

Accreditation process and requirements review consultation

Contents

Foreword.....	3
About this consultation.....	5
How to respond	5
Who should read this	6
What is the accreditation process and what does it do?	6
Why do we accredit?	7
What is the purpose and extent of this review?.....	7
Engagement to date.....	8
Wider landscape	8
Format of consultation	9
Draft policy consultation questions	10
Section 1: GTC Scotland's role.....	10
Section 2: this document	10
Section 3: general principles	11
Section 4: equality, diversity and inclusion.....	12
Section 5: admission of individuals to programmes	12
Section 6: content, nature and duration of programmes	12
Section 7: teacher educators and programme staffing	14
Section 8: assessment of individuals undertaking teaching qualification programmes	15
Section 9: accreditation application, assessment and duration	16
Section 10: accreditation regulation.....	19
Section 11: glossary and interpretation.....	21
Additional comments.....	22
Respondent Information Form	23
Responding to the consultation.....	24
Format of responses	24
Deadline for responses	24
How responses are handled	24
Freedom of Information	25
Comments or questions.....	25
Annexes.....	26

Foreword

As the independent regulator for teachers in Scotland, we have a statutory responsibility to determine what constitutes a recognised teaching qualification for individuals seeking registration as a school teacher.

Our accreditation arrangements have remained largely unchanged since 2012 when we became an independent body and assumed formal responsibility for the process from the Scottish Government.

As a result, when we published our strategic plan *Trusted Teaching* in 2023, one of the major pieces of work we planned was a comprehensive review of the current accreditation process and requirements for programmes of initial teacher education (ITE). We wanted to bring them into line with contemporary practice and system requirements, with the aim of making a process that is more targeted, proportionate and adds value.

This review forms part of a package of work and includes the review we completed last year of the Memorandum on Entry Requirements for programmes of ITE.

We are grateful to higher education institution (HEI) colleagues who participated in a series of workshops that we ran to understand better how they approach the accreditation process, and also to local authority probation managers who shared their views on the process.

Another major change that has happened since our current policy was published is the requirement for college lecturers to obtain a Teaching Qualification for Further Education (TQFE) and register with us in order to work in Scotland's colleges. Following the [Scottish Government's Teaching Qualification for Further Education Determination](#) and associated guidance, which took effect from 1 August 2025, we are now also responsible for accrediting programmes of TQFE.

A recent review of our brand and messaging has seen us take a new approach to how we communicate. We want to ensure that each policy, practice and guidance document that we publish is accessible, logical and unambiguous. Our updated policy should say only as much as is necessary to guide the accreditation process while helping our colleagues and stakeholders understand our role as a regulator and why we carry out this important function.

We trust that you will find this draft policy to be a welcome new approach; a streamlined source of information and guidance that clearly sets out what the process for accrediting teaching qualification programmes is, why it's necessary, and what our expectations in overseeing it are.

We look forward to hearing your views.

About this consultation

Our current accreditation arrangements have remained substantially unchanged since we assumed formal responsibility from the Scottish Government for the process in 2012. In that time, the number of ITE programmes available and the providers offering them have increased, and it has also become a legal requirement for college lecturers to register with us and for TQFE to be accredited. The landscape has changed and we believe that aspects of our current practice need to be brought up to date to reflect this.

We are consulting on changes to our Accreditation Policy following a review of our accreditation process and requirements, including:

- its name
- one document that covers programmes of ITE and TQFE
- a statement of general principles to guide the process
- one section that sets out the requirement for the content, nature and duration of programmes of ITE with a stronger focus placed on ensuring the outcome of these is the achievement of the Standard for Provisional Registration
- a new section setting out expectations for teacher educators and programme staffing.

The consultation will close on 12 March 2026. After the consultation closes, we aim to publish our response including a summary report of responses received, with a view to publishing the revised document in summer 2026.

We currently have transitional arrangements in place and are engaging regularly with HEIs for programmes that need to be accredited or reaccredited while we are carrying out this review. We anticipate that the first accreditations under the new process will take place in 2027.

How to respond

This consultation document takes a section-by-section look at the draft policy, together with the rationale for the proposals and related consultation questions. Please see page 24 of this paper for further information about how you can submit your views.

Documents relating to this consultation:

[Draft new policy \(annex 1 on website\)](#)

[Current policy, guidelines](#) and [evaluation framework](#) (annexes 2,3 and 4 on website)

Who should read this

As an organisation that values transparency, we are publishing this consultation on our website and invite anyone with an interest to share their views. In practice, the policy applies to a technical process mainly involving HEIs that offer programmes of ITE and TQFE, and so we expect them to be the primary respondents.

The government, government agencies, professional bodies and employers of teachers are also likely to have an interest in responding, as might the Scottish Funding Council and His Majesty's Inspectorate of Education in Scotland (HMIE), who are named in the document.

What is the accreditation process and what does it do?

Article 29 of our governing legislation, the Public Services Reform (GTC Scotland) Order 2011 (the Order), sets out our responsibilities in relation to programmes of ITE as follows:

- It is for the GTC Scotland to determine what constitutes a recognised teaching qualification for individuals seeking registration as a school teacher.
- A determination may make such provision about the education and training required to attain such a qualification as the GTCS thinks fit.
- A determination may, in particular, make provision about -
 - institutions providing courses of education and training for teachers;
 - the qualifications of persons employed by institutions providing courses of education and training for teachers;
 - the admission of individuals to such courses;
 - the content, nature and duration of such courses;
 - the assessment of individuals undertaking such courses;
 - the functions of the governing bodies, principals and members of staff of institutions providing those courses.

Article 30 of the Order sets out an equivalent provision to Article 29 for Scottish Ministers for the purposes of determining what constitutes a recognised teaching qualification for individuals seeking registration as a further education teacher. On 31 July 2025, Scottish Ministers made a determination in terms of Article 30(1) of the Order setting out requirements for the teaching qualification for teachers of further education (the Teaching Qualification for Further Education (TQFE) Determination 2025). The associated guidance provides that GTC Scotland will accredit or reaccredit TQFE programmes in line with the requirements set out in the Scottish Ministers' determination.

This means that we have a responsibility to set requirements for teaching qualification programmes. Setting requirements for the professional education of teachers in this way is a core part of our role as a regulator.

Why do we accredit?

The purpose of accreditation is to ensure that the outcome of teaching qualification programmes is that individuals undertaking them meet the relevant GTC Scotland Professional Standard, meaning they are eligible to join the Register of Teachers (the Register).

One of our main aims in drafting this policy has been to ensure that the importance of accreditation as a safeguard for the integrity of the Register is emphasised throughout.

What is the purpose and extent of this review?

Our current accreditation arrangements centre on a panel process, which has become increasingly challenging for panel members, programme providers and the GTC Scotland staff involved alike. It brings operational and scheduling challenges, creates potential conflicts of interest among HEI panel members, and can at times impact on quality and management of participation.

The accreditation process is meant to be more than a tick-box exercise. If managed and engaged with constructively, it is a valuable tool in the establishment of high-quality programmes of ITE (a goal that everyone involved shares) rather than a hurdle to overcome.

In short, accreditation matters. While we recognise that we have a responsibility to keep working with partners to promote this message and why our role in the process is important, we believe that the draft policy set out in annex 1 of this consultation paper will help to achieve this aim.

In addition, understanding how our current process works requires users to be familiar with 3 separate documents; our policy, its associated guidance and an evaluation framework. At times, we consider that the status of each of these documents and how they interact is unclear. In redrafting our policy, our aim has been to tie all aspects of policy together into 1 comprehensive and user-friendly resource. While additional practical guidance may be required, our aim will be to ensure that its relationship to the core policy is clear.

Engagement to date

In autumn 2024, we held engagement meetings with the 11 HEIs that provide programmes of ITE in Scotland to get their feedback on our current accreditation arrangements. Feedback from local authority probation managers who are involved in the current panel process, was obtained in a similar way.

From these discussions, broad emerging themes and areas of agreement included:

- the accreditation review that we are carrying out is positive, as the process could helpfully be improved
- there is a lack of clarity as to what the purpose of our accreditation process is, and how it relates to other players in the landscape, including HMIE and Education Scotland
- a more targeted and proportionate approach to the accreditation process that is risk based and takes better account of the extensive HEI internal approval processes would be welcomed
- a panel (or similar) arrangement should be retained within the process for professional dialogue. Those experienced in ITE delivery should continue to form some part of it but the potential conflict of interest issues that can arise due to the competitive nature of the ITE market were acknowledged
- an element of ongoing quality assurance through annual reporting or similar is justified but this should not be burdensome given what HEIs have in place through their own internal arrangements
- an annual cycle of accreditation activity like other professional regulatory bodies operate could be challenging because there is such variability between HEIs and how their internal processes run.

Wider landscape

We are aware from comments made by the Cabinet Secretary for Education in recent months that the Scottish Government has an interest in reviewing ITE. Within the Strategic Board for Teacher Education, which the government chairs, there is scoping work being done to review teacher education and development from ITE, through induction, early career and beyond.

Because of these wider initiatives, the scope of which is as yet unknown, we do not consider that a substantive review of ITE programme requirements for teachers of school education should form part of the scope of our current work. Additionally, because of the direct link between the Standard for Provisional Registration and the requirements of programmes of ITE, it would make sense from our perspective to review them in tandem to ensure that the Standards are at the heart of the process. Reviewing the Professional Standards would be a major piece of work, which we are not planning to undertake until our next strategic planning period (2028 to 2032). It is for the Scottish Government to determine how programmes of TQFE meet the Professional Standard for College Lecturers.

We know that HEIs have their own rigorous approaches for the design and approval of programmes. That is why the draft policy doesn't fundamentally change the process requirement; our intention was to confirm what we know is already being done in practice. Instead, the focus of this review has been to move towards a more proportionate and risk-based approach that will reduce bureaucracy and duplication of labour. However, we believe it is important to strike a balance between operating on trust and emphasising the purpose of accreditation as a regulatory function for which we have

statutory oversight and control, not least in order to protect the quality and integrity of the current landscape.

Format of consultation

This consultation is a section-by-section examination of the draft policy along with an explanation of the rationale behind the new or reworded content and comparison, where appropriate, with current provisions. Questions are integrated throughout.

Where changes to the language are stylistic and have been made in accordance with our updated brand guidelines and style guide, but nothing substantive has been added or changed, this is not commented on. However, we would welcome any comments or observations about this (and any other general points) in response to the final question.

Draft policy consultation questions

Section 1: GTC Scotland's role

This section is self-explanatory. It sets out who we are and what we do, and the basis for our teaching qualification programme accreditation functions, rooting the policy in its legal context.

Q1. If you have any comments about this section, please leave them here.

Section 2: this document

We consider that this section is also self-explanatory, setting out the purpose and scope of the document within that context. What is notable is that the name of the policy has changed to 'Standards and Conditions for Recognised Teaching Qualifications in Scotland and Accreditation' (see section 2.2) as we believe this better reflects what it is. It also notes the revocation of the previous policy and associated documents, confirming that this will be the single source of accreditation policy.

As noted above, we consider that the status of the current documents and how they interact can be unclear. In redrafting our policy, our aim has been to tie all aspects of policy together into 1 comprehensive and user-friendly resource. While additional practical guidance may be required, our aim will be to ensure that its relationship to the core policy is clear.

Q2. Do you think the proposed name of the draft policy accurately reflects its purpose and scope?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q3. If not, please explain why.

Q4. What resource(s) do you think would be helpful to have by way of additional guidance and support?

Section 3: general principles

This section lists the general principles that govern our relationship with HEIs and underpin the accreditation process. We consider that these principles have, to a greater or lesser extent, always guided the process but have never been explicitly acknowledged. We believe that by stating them upfront, it will remind everyone involved in the process of the purpose and significance of accreditation, and help guard against it being viewed as an administrative hurdle or tick-box exercise.

The principles are:

- Shared commitment to teacher quality
- Trust and transparency
- Risk-based, targeted and evidence-informed
- Developmental and responsive
- Ethical conduct and confidentiality
- Timeliness and responsiveness
- Partnership and collaboration.

Q5: Do you agree with the inclusion of an upfront statement of general principles?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q6. If not, please explain why.

Q7. Do you think that we have identified the right principles associated with the process?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q8. If not, please explain why.

Section 4: equality, diversity and inclusion

This is another self-explanatory section describing the statutory and social obligations of the parties involved in relation to equality, diversity and inclusion and relevant equalities legislation.

Q9. Is there anything else we should add to this section to reinforce the importance of promoting diverse and inclusive teaching qualification programmes?

Section 5: admission of individuals to programmes

This section replaces section 3.4 of the current guidelines, which sets out factors to take into account in relation to the recruitment and selection of students. It aligns the necessary attributes of applicants to programmes of ITE with the requirements set out in [the Memorandum on Entry Requirements into Programmes of ITE](#); and the necessary attributes of applicants to programmes of TQFE with the entry requirements set out in the [Teaching Qualification for Further Education Determination 2025](#).

Q10. If you have any comments about this section, please write them below.

Section 6: content, nature and duration of programmes

Section 6 clarifies that it is the government's responsibility to determine the content, nature and duration of programmes of TQFE while it is for GTC Scotland to determine the content, nature and duration of programmes of ITE. The section then goes on to set out what the latter is.

While the tone of this section may differ from the current guidelines, the substantive content does not. Our intention was to make it more coherent and align it more overtly with the Standard for Provisional Registration. This is because the core purpose of programmes of ITE is to equip student teachers with the necessary knowledge and experience to meet that Standard and be eligible for provisional registration with us.

It also aims to make various aspects more explicit, for example the importance of teaching being a profession rooted in academic study (section 6.2), of aligning programme content with the conduct expected of a teacher as set out in the Code of Professionalism and Conduct (COPAC) (section 6.4), and the importance of high-quality professional placement as a critical part of the programme (section 6.7).

The table in section 6.11, which sets out the requirements for ITE within both combined and concurrent degrees, has been updated to correspond with SCQF requirements and to include more consistent framing in respect of duration.

Q11. For programmes of TQFE, will this section of the draft policy work effectively in tandem with the Scottish Government's course and entry requirements?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q12. If not, please explain why.

Q13. Do you agree with the rationale for aligning the content and nature of teaching qualification programmes more explicitly with the Standard for Provisional Registration?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q14. If not, please explain why.

Q15. Does the table set out in section 6.11 accurately reflect current requirements:

a) in general

b) specifically in relation to Professional Placement requirements?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q16. If not, please explain why.

Section 7: teacher educators and programme staffing

This is a new section. Increasingly, the importance of high-quality teacher educators as a core part of effective teaching qualification programmes is being acknowledged. To date, we have only ever specified that a teacher educator should be registered with GTC Scotland. However, [Article 29\(3\)\(b\) of our Order](#) provides that we can make provision about the qualifications of persons employed by institutions that offer programmes of ITE.

In this section we set out our general expectations for teacher educators as higher education academics delivering teaching qualification programmes and specific requirements for the staff

delivering teaching qualification programmes. Section 7.2 provides that these expectations may also apply to school-based teacher educators or mentors.

Section 7.3 sets out a list of criteria that HEIs should satisfy themselves that a candidate for a teacher educator post is able to demonstrate.

Section 7.5 recommends effective induction for teacher educators to help them develop the necessary knowledge, skills, pedagogy and commitment to professionalism in learning and teaching in higher education.

Section 7.8 highlights the role of Professional Update, which all registered teachers are required to engage with, as a valuable tool to ensure the continued understanding of and engagement with GTC Scotland's Professional Standards and Code of Professionalism and Conduct.

The remaining sections set out requirements for ongoing professional development for teacher educators, the performance management of teacher educators (including a reminder of the obligation on providers to make a fitness to teach referral in appropriate circumstances) as well as requirements for wider HEI staff, tutors and using research or scholarship provision in the interests of supporting effective student outcomes.

Q17. Will having clearer expectations with regard to the attributes required of a teacher educator help select good quality candidates to programmes of ITE?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q18. If not, please explain why.

Q19. Have we identified the correct attributes and skills required of a teacher educator?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q20. If not, please explain why.

Q21: Do you agree with the need to have appropriate induction and ongoing professional development arrangements for teacher educators in place?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q22. If not, please explain why.

Section 8: assessment of individuals undertaking teaching qualification programmes

Our aim with this section has been to make the purpose of effective assessment clearer, namely that we rely on it to ensure that candidates are meeting the relevant Professional Standard. HEIs play a critical role for us: through the delivery of quality teacher education and with appropriate checks and balances that key milestones are being met throughout, they make decisions about who belongs to the teaching profession.

Section 8.3 makes explicit the need to ensure that robust arrangements are in place to detect instances of plagiarism and inappropriate use of AI.

Section 8.4 highlights the need to ensure that joint assessment arrangements between HEIs and schools and colleges are governed appropriately.

Section 8.6 clarifies the requirements for determining a student teacher's fitness to teach. This is something that we have received feedback on over time, indicating that clearer guidance on how to manage conduct issues was required. We envisage that these arrangements will need to be supported by appropriate data sharing agreements between GTC Scotland and HEIs.

Q23. Have we identified the necessary attributes for the effective assessment of student teachers?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q24. If not, please explain why.

Q25. Are the new provisions on managing conduct issues framed appropriately if concerns about student teachers arise?

Yes ☐

No ☐
Don't know ☐

Q26. If not, please explain why.

Section 9: accreditation application, assessment and duration

This section represents the biggest departure from our current policy and has been strongly influenced by the feedback we have received from HEIs in relation to their experiences of getting teaching qualification programmes approved through both their institution's own processes and ours.

While it is necessary for HEIs to engage constructively with our process as a key safeguard for the integrity of our Register, we understand that our process is just one of the ways in which programmes are rigorously examined. We therefore appreciate that it would assist HEIs to engage with the accreditation process if we ensure that its purpose is clear, the process is proportionate and that there is no unnecessary duplication.

The section therefore begins with a clear definition of what accreditation is and what its purpose is. Section 9.2 confirms that HEIs must have completed their own internal approval processes before seeking accreditation from us. It sets out what we expect those processes to have covered, in essence so that we can trust and rely on the evidence already gathered by the HEI in respect of the programme to satisfy ourselves of these aspects.

Section 9.3 sets out that we will carry out the accreditation process as a cycle of activity with defined stages and deadlines. We will publish the timings of the cycles and communicate these to HEIs. The notion of having accreditation as a cycle of activity rather than something that is done all year round is what our benchmarking has shown us is a common approach taken by other regulators. We believe it will make the process more efficient and sustainable. Our accreditation activity over recent times has demonstrated that May to June is a window of time that appears to work well for accreditation assessment for HEIs.

Section 9.4 then sets out what we expect HEIs to provide in support of their application, to include proof of the internal approval process.

Section 9.6 confirms that we are taking a targeted and risk-based approach to the accreditation assessment process. This means that rather than have a one size fits all approach, the process of assessment will be designed flexibly according to what we consider the provider and programme need to be. This section also highlights that we may involve an independent assessor in carrying out the assessment process. It concludes with an inexhaustive list of supplementary evidence, which we

may require to a greater or lesser extent, as well as stating the possibility that HEIs might be asked to attend an in-person meeting to talk through the details of the programme and engage in professional dialogue.

Section 9.7 confirms that where an in-person meeting is deemed necessary we will ensure that HEIs are given sufficient notice and that it takes place within the cycle timeframe to enable providers to plan accordingly.

Section 9.11 provides that we may charge a fee for accrediting a programme in line with our Fee Policy. Having carried out some early benchmarking work as part of the review, we are aware that it is common for regulators to charge programme providers an accreditation fee to help cover the costs of carrying out the work. However, this is not something that we would decide and introduce on an arbitrary basis. As an organisation that is funded by teacher registration fees, we are very open about our annual budgeting process. Any decision about fees will be made as part of a wider piece of work incorporating consideration of other potential sources of income, the value of the corresponding services that we offer and the cost of administering a fee structure. We envisage that we will not be in a position to make a decision about fees until some point in our next strategic planning period (2028 to 2032) and we would communicate any proposed changes well in advance.

The rest of the section confirms the 2 potential outcomes of an accreditation application and the consequences for each, and concludes with a notification that if a provider gives inaccurate information about the accreditation status of a programme, we may deem this to be a non-compliance issue under Section 10 and will take appropriate action. The purpose of this is to emphasise that accreditation is a mark of assurance and as such, it is our responsibility as a regulator to protect the integrity of the teaching qualification landscape in Scotland through our oversight of this process. Again, we saw from the benchmarking we carried out that other regulators perform a similar oversight function.

Q27. Does the criteria set out in 9.4 correspond with the information required for your internal approval process(es)?

- Yes ☐
- No ☐
- Don't know ☐

Q28. If not, please explain why.

Q29. Is there any further data that we should request or steps that we should carry out as part of our process?

Q30. If we were to bring in an independent assessor to help with accreditation determinations, do you have any views on who would be well placed to perform this function and what knowledge or expertise would be required?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q31. If yes, please explain why.

Q32. What are your views on accreditation operating as a cycle of activity with defined stages and deadlines? When could or should the accreditation cycle(s) take place in the year?

Q33. What are your views on the possibility of paying a fee in order to have programmes of ITE or TQFE (re)accredited?

Q34. Do you think it is appropriate for us to take action in instances of non-compliance with the accreditation process?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q35. If yes, what sort of action would you consider to be appropriate?

Section 10: accreditation regulation

This section follows logically on from Section 9 and the 2 sections should be read together. As noted above, it is our responsibility as a regulator to protect the integrity of the teaching qualification landscape through our oversight of the accreditation process. This section provides that our responsibility goes beyond the 6-yearly accreditation process itself and will encompass ongoing oversight of how programmes are performing.

By making accreditation more than a single event, we aim to create a more dynamic approach that should have a positive impact on HEIs by reducing the administrative and evidential burden of the application process, while building in a proportionate level of ongoing quality assurance.

Section 10.1 states that the monitoring and supervision may be informed by information found by or given to us from any source, and that we may also involve an independent assessor in this process.

Section 10.2 sets out our expectation that we will maintain an ongoing dialogue with HEIs to satisfy ourselves that their teaching qualification programmes continue to meet standards and conditions that we set. This may require HEIs to provide additional information, or it may require a programme monitoring visit so that we can check whether the programme is delivering the required outcomes. This section also provides that where an HEI identifies for itself that for whatever reason these standards and conditions are no longer being met, they need to notify us of this.

Section 10.3 makes explicit for the first time that we have the authority to remove accreditation in relation to a teaching qualification programme that is not meeting the required standards and conditions.

This would not occur unless a non-compliance supervision process has been followed first, the details of which are set out and essentially give the provider the opportunity to address the issues identified. During that time, we will supervise them closely to determine whether progress is being made and make a new decision at the end of the process.

Section 10.4 sets out the practical steps a provider would need to take in the event that accreditation is withdrawn in relation to matters such as recruitment, marketing and managing the cohort that is in the process of completing the programme.

We consider that removal of accreditation would only occur in extreme circumstances and that in practice, supporting HEIs to meet the required standards and conditions will be the more likely approach. However, having the authority to remove accreditation is a common regulatory feature and a logical consequence of having the authority to grant it, recognition of which has been lacking in our documentation to date. It is appropriate for a process that is 1 of our core statutory functions that we emphasise the significance of accrediting high-quality teaching qualification programmes as the foundation of an effective teaching profession in this way.

Q36. Do you agree with our rationale for proposing the introduction of an ongoing monitoring and supervision function as part of the accreditation process?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q37. If not, please explain why.

Q38. Do you have any views on what data we should request, or activities we should carry out, to inform an ongoing monitoring and supervision function?

Q39. Do you think our proposed non-compliance supervision process will give HEIs sufficient opportunity to take action to meet the required accreditation standards and conditions in the event this situation arises?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q40. If not, please explain why.

Q41. Taking sections 9 and 10 together, do you think we have achieved our aim of creating a targeted, proportionate and risk-based approach to accreditation?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don't know ☐

Q42. If not, please explain why.

Section 11: glossary and interpretation

This section is self-explanatory. It clarifies the definitions of important words and terms contained within the policy in the context in which they are used.

Q43. Are there any words or terms that we have not included which could usefully be defined?

Additional comments

Q44. If you have any comments about anything not covered by the consultation questions, or any other general observations, please leave write them below.

Respondent Information Form

Please Note this form must be completed and returned with your response.

Are you responding as an individual, group or an organisation?

Individual ☐

Group ☐

Organisation ☐

If responding as an individual or group, which of the following best describes your role in the education system?

Teacher / Lecturer / Practitioner ☐ Student / prospective teacher ☐

School / Centre Leader ☐ National Agency Officer ☐

Local Authority / Regional Officer ☐ Other (please state):

If responding as an individual or group, which of the following best describes your sector?

Primary (local authority) ☐ Primary (independent sector) ☐

Secondary (local authority) ☐ Secondary (independent sector) ☐

Further / Higher Education ☐ Other (please state):

We may want to contact you about some of the points you have raised in your response. If you are happy for us to do this, please provide your name and an email address.

Name:

Email address:

Responding to the consultation

Format of responses

You can respond to this consultation in the following ways:

Complete the online form. Please include your name and email address if you are happy to be contacted about any of your responses.

[Accreditation process and requirements review consultation online form](#)

Download the Word questionnaire and either email your response to gtcs@gtcs.org.uk and put 'Accreditation Process and Requirements Review consultation' in the email subject line, or print off the document and post to:

General Teaching Council for Scotland
Clerwood House
96 Clermiston Road
Edinburgh
EH12 6UT

If you need us to provide the consultation documentation in an alternative format, please email us at gtcs@gtcs.org.uk.

Deadline for responses

All responses should be received no later than 5pm on 12 March 2026. Responses received after this deadline may not be considered. Please let us know in advance of this deadline if you anticipate having difficulties meeting it.

How responses are handled

For this consultation we intend to publish a summary report of the responses that we receive. If we quote from individual responses in our summary report, these will be unattributed. Please be mindful not to share any personal information in your response.

GTC Scotland must comply with the requirements of the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) and other data protection legislation. Information on how we process your personal data in relation to this consultation is set out in our privacy notices, which can be found on our website: [Privacy Notice for Consultation Exercises by the General Teaching Council for Scotland](#)

Further information about data protection can be found on the Information Commissioner's Office website: [Homepage | Information Commissioner's Office \(www.ico.org.uk\)](https://www.ico.org.uk)

Freedom of Information

Once your response is received it is considered to be held by GTC Scotland and is subject to the requirements of Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 (FOISA) as GTC Scotland is a public authority under the Act. If the information you send to GTC Scotland is requested by third parties under FOISA, we are obliged to consider the request and provide the information unless it falls within one or more of the exemptions set out in the Act.

Further information about Freedom of Information can be found on the Scottish Information Commissioner's website: [Homepage | Scottish Information Commissioner](https://www.scot.nhs.uk/sic/)

Comments or questions

If you would like to clarify any aspect of this consultation prior to the deadline for responses, please contact us at gtcs@gtcs.org.uk using the subject line 'Accreditation process and requirements review consultation'.

Annexes

1. Standards and Conditions for Recognised Teaching Qualifications in Scotland and Accreditation | draft policy
2. [Current Accreditation of Programmes of ITE in Scotland Policy](#)
3. [Current Guidelines for Accreditation of Programmes of ITE in Scotland](#)
4. [Current Evaluation Framework for Accreditation of Programmes of ITE in Scotland](#)