyers and further education teachers

In theory, professions are distinguished from other occupations by their specialist and sometimes esoteric body of professional knowledge and the indeterminacy of professional judgement. Further education teachers are one of many occupations which have a generalised corpus of knowledge. Teaching in vocational areas especially, needs to be delivered by seasoned and successful practitioners, for example, in retail, construction, engineering, law or new technologies. The Institute for Learning has defined further education teachers' as 'dual professionals' in subject discipline and in pedagogy. In contrast, established professions choose to conceal a similar division between knowledge and skill in order to maintain the mystery of the professional art (Jamouille and Peloile, 1970). Lawyers and medics have high professional status because, historically, they convinced the state that state regulation is the best mechanism of quality control. Historically, FE teachers have enjoyed relatively little professional prestige, and are therefore more dependent on the professional body in order to achieve this.

Barristers can trace their antecedents to the reign of Henry II (Brand, 1992) while The Law Society, the professional body of solicitors, was incorporated in 1831 (Boon and Levin, 2008). These professions prescribe over half the content of law degrees and vocational courses and insist on extensive training periods in practice (Boon and Webb, 2008). Arising from their roots in the mechanical institutes established in the early nineteenth century, teachers in further education colleges offer a much more recent example of professionalisation compared with law. The relatively low professional status accorded to teachers in FE was partly due to the fact that the sector was dispersed rather than national, with local authorities provided further education funding until 1993, when arrangements were centralised through the Further Education Funding Council. The sector remains relatively marginal in national policy compared with the school system, a fact reflected in the far later introduction of qualification requirements. Qualifications for primary school teachers were introduced as a requirement in 1969, for secondary school teachers from 1973 and for FE teachers in 2001 and updated in 2007.

Until the late 1990s Further Education teachers had little central organisation or national standards, both of which are usually a precursor of professionalisation. The Institute for Learning (IfL), was established in 2002 by teachers, trade unions and the employers' association, as a voluntary membership professional body. Membership originally numbered several thousand. In September 2007, following an independent review initiated by government (Foster 2005), a white paper (Department for Education and Skills 2006) and wide consultation, two sets of regulations were issued. The first required that all further education teachers should be registered with IfL and that they undertake at least 30 hours of continuing professional development a year, to be monitored by IfL.³ The second set of regulations built on the 2001 requirement that further education teachers be qualified. They also required that, from September 2007, as well as specified initial qualifications, new further education teachers gain the post-qualification professional status of Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills (QTLS), or an associate level for those not holding a full teaching role (ATLS) from the Institute for Learning (UK Government, 2007), within the first five years of teaching.

Ethics and discipline are two areas often indicative of the later stages of professionalisation. Lawyers are subject to a professional code, formerly upheld by the Law Society and since 2007 by the regulatory body, the Solicitors' Regulation Authority, and, for barristers, by the Bar Standards Board. These codes are underpinned by extensive disciplinary machinery, with power to bar from practice. The government regulations governing FE teaching had no requirement for a code of conduct or ethical standards and no system for removing individuals from practising. In 2008, IfL introduced a code of professional practice, partly as a result of comparisons with other professional bodies and partly to protect the profession and public. IfL's code differs from some other professional codes in that it focuses on professional behaviours and ethics, and not competence, which is left as a domain for the employer to address. The approach was approved in consultation with members. Many evinced pride in professional status and support for investigation and removal of individuals from registration if there was found to be a serious breach of the code of professional practice.

4. Forms of CPD

³ This set of regulations subsequently were revoked 30 September 2012.

In 1985, compulsory CPD was introduced to solicitors in the first three years of practice and extended incrementally to all solicitors from 1st November 1998. The General Council of the Bar introduced CPD a little later than solicitors along similar lines. The original requirement for solicitors undertaking CPD was attendance at 12 hours of approved courses. Currently, all solicitors working at least 32 hours a week must complete a minimum of 16 hours of CPD annually.⁴ The only mandatory component is that newly qualified solicitors must attend a Management Course Stage 1, taken between the date of admission and the end of the third CPD year, a clear example of 'initial professional education' (Eraut 1994).⁵ Similar to dentists and doctors, the standard CPD requirement is for completion of 25 per cent of the 16 hours by participation in accredited training courses, from authorised CPD providers, requiring attendance for one hour or more.⁶ The remaining 75 per cent can comprise a wide range of activities, such as preparing or delivering courses, legally related research and authorship, coaching, mentoring or work shadowing. The Law Society has launched a 'CPD Centre' providing details of courses counting towards CPD requirements. Solicitors' firms or barristers' chambers often run CPD validated in-house courses. Practitioners can complete on-line self-assessment exercises, based on law-related publications.

Although the requirements for lawyers' CPD have liberalised the profession has been quite slow to make a more rigorous link between CPD and competence. The Lord Chancellor's Advisory Committee for Education and Conduct, a generally progressive body, suggested that the lawyers adopt a broad conception of CPD as a 'regular, structured educational activity designed to supplement the practitioner's experience by enhancing any aspect of his professional competence at all the different stages of his career' (ACLEC, 1997: para. 1.13), that there should be an element of reflection and that the Law Society should make appraisal and planning a compulsory element (ACLEC, 1997; paras. 1.13 and 4.30). No steps were taken to require reflection, appraisal or planning and the Solicitors' Training Regulations 2009 still define CPD as 'a course, lecture, seminar or other programme or method of study

⁴ (<http://www.sra.org.uk/solicitors/cpd/solicitors.page#cpd-scheme>) For solicitors and RELs who work fewer than 32 hours per week, the requirements are reduced.

⁵ The seven CPD hours the course attracts count towards the annual requirement. Solicitors who qualified by undertaking the Law Society Finals Examination, which was phased out in 1994, or the Qualified Lawyers Transfer Test (QLTT) have a requirement to attend the Financial and Business Skills (not the exam) and, subject to exemptions, the Client Care and Professional Standards modules of the Professional Skills Course (PSC) during their first CPD year. The hours gained from attending these modules will count towards a solicitor's first-year CPD requirement. No hours can be claimed for undertaking the modules prior to admission.

⁶ "**Participation**" includes preparing, delivering and/or attending accredited courses.

"**Attendance**" means attendance at the complete course. Part attendance does not count at all.

"**Course**" includes

- face-to-face sessions forming part of a course, including those delivered by an authorised distance-learning provider
- a course wholly provided by distance learning that involves assessment by dissertation and written examination
- structured coaching sessions, delivered face to face, of one hour or more, which have written aims and objectives, are documented showing an outcome, and are accredited under an authorisation agreement
- structured mentoring sessions involving professional development, of one hour or more, delivered face to face, which have written aims and objectives, are documented showing an outcome, and are accredited under an authorisation agreement

(whether requiring attendance or not) that is relevant to the needs and professional standards of solicitors and complies with guidance issued from time to time by the SRA (Solicitors Training Regulations, 2009).⁷ Progress towards recognising the workplace as the focus for the development of competence has also been slow. The bar working group noted that the legal professions are unusual in not recognising that workplace activity can constitute relevant CPD, recommending a move away from accredited courses and towards a more flexible requirement of 'verification (BSB 2011).

Based on the government regulations introduced in 2007, IfL required each full-time member to carry out at least 30 hours of CPD a year.⁸ The CPD strategy was developmental and, in contrast with the legal professions, an 'outcomes model'. Members gauged the impact of CPD on their performance supported by guidance produced by IfL. The focus on impact rather than hours of input reflects the decision by IfL to support teachers to be the best they can be, up to date in subject or vocational knowledge and in teaching methods ie. not a threshold competence nor a compliance input model. IfL monitors the overall number of hours of CPD carried out each year by each member, gauged by the individual as having an impact on practice, including the proportion of hours relating to teaching methods, and subject or vocational knowledge updating or other areas. Since 2008-09, IfL has sampled members' CPD each year through a combination of examining CPD records, telephone interviews and focus groups. In addition to exploring the nature and range of CPD undertaken a primary aim of these in-depth interviews is to identify the kinds of CPD that are effective and have had the greatest impact. IfL, then publishes findings and shares good practice as a resource for other members and employers (IfL 2012, IfL 2010, IfL 2009).

The balance of evidence from tens of thousands of practising teachers and trainers who have declared their CPD, and thousands more involved in IfL's sampling over the last four years, suggests that nearly all teachers carry out about double the number of hours of CPD required each year. There is an even amount of time that may be said to have impact spent on updating subject knowledge and expertise in teaching methods. IfL's research with more than 5,000 members identified what excellent teaching is like and CPD that works (IfL 2010). Teachers value sharing critical reflection, testing practice and learning from each other, both within and outside of their place of employment. This led IfL to conclude that collaborative reflection, participating in communities of practice, and individual reflection on professional learning is most powerful and likely to lead to positive change in practice. These findings about the importance of collaborative professional practice (IfL 2012) coincide with recent meta-analysis of over 80,000 individual pieces of research weighting the range of teaching interventions yielding the greatest impact (Hattie 2009, 2012). Reflective practice was the most highly rated form of professional learning supporting outstanding practice (IfL, 2010).

5. Models: inputs and outputs

Perhaps the key distinction in CPD practice in recent years is between input models and output (or outcomes) models. In this respect, the lawyers and FE teachers approach represent different ends of the same telescope. The lawyers' 'input model' attracted concern that it encouraged a 'box ticking' mentality in attendees and a propensity among course

⁷ Regulation 2(3) (Interpretation and Definitions) of Part 1.

⁸ *Pro rata* for part-time teachers with a minimum of six hours a year.

providers for 're-inventing the wheel', often at high cost to small firms (ACLEC, 1996, Gold *et al*, 2007). Despite high level encouragement for individuals taking responsibility for their own personal and professional development (ACLEC, 1997: 17) it was not until 2003 that the Law Society Training Committee consulted on the issue, proposing a requirement of more hours within a more flexible system focused on personal professional development rather than hours of activity. While some amendments were made to the solicitors' CPD scheme, the definition of CPD retained the focus on lectures and seminars and this, to a large degree set the tone.

Solicitors are offered a framework which could provide a basis for a degree of reflection. They are advised to analyse their training needs using a career plan, setting short, medium and long term goals, setting specific targets for each goal, together with deadlines by which these targets should have been achieved. A suite of forms is provided to help them make best use of the CPD scheme. A development plan template, for example, is in tabular form with columns headed development activity, knowledge or skills to be developed, priority, development strategy/methods, providers, start date/end date [of courses]. Worked examples of training needs analysis forms are attached for those at different career stages. Solicitors are advised to enter on their training record all developmental activity, whether or not it qualifies for CPD credit. Despite the existence of this framework, the solicitors' CPD continues to be based on an input model. There is no requirement for planning, reflection, recording or communication and no mechanism to ensure that the various good practice items are followed.

In contrast with the solicitors' approach, the IfL's scheme is 'outcomes driven'. CPD is defined by the outcomes sought; 'maintaining, improving and broadening relevant knowledge and skills in a subject or vocational specialism, and in teaching and training methods so that it has positive impact on practice and the learner experience' (IfL 2012). Although government regulations specified that the hours of professional development should be monitored, IfL required focus on hours that had impact rather than the hours spent on an activity. This was a more notional and subjective measure, but it emphasised individual responsibility to identify *what they had learned leading to a tangible impact on practice*.⁹ Evidence collected by IfL suggests that these requirements sparked greater discussion between teachers, and with managers, about professional development and assisted negotiation of development time.

Early experience of the application of IfL's CPD model was not, however, wholly positive. Some employers laid on 30 hours of events a year for their teachers. Worse, some assumed that four days a year of 'development days', leadership briefings on college finances and priorities, motivational speakers, introductions to new administrative systems and a few teaching workshops, fitted the bill. Some FE lecturers therefore shared the familiar CPD experience of many professionals, rail-roaded by employers into events that had little meaning or purpose for them, their learners or their practice. Employers over-managing and over-structuring professional development for their teachers squeezed out the very thing

⁹ For example, a teacher may attend a six-hour long conference, but gauge that only the one hour workshop session could be legitimately counted as leading to a positive change in the effectiveness of their teaching. By contrast, two hours of reading research on teaching methods and three hours spent reflecting and talking with a fellow teacher about developing and improving teaching methods, when implemented, would count as five hours. CPD is measured by time leading to change, the input that made a difference.

they should seek; effective professional development personalised to meet needs, leading to excellent teaching practice.

6. Monitoring and licensure

Both legal professions require full completion of CPD requirements as a condition of practice. Solicitors must record their CPD activity in a training record. In the case of courses, providers notify attendees how many hours of credit they attract and the provider's reference. This information, together with the date and course title, must be entered into the training record. The other activities which can form up to 75% of solicitors' annual hours requirement include delivery/preparation of courses, coaching/mentoring, writing books/articles and research. When making an application for an annual practising certificate, individuals are asked to confirm whether or not they have complied with the CPD requirements during the last complete CPD year. If unable to comply they must agree a date by which the shortfall must be made up. The training regulations impose obligations on a solicitor or registered European lawyer to produce the CPD record to the regulator on demand and training records may be subject to random sampling. The emphasis on tracking performance is understandable given the significance attached to the profession's responsibility for quality control of legal services. It is not uncommon that CPD 'laggards' also manifest other professional failings (Houle, 1980).

In contrast to the 'low trust' model traditionally operated by lawyers, IfL members are trusted to honestly declare their CPD hours. This approach was criticised by some members and others in the further education sector as not being tough enough and not involving tight enough checking. The high trust strategy was informed by the Institute's own ethical values, developed with members. It is centred on the values of professionalism, autonomy and integrity (IfL, 2011). This is expressed in the aspiration that further education teachers: 'strive for the highest standards in teaching and learning, and high levels of subject or vocational expertise, placing the interests and progression of learners at the very heart of our practice'; they 'should be trusted to exercise informed judgements in the interests of learners'; and to 'use our skills and knowledge and resources at our disposal wisely to benefit all learners, the public and where we work, and are respected and trustworthy members of society' (IfL 2012). IfL argues that the value base for a professional body to monitor CPD is significant, and the methods used for promoting and monitoring reveal the underlying values.

When reporting the CPD undertaken IfL members are asked for overall numbers of hours of CPD that had impact and the proportions relating to teaching methods and to subject updating and relevant policy knowledge. Some 60% of members choose to enter their individual records of hours online using the e-portfolio REfLECT, designed specifically to support teachers' planning, recording and review of CPD. Others use their own electronic or paper systems, or those their employer may provide or declare their CPD hours to IfL by telephone. IfL aggregates and analyses these data nationally. IfL believes that the professional body has a key role in broadening horizons and publishes or gives access to research findings and disseminates good practice nationally and internationally to support practitioners' CPD.

7. Changing environments

In the recent past, both of the professional groups under study have undergone significant and dramatic change. The legal professions' longstanding independence was curtailed by the Legal Services Act 2007, which followed a report that was highly critical of the legal

professions' regulatory arrangements (Clementi, 2004). The Act created a Legal Services Board to oversee the operation of the legal services market. Professions, formerly operating as 'front-line regulators', were required to create an independent regulatory arm, separate from the 'representative' body. The Law Society created the Solicitors' Regulation Authority and the General Council of the Bar created the Bar Standards Board. Member practising certificate fees went to support the regulatory arm only, while membership of the 'representative' professional body was optional.

The regulatory arms of the legal professional bodies now operate at arm's length from the representative arms. The professional bodies have effectively become one of many stakeholders in the regulation of the occupation. One of the changes urged on the new regulators was the adoption of Outcomes Focused Regulation (OFR), a suite of procedures pioneered in the financial services industry designed to exert tighter control on the day-to-day operation of organisations (Boon, 2010). The bar, however, made the first to move towards liberalisation before the review, with barristers' CPD requirements moving away from accredited courses to an extended requirement of 24 hours of which only 12 will 'verifiable' and with more flexibility around qualifying activity (Bar Standards Board, 2011). The draft handbook defines CPD as improving subject knowledge and keeping up to date with knowledge and skills relevant to practice (Bar Standards Board, 2012). CPD courses for the bar will no longer be accredited. Declaration of completion will suffice for grant of practising certificates although barristers may be selected on a random basis to produce a portfolio of evidence of completion. The future of solicitors' CPD is in limbo. Policy makers have registered the pre-existing dissatisfaction with the input model of CPD and are grappling with the implications for CPD, if any, of OFR.

Changes in regulation have caused the legal profession to question and revisit their approach to CPD, but these concerns were parked when the Legal Services Board announced a Legal Education and Training Review to be undertaken by frontline regulators. Possible outcomes of the Legal Education and Training Review include using CPD as a means of post-qualification licensing for areas of work that are reserved to specified legal professions, like providing litigation services and court advocacy. If professions do not set standards and qualifications in these areas the Legal Services Board may seek to do so (Legal Services Policy Institute, 2009). Both legal professional bodies may be pondering whether a new regulatory regime focused on outcomes should have a system of CPD with the same broad objective, with new monitoring arrangements, with a shift in focus from inputs (hours) to outcomes (results), new mandatory requirements to embrace legal skills, legal knowledge, professional values, behaviour and ethics, or to provide specific training for those holding specified roles in the new regulatory structure. (Shirley, 2010). One of the implications of aligning CPD with OFR is that mechanisms of monitoring, for example, appraisal, and some mechanisms of enforcement, for example, employment security or promotion, could be focused on employing organisations rather than the regulator.

The professional aspirations of FE teachers potentially have been threatened by recent changes in government policy. The 2007 regulations provided for registration of teachers and payment of their professional body fees. Initially, government agreed to pay the registration fees, putting teachers on the same basis as school teachers registering with the General Teaching Council (England). The three year period was then extended for a further year to 2011. Confirmation was given in the white paper *Skills for Growth* (2009) and reconfirmed in the skills white paper, *Skills for Sustainable Growth* (2010) that IfL would

become self-financing by 2011/12. The risk of negative impact of this change was compounded by the government's subsequent decision to remove regulations requiring registration with IfL, and compulsory CPD, from 30 September 2012. Further, government removed those parts of the regulations requiring new entrants to gain the post-qualification professional status of QTLS or ATLS within five years of initial teacher education. Government also proposed considering removal of initial teacher qualification regulations from September 2013; a very significant backwards step in the professionalization of the further education workforce as initial training is one of the key hallmarks of a profession.

In autumn 2012, government proposed creating a new Further Education Guild (FEG) of further education employers in partnership with other bodies in the further education sector, by late 2013. The two main employer associations, the Association of Colleges and the Association of Employment and Learning Providers will lead and with key partnerships with several specialist employer bodies, trade unions and IfL. While it is too early to assess the impact of this move, it represents a significant shift of power to employers, with the partnership between IfL and trade unions a balancing factor. Some elements of the previous regulatory regime may be carried forward by the FEG, for example, the expectation that employers will ensure that teachers are qualified and provide support for CPD. The IfL continues to offer QTLS, which since April 2012 is also recognised in statute as equal to Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) for teaching in schools as a professional teacher, and ATLS for those seeking associate status. Individuals choose to undergo professional formation to gain QTLS or ATLS with IfL, as there are now no regulatory requirements to gain this professional status.

8. Analysis

Our brief account of occupational engagement with CPD hints at significant underlying changes in professionalism. From the 1980s all sectors of the economy became increasingly subject to markets and, where this did not occur naturally, government intervened. This particularly affected the traditional professions, which had established a high degree of market control by closure of access to the occupational order (Larson, 2013). For lawyers, the process began in the early 1990s with legislative inroads into professional boundaries and culminated with inroads into self-regulation made by the Legal Services Act 1990. The decline of established professions intersected with the continuation of a wider movement towards 'professional society', whereby occupations increasingly used the capitalised value of education, training and experience to command an increasing share of resources (Perkin, 1989, 1996). Some of these occupations gained state recognition and were granted a degree of market control. In the case of IfL, this was established only to be changed within five years. Therefore, we see in these examples that professional status is more threatened and volatile than previously and its rewards more contingent.

Professions are more subject to state manipulation and to mechanisms of state control. This will, we suspect, increase pressure for CPD to demonstrate impact, leading to a stronger focus on the workplace and an on-going risk of co-option of CPD as a tool of management. Public sector organisations and professions are particularly at risk of a suite of techniques designed to increase efficiency. Gathered under the label 'new managerialism' these regimes establish a narrative of strategic change and operational control subject to external accountability. They aim to capture and colonise professional ideologies and organisational identities in order to release entrepreneurial potential. One impact of new management

philosophy on academic labour is through control mechanisms entailing detailed and intensive auditing and continuing evaluation according to externally set performance measures (Reed, 2002). The appearance of freedom within these regimes is deceptive. They produce 'regulated autonomy' for professionals within underlying normative principles (Hoggett, 1996, Deem *et al.*, 2007). The new system of Outcomes Focused Regulation in the legal profession is an example of such a system. Internal mechanisms like appraisal and external mechanisms like audit have the potential to change the complexion of CPD in law firms, emphasising narrow notions of workplace competence at the expense of broader development.

We draw several tentative conclusions from our case studies, suggesting significant evolution and current trends in the development of CPD. First, there seems little doubt that, historically, professions embraced the model of CPD current during the period of adoption. A cynical view of early schemes suggests that the actual purpose was to assure key stakeholders that professions took the issue of competence seriously. Thinking on how this could be achieved was underdeveloped. So, rather than identifying what they want to achieve through CPD, and how best to achieve it, professions tended to adapt the current orthodoxy or 'best practice' to their purposes. This may have a fortunate consequence for the breadth of CPD schemes, allowing a wide range of activity, accommodating a wide view of professional development and leaving a space for individual choice. One direction for the second generation of CPD schemes is to be more relaxed about content, hours and reporting requirements. This risks increasing pressure to justify any CPD requirements. The other direction involves paying serious attention to outcomes and, hence, performance and competence issues (Bindman, 2010). This risks constraining the breadth of CPD within a narrow view of competence.

Typically, the express purpose of most CPD schemes is the enhanced professional competence of the occupational workforce, but early schemes seldom fit the bill. Professions are increasingly seeing impact as a key feature of CPD. The Academy of Medical Royal Colleges, for example, describes CPD activity as that supporting 'the development of knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviour' and 'specific changes in practice.' CPD schemes intended to actually address deficiencies and those that aspire to excellence in professional performance need to focus much more closely on individuals, their needs and on customised solutions that impact on behaviour. This concern with the everyday experience of the professional can, in general, be seen as a positive development. It meets the practical, contemporary priority that development should contribute to changing practice. It also has the potential for coaching and mentoring, somewhat in line with Schon's notion of a *practicum* for reflective practice. An example of this potential is provided by Gold *et al* (2007), whose action research provides a rare insight into professional development in a law firm. Citing an example of a tribunal chair demanding a lawyer provide a justification of a 'taken for granted' assumption they identify 'hot' action, something disconcerting, which can be a catalyst for later learning assisted by articulation and interaction. Learning engendered when routine procedures do not go according to plan is validated and made more meaningful by sharing with others. In this way the lessons of such experience can be elaborated, related to existing practice and refined.

The individual's own practice, and experience more widely among practitioners in an organisation, provides daily material which has the potential to go beyond 'hot action' in locating the substance of CPD. This recognises Eraut's criticism of Schon, that learning

often occurs in the neglected routine rather than exceptional cases. Analysis of routine could help '... professionals to reformulate their theories of practice in the light of semi-digested case experiences'. (Eraut, 1994: 13) A legal practice example of this routine or everyday experiential learning is also provided by Gold *et al.* (2007) in their case-study. They describe how members of the employment department of a law firm eagerly await electronic updates of tribunal decisions, which are analysed daily by the team, and related to on-going cases. This situational learning, which can also draw in the latest practice, research and wider policy contexts, is consistent with growing recognition that for economy, effectiveness and efficiency reasons, employers should foster collaborative learning environments in the workplace. Professionals reflecting together have been called 'communities of practice', a term originally coined to explain situated learning, how newcomers to professional communities learned about the social structure of communities from the periphery (Lave and Wenger, 1991).

A strong location of CPD in the workplace, and implicating employers in the process, represents a potentially dramatic change in the focus of CPD for some professions. In the introductory or adoption phase, CPD was generally regarded as a personal responsibility. The lawyers' 'input' model facilitates this by being individualised; CPD was an issue between the professional body and the practitioner. Thus, while solicitors are advised to plan their training activity with the needs of their firm and its business objectives in mind, firms or employers are not obliged to pay for or allow time off to attend CPD courses. Similarly, the regulations relating to CPD gave responsibility to IfL for the monitoring of CPD and did not specify the responsibilities of the individual, other than a general responsibility of at least 30 hours of CPD a year and to record this, nor of the employer. The organisations where the professionals worked had no responsibility for providing or paying for employees' CPD or for ensuring that it was effective, although custom and practice is that FE employers do this but often without a strong focus on the individual needs and career development, nor enough drawing on research evidence about the kinds of CPD that work effectively to support positive changes in practice. There were no formal requirements for reflection. For lawyers the regulatory shift to OFR, which will rely on visits to audit the procedures adopted by firms, could be the vehicle for a more pervasive, effective but intrusive CPD regime for solicitors' firms. Likewise, the new FEG may well favour a CPD regime that gives further education employers a more direct role in defining the scope and nature of CPD.

The move to more collaborative forms of CPD organised around the workplace carries great potential and significant risks. In the past ten years there has been growing use of communities of practice in professional bodies and in corporate organisations. These have used the concept in organising employees to build work relevant knowledge among cognate professional groups (Hara, 2009). One of the issues raised is the somewhat vexed question of the relative responsibility of individuals and employers for driving CPD. There appears to be no single correct balance, but there does need to be some connection between the two to secure the greatest synergies and to reduce conflict. IfL found reflection and dialogue with peers and managers about CPD to be valuable CPD in its own right. Individual freedom to take responsibility for their own CPD, above and beyond what the employer could expect, is motivational. One of the risks of organisationally based learning is that processes will become co-opted to the employer's purposes and the more narrow needs of the business.

1. The role of professional bodies

CPD regimes should, we argue, consider, and if possible balance, a number of competing interests. These might include, for example, the public interest in competent and indeed high standards of service, an employer's interest in a productive workforce, a profession's interest in earning status and collegiality and an individual's interest in personal development. The increasing focus on competence, impact and outcomes raises questions about how more diverse interests will be accommodated when increased focus on workplace CPD casts doubt on the role of professional bodies. Both of the professional bodies considered here now operate under considerable regulatory constraints. The Law Society is at arms' length from the SRA, which has regulatory responsibility for designing and implementing CPD. It is merely one of many stakeholders in CPD. IfL now has a voluntary membership and no statutory underpinning or support for its CPD scheme. It will be even more dependent on the commitment and participation of its members. In this new environment, what role should professional bodies seek to play in relation to CPD?

Communication

One of the key roles of professional bodies is communication and engagement. The existence of CPD requirements speak to various audiences about the ambition and place of the occupation. It offers reassurance to stakeholders, including the public, that the profession takes quality assurance seriously. It also sends an important message members, providing confirmation that the professional body retains professional aspirations, guidance and programmes capable of realising and sustaining them. This can be a difficult process. The IfL's CPD requirement was perceived by some as an additional burden, both on individuals' busy working lives and on busy organisations. IfL has been leading a counter cultural movement around CPD within further education, questioning old and often not very effective CPD traditions. Unsurprisingly, IfL's approach has met some opposition in achieving this agenda, as well as supporters and enthusiasts.

IfL has sought to convince employers that fostering and supporting CPD that actually helps improve performance appeals to good business sense; it brings a return on investment. From 2007 to the present, some employers, supported by some teachers in further education, expressed a preference for a 'tick box' system for CPD; something that is easy and quick to record. IfL has worked to conceive of the real work of teachers being more than simply working with students or trainees and that CPD is integral to the work of teaching. However, for some organisations it may need to involve changes in their own systems and practices and cultures, and sometimes quite significant change. This is because reflective practice involves, for example, collaborative reflection with peers and action research as new and effective ways of using time. Fostering the degree of sophistication needed in approaches to CPD by individuals and organisations is a long term project.

Engagement

Another key ingredient of normative professionalism is engagement, which professions must work hard to maintain. The removal of compulsion to register with the professional body and of substantial support will test FE teachers' commitment to professionalism. Since 1 October 2012, following the revocation of the regulations, registration and membership of the IfL, just over 98% of members chose to remain with the professional body, a total of 77,000 by December 2012. The CPD scheme that IfL will operate will emerge from consultation with members on the ways in which they wish CPD to be supported and monitored by their

professional body. It is expected that IfL will seek arrangements that add value to members' professional standing, yet complement any FEG initiative. The extent to which IfL is successful will depend on individual member's commitment to their own CPD and the extent to which they can exercise choice and freedoms for meaningful and relevant CPD in the context of their employment.

Considering purposes, priorities and scope

Professional bodies typically play a significant role in determining the purposes, priorities and scope of CPD regimes. As competence development becomes more firmly located in the workplace, quality assurance mechanisms will need to take this into account. Employers may be more involved in delivery, since their co-operation is fundamental to the success of the scheme, and this creates opportunities for using portfolios as evidence of compliance where compliance requirements are in place.

CPD can also be used for a range of purposes beyond development. Satisfactory completion of CPD activity can be used as a filter for removing members of the profession who are not sufficiently engaged with their calling or as a post-qualification hurdle, for example as a pre-requisite for obtaining a licence to conduct particular kinds of work. The nature of the regime should reflect the philosophy of the professional body and the purposes it seeks to achieve by having CPD requirements.

When the legal profession launched CPD schemes the use of the word 'development' suggests that the aims were broader than competence or even 'education', in an old school notion of passively imbibed knowledge. While the purpose of this breadth of focus was never clearly articulated, it was capable of embracing wider but important professional purposes. Philosophically, IfL's aspirational model for CPD seeks congruence with the nature of the occupation; teachers expand the minds and expertise of learners and so too the profession's own CPD should be expansive in nature and intent. IfL's approach to CPD was informed by research and practice across professions that also had begun to critique input models, and to value outcome-focused CPD. IfL sought to avoid the risk of individuals and organisations bypassing thoughtful consideration of experience and falling into a trap of achieving 'minimal compliance if we have to'. It sought to shift the balance away from employers managing employees' CPD experience and to encourage individuals' greater autonomy and freedom as professionals, driving their own professional development. Regimes that are more focused on compliance for practicing or licensure requirements may impose greater constraints on autonomy and choice.

Setting standards

Professional bodies can play a significant role in setting standards for CPD. In many professions the national requirement for CPD is described in terms of a minimum threshold linked to competence. IfL's CPD requirements, however, aspired to excellence; producing truly inspirational teachers at the leading edge of their vocational or subject area and their methods of teaching. Research evidence from schools shows that achieving excellent outcomes needs quite distinct approaches, ones that go beyond national intervention or compliance which only take developments so far and then plateau, and that creativity, innovation and greater flexibilities and autonomy is needed for practitioners and

organisations (Hopkins, 2009). The logical flow from this is we need to create environments that promote excellence through the value of professional autonomy and seriousness in personal and collaborative endeavours to improve practice. Professional bodies can require elements like reflection, that might not otherwise feature in workplace schemes.

Determining strategy

There are numerous factors to consider when designing a scheme of continuing education for professionals. Houle (1981) noted that self-motivated learning is the most effective, but people's propensity for undertaking, or not undertaking, continuing education is often deep seated. The most likely subscribers are those who have done so before, but any population confronted with new challenges innovation is likely to include innovators, pacesetters, a middle majority, and laggards. Laggards are likely to cause the profession most concern. Professions are likely to have similar practical agendas for CPD schemes; 'how to speed up the learning of majority adopters and how to reach the laggards' (Houle, 1981: 164). Merely reaching the laggards does not explain what is then done. According to Houle, the continuing enhancement of professional competence involves constant self-monitoring of practice involving a) absorption in the task at hand while b) maintaining detachment necessary to enable the professional to 'observe the scene in which he or she is an actor' (Houle, 1981: 209). This process is accompanied by introspection, a habit that may be difficult to develop and retain. This difficult challenge requires a strategy for instilling and maintaining the habit of introspection, or critical reflection, which may involve earlier stages of education. Planning for how this is done requires a high level strategy that considers the whole process of training. Professional bodies are ideally situated to carry out this role and to expect it of others with a role in training and professional development.

Defining and defending the space

In further education, there has been an emphasis on in-house workplace CPD as financial pressures impinge on individuals going outside of their institutions for CPD programmes or courses. Much of this in-house CPD is heavily criticised by teachers as being well intentioned, overly prescriptive, too generic and largely irrelevant to their needs. A tick box mentality can drive the filling of a staff development day with input 'activity' so that CPD has been done (IfL 2012). Many teachers find it hard to get financial support and time from their employer to support CPD that is most relevant to their practice. This is similar in the United States, where teachers, researchers, and policymakers consistently indicate that the greatest challenge to implementing effective professional development is lack of time and having the right variety of CPD. Teachers need time to understand new concepts, learn new skills, develop new attitudes, research, discuss, reflect, assess, try new approaches and integrate them into their practice; and time to plan their own professional development (Cambone 1995; Corcoran, 1995).

Adult learners need both set-aside time for learning, for example workshops and courses, and time to experience and digest new ideas and ways of working (Cambone (1995). There needs to be time to work in study groups, conduct action research, participate in seminars, coach one another, plan lessons together, and meet for other purposes. Professional development can no longer be viewed as an event that occurs on a few particular days of the year; rather, it must become part of the daily work life of educators. The right balance between individuals and peers driving their own CPD, and employers supporting this, both

inside and beyond the organisation, is essential. Professional bodies can have a crucial role in identifying the space for CPD, the evidence base for CPD that works and which does not and in defending the necessary space from encroachment.

Providing infrastructure

One of the key roles of professional bodies in maintaining standards is to maintain an overview of CPD on the ground. This allows systems to be adjusted to build on strengths and eliminate weaknesses. There are several ways that this could be done, for example, IfL's surveys, audit visits at which organisations' CPD strategies are discussed or submission of portfolios of evidence. The ease of collation, monitoring and sampling of evidence is obviously assisted by maintenance of substantial databases and sophisticated software. Investment in these tools is an obvious role for professional bodies. They can also be trusted with the sensitive information that may be created by some CPD activity, which professionals may be reluctant to share with employers. Professional bodies not only have a sufficiently disinterested perspective to handle such data, they can extract and de-personalise it for general consumption and wider benefit.

Protecting autonomy, the ethos of independence and self-direction

For the individual, CPD can be an imposition or a source of motivation towards a stronger commitment to personal development and lifelong learning. It is far healthier for professions if their members are positively motivated towards CPD. This involves professional bodies ensuring that CPD schemes seek to encourage personal curiosity, autonomy and choice. Another task of in the new environment is to resist managerialism. This includes a wide spectrum of possibilities from standardised and procedural forms of practice often referred to as 'box ticking', to the conception of 'useful' knowledge narrowly as instrumental to the absorption and limiting of CPD into organisational quality assurance frameworks. CPD must retain the potential to develop and inspire. Professional bodies must work to influence and ensure that CPD involves more than the instrumental production of localised knowledge. It should also demand the critical use of knowledge of wider frameworks. This may relate to critical depth, examining the assumptions and forms of reasoning influencing circumstances, and critical breadth, locating understanding in a wider, holistic social and political framework (Thompson and Thompson, 2008).

Promoting professionalism

Freidson (1988) identifies core denominators of professionalism as expertise, credentialism and autonomy,¹⁰ suggesting that the exercise of discretion plays a key part in maintaining these distinctive claims of professionalism (Simon, 1988, Nicolson, 2006). It is arguable both that CPD should involve a more conscious effort to develop the capacity to exercise discretion but also a sense of wider professional purposes. For lawyers this could involve, for example, emphasis on professional ethics as an important dimension of discretionary decision making and consideration of abstract notions such as the importance of the rule of law in pursuing justice. There are strong arguments that professional growth and personal development are achieved most effectively in a cooperative and collegial learning

¹⁰ Autonomy, particularly in the US, be interpreted as the occupation's independence from the state in internal management, while in the European context, it often refers to the freedom of individual professionals to exercise discretion in their work.

environment (Bebeau, 2008) and that law firms offer an excellent environment for collaborative reflection on ethics in action (Parker and Aitken, 2011). Moves to these more expansive agendas may be at odds with organisational priorities focused on the bottom line, hence the need for professional bodies to champion these agendas.

Another key ingredient of normative professionalism is engagement, which professions must work hard to maintain. The removal of compulsion to register with the professional body and of substantial support will test FE teachers' commitment to professionalism. Since 1 October 2012, following the revocation of the regulations, registration and membership of the IfL, just over 98% of members chose to remain with the professional body, a total of 77,000 by December 2012. The CPD scheme that IfL will operate will emerge from consultation with members on the ways in which they wish CPD to be supported and monitored by their professional body. It is expected that IfL will seek arrangements that add value to members' professional standing, yet complement any FEG initiative. The extent to which IfL is successful will depend on individual member's commitment to their own CPD and the extent to which they can exercise choice and freedoms for meaningful and relevant CPD in the context of their employment.

Redefining professionalism

As our account of aspiring professions demonstrates, professionalism does not stand still. Professional bodies should stimulate work that carries forward the professional agenda, educating about what professionalism is and what it could be. This activity might include inquiry into the occupation's defining functions, how self-enhancement agendas may be served or the formation of occupational sub cultures, all of which serve important professional functions (Houle, 1981). If, in the future, practicing professionals do not define what professionalism means, others will do it for them.

Conclusion

In the first wave of CPD schemes, which were invariably input focussed, the failure to articulate or prioritise the various potential goals of continuing professional development (or education (or learning) led to an unsatisfactory CPD experience for many professionals. In recent times, many professions have recognised this fact and are now considering, or taking, tentative steps to address the situation. In the UK, across professions, a more liberal attitude to the form and scope of CPD has been accompanied by a more thoughtful attitude to the purpose of development activity. This has two dimensions. First, in addition to CPD addressing issues of work performance, wider issues of professional role and responsibility and wider conceptions of personal development are more likely to be defined within the scope of CPD. Second, adoption of the 'output' model of CPD has seen a sharper focus on the actual effect and impact of professional learning on knowledge, attitudes, perceptions or emotions, behaviour, professional practice and client, patient or employer conditions (Freidman , 2011). Material gathered for the detailed study of the CPD schemes of two professions highlights important practical, operational and theoretical distinctions in available models, and the kinds of circumstances in which they are deployed. For example, the kind of model that aims to inspire positive motivation towards continuing learning may be more difficult where there is a need to demonstrate compliance. We anticipate that the wider

purposes of CPD will need to be accommodated within schemes that are much more closely tied to outcomes linked to competence and excellence.

Forms of CPD most likely to deliver changes in practice may be more difficult to effectively control and monitor. Shifts to workplace models may squeeze out professional initiatives to build engagement and a broader professional responsibility. These various factors may be combined within a single scheme, but the process is assisted by a greater and clearly articulated sense of purpose and possibility. Most importantly, it is necessary to consider the place that practising professionals might have in future CPD regimes, particularly if the location of CPD in the workplace takes more hold. We argue that professions and professional bodies have a vital continuing role in relation to CPD. Scoping activity, such as defining the broader professional rationale of CPD, lie at the core, but there is also a role in defining the scope of employer involvement and gauging its operation and effectiveness for individual professionals. In the new environment for professions and CPD, locating the right balance between individual and employer-led activity, and highlighting the boundaries, is a primary challenge for professional bodies. In summary, our case study government policy has impinged directly on professions, leading, directly or indirectly and intentionally or unintentionally, to changes in the orientation of CPD schemes. Our case study also gives credence to Houle's assertion that occupations are constantly moving towards or away from the professional ideal (Houle, 1980). We predict that CPD will play an increasingly significant role in informing and defining the ideal and moving towards it.

Bibliography

ACLEC *First Report on Legal Education and Training* (London, ACLEC, 1996) p.96, para 6.29.

ACLEC (1997) *Continuing Professional Development for Solicitors and Barristers: A Second Report on Legal Education and Training* London: ACLEC.

Bar Standards Board (2011) *Review of CPD: Report of the Working Group* London: Bar Standards Board.

Bar Standards Board (2012) *Handbook for Continuing Professional Development* (draft for consultation) London: Bar Standards Board.

Bebeau, M.J. (2008) 'Promoting Ethical Development and Professionalism: Insights from Educational Research in the Professions' 5:2 *University of St. Thomas Law Journal* 366.

Bindman, D. 'Testing times' *The Legal Executive Journal* June 2010, 24.

Bolton, J. (2002) 'Chiropractors' Attitudes to, and Perceptions of, the Impact of Continuing Professional Education on Clinical Practice' 36 *Medical Education* 317.

Boon, A. 'Professionalism under the Legal Services Act 2007' (2010) 17(3) *International Journal of the Legal Profession* 195

Boon, A. and Levin, J. (2008) *The Ethics and Conduct of Lawyers in England and Wales* 2nd edition Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Boon, A. and Webb, J. (2008) 'Legal Education and Training in England and Wales: Back to the Future?' 58:1 *Journal of Legal Education* 79.

Boud, D., in Bradbury, H., Frost, N., Kilminster, S., and Zukas, M. (eds), (2010) *Beyond Reflective Practice: New Approaches to Professional Lifelong Learning*, .Routledge, London.

Brand, P. (1992) *The Origins of the English Legal Profession* Oxford, UK and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.

Cevero, R.M. (2000) 'Trends and Issues in Continuing Professional Education' 86 *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* 3.

Cambone, J. (1995) 'Time for teachers in school restructuring' 96(3) *Teachers College Record* 512-43.

Clementi, Sir David, (2004) *Review of the Regulatory Framework for Legal Services in England and Wales* (<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.legal-services-review.org.uk/content/report/index.htm>)

Corcoran, T.C. (1995) *Transforming professional development for teachers: A guide for state policymakers* Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

Courtney, S. (1992) *Towards a Theory of Participation in Adult Education* London: Routledge.

Deem, R., Hillyard, S., Reed, M. & Johnson, R. (2007) *Knowledge, Higher Education and the New Managerialism: The Changing Management of UK Universities* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

Department for Business, Education and Skills (2009) *Skills for Growth* London: The Stationery Office.

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (2010) *Skills for Sustainable Growth* London: The Stationery Office.

Department for Education and Skills (2006) *Further Education: Raising Skills, Improving Life Chances*, London: The Stationery Office,

Eraut, M. (1994) *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence* London: The Falmer Press.

Fleisher, D.S. (1974) 'Priorities and Data Bases: Their Relationship to Continuing Education' in US Department of Health, Education and Welfare *Fostering the Growing Need to Learn* Washington DC: US Government Printing Office.

Foster, A. (2005) *Realising the potential, a review of the future role of further education colleges* London The Stationery Office.

Freidson, E.A. (2008) *Profession of Medicine: A Study of the Sociology of Applied Knowledge* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Friedman, A.L. (2011) *CPD – Lifelong Learning of Millions*. Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge.

Gold, J., Thorpe, R., Woodall, J. and Sadler-Smith, E. (2007) 'Continuing Professional Development in the Legal Profession' 38:2 *Management Learning* 235.

Hara, N. (ed) (2009) *Communities of Practice: Fostering Peer-to-Peer Learning and Knowledge Information Sharing in the Workplace* Berlin, Springer.

Hattie, J (2009) *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Hattie, J (2012) *Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning*. Abingdon, Oxon., Routledge.

Hoggett, P. (1996) 'New Modes of Control in the Public Service' *Public Administration*, 74(1) 9.

Hopkins, D (2009) *The changing landscape of school improvement 1:4 School Leadership Today* Imaginative Minds, Birmingham.

Houle, C.O. (1980) *Continuing Learning in the Professions* San Francisco & London, Jossey-Bass.

Institute for Learning (2010) *2009 – 10 IfL review of CPD - Excellence in professional development: Looking back, looking forward* London: Institute for Learning.

Institute for Learning (2009) 2008-09 IfL review of CPD - Making a difference for teachers, trainers and learners London: Institute for Learning.

Institute for Learning (2010) *Brilliant teaching and training in FE and skills - A guide to effective CPD for teachers, trainers and leaders* London: Institute for Learning.

Institute for Learning (2011) *Strategy update - IfL Supporting Professionalism Update for 2011–14* Institute for Learning, London.

Institute for Learning (2012) 2010-11 IfL review of CPD - CPD for the future: the networked professional. Institute for Learning, London.

Jamous, H. and Pelloille, B(1970) 'Changes in the French University Hospital System' in Jackson, J.A. (ed.) *Professionalization* London: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, T.J. (1972) *Professions and Power* London and Basingstoke, Macmillan Press Ltd..

Knowles, MS. (1975). *Self-directed learning: A guide for learners and teachers* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall/Cambridge.

Knowles, MS. (1980) *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall/Cambridge.

Larson, MS (2013) *The Rise of Professionalism: Monopolies of Competence and Sheltered Markets* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Legal Services Policy Institute (2009) *The Accreditation of Learning Programmes Leading to Professional Legal Qualifications* London: College of Law.

MacIntyre, D. (1994) preface to M. Eraut *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence* London: The Falmer Press, 1994.

Madden, C.A. and Mitchell V.A. (1993) *Professions, Standards and Competence: A Survey of Continuing Education for the Professions* Bristol: University of Bristol.

Nicolson, D. (2006) 'Making lawyers moral?: Ethical codes and moral character' 25(4) *Legal Studies* 601.

Parker, C. and Aitken, L. (2011) The Queensland "Workplace Culture Check": Learning from Reflection on Ethics Inside Law Firms' *The Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics* 399.

Perkin, H. (1989) *The Rise of Professional Society: England Since 1980* London,, Routledge.

Perkin, H. (1996) *The Third Revolution: Professional Elites in the Modern World Since 1945* London, Routledge.

Reed, M.I. (2002) 'New Managerialism, Professional Power and Organisational Governance in UK Universities: A Review and an Assessment' in Amaral, A., Jones, GA., and Karseth, B. (eds.) *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance* Dordecht, Netherlands, Kluwer Academic 163.

Schon, DA. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* New York: Basic Books.

Schon, D. *Educating the Reflective Practitioner* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Shirley, L. 'Long past its sell-by date?' (2010) 160 *New Law Journal* 1461.

Simon, WH. (1988) 'Ethical Discretion in Lawyering' 101 *Harvard Law Review* 1083.

SRA *Solicitors' Training Regulations 2009*.

Thompson, S. and Thompson, N. (2008) *The Critically Reflective Practitioner* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

UK Government (2007) *The Further Education Teachers' Qualifications (England) Regulations 2007*.