

THE FUTURE OF INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION FOR THE LEARNING AND SKILLS SECTOR

AN AGENDA FOR REFORM - RESPONSE FORM

The closing date for this consultation is **29/02/2004**
Your comments must reach us by that date.

Note when completing electronically Use: • **mouse** to access hyperlink. And to access input boxes;
• **scroll** bar to navigate the form;

The information you send to us may need to be passed to colleagues within the Department for Education and Skills and/or published in a summary of responses received in response to this consultation. We will assume that you are content for us to do this, and that if you are replying by e-mail, your consent overrides any confidentiality disclaimer that is generated by your organisation's IT system, unless you specifically include a request to the contrary in the main text of your submission to us.

The Department may, in accordance with the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information, make available on public request, individual consultation responses. This will extend to your comments unless you inform us that you wish them to remain confidential.

Please insert 'X' if you want us to keep your response confidential

Name	
Organisation (if applicable)	National Institute for Adult Continuing Education
Address	21 De Montfort Street Leicester LE1 7GE

If your enquiry is related to the policy content of the consultation you can contact Jane Cunliffe at:

Telephone: **0114 259 3156**
Email: **Sqd.team@dfes.qsi.gov.uk**

Please insert 'X' in **one** of the following boxes that best describes you as a respondent.

<input type="checkbox"/> FE College	<input type="checkbox"/> Higher Education Institution
<input type="checkbox"/> Awarding Body	<input type="checkbox"/> Student Teacher
<input type="checkbox"/> Work Based Training Provider	<input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary / Community Provider
<input type="checkbox"/> Sixth Form Colleges	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Organisations (please specify)	National Organisation for Adult Learning

QUESTION ONE (PAGE 13):

Do you broadly agree with the vision for the future of initial teacher education (paragraphs 3.1-3.5)?

Agree

Disagree

Unsure

Comments:

We fully support the vision of a professional workforce able to support learning at all levels and for all learners in the learning and skill sector. We also support the principle that teachers in the L&S sector should be accorded equal esteem with other teachers in the schools sector and should be able to use ICT effectively in the support they offer to learners. (paras 3.1 & 3.2)

While we also support the broad vision of a newly-qualified teacher in 3.4 we would also like to see that teacher explicitly committed to the principles of equality and diversity in offering an inclusive range of support skills to all learners from all communities. (3.4)

We are not convinced however that the particular features of the qualification envisaged for newly qualified teachers in the L&S sector described in this section (para 3.5) will deliver on this vision of the workforce. NIACE would wish to see a less rigid distinction drawn between ITE and continuing professional development. We would also wish to see a range of qualifications offered that recognised the variety of skills employed in supporting learners that may not be readily classified as 'teaching skills'. The future L&S workforce will require competent managers of the learning process and creative curriculum leaders who may have high level professional skills that transcend the boundaries of 'teaching' as envisaged in this section(para 3.4)

QUESTION TWO:

Do you think the award for qualified teachers should be entitled QTFE or QTLS, as outlined in paragraph 3.5?

QTFE

QTLS

Unsure

Comments:

In principle NIACE would like to see the establishing of awards for teachers that would qualify them for teaching positions across all parts of the Learning and Skills Sector. In particular we would wish to ensure that awards made to teachers in adult and community learning will be accepted as a qualification for teaching posts in both Colleges and in Work-based Learning. If this can be guaranteed through the structure of the awards then NIACE would support the use of the title QTLS as the preferable title for these awards. If however all routes to achievement of these awards across all areas of the L&S sector cannot be accorded equal status, then it would seem that QTFE is the most accurate description of these awards.

QUESTION THREE:

Should teacher training in the learning and skills sector be at graduate or equivalent level, as in schools?

Yes

No

Unsure

Comments:

The level of the award should accord equal esteem for these awards to those offered to teachers in the school sector. However, we would also wish to ensure that access to the award was made as open as possible to all candidates. Entry to programmes leading to the award should be on the basis of 'ability to benefit' as judged by the admitting institution and not on any pre-requisites for the achievement of a qualification at a lower level.

QUESTION FOUR (PAGE 16):

Do you agree with the proposal to introduce professional formation, including both initial training and workplace development, for new teachers?

Agree

Disagree

Unsure

Comments:

NIACE supports the principle that teachers in the L&S sector should combine initial training and professional development in the workplace within a concept of 'professional formation'. However, the model envisaged seems too linear, assuming that initial training takes place prior to workplace development. NIACE would wish to see a much more closely integrated model of professional formation for teachers in the L&S sector, with the balance between workplace and 'off-the-job' training able to be varied to suit individual needs and a range of models of provision leading to qualification.

NIACE is also concerned that concept of 'professional formation' might be limited to people entering the L&S workforce solely through a structured ITE programme. In fact many people enter (and will continue to enter) the workforce through part-time work or through staff development programmes that do not conform to the proposed ITE model. NIACE would not wish to see these staff excluded from the concept of 'professional formation' because an ITE programme was inappropriate to their needs and/or circumstances.

QUESTION FIVE (PAGE 19):

Do you agree with the principle of differentiated learning?

Agree

Disagree

Unsure

Comments:

NIACE fully supports the principle that the range of skills and knowledge that people bring with them into employment in the L&S sector should be reflected in individualised programmes of learning based on effective initial assessment. In order for this individualisation to work effectively the structure of qualifications for teachers needs to be based explicitly on the principles of credit accumulation and transfer. Within this credit system it will be feasible to develop sensitive procedures for recognising prior experiential achievements, as well as creating rules of exemption based on certificated achievements in 'neighbouring' sectors.

In developing such an individualised system the potential increase in the costs of managing such flexible programmes of learning needs to be recognised. NIACE is confident that, if such a system was developed, the additional operational costs would be offset by the benefits of increased success for a wider range of people entering and remaining in the workforce.

QUESTION SIX (PAGE 21):

Do you agree with the idea of a professional development record?

Agree

Disagree

Unsure

Comments:

NIACE supports the principle of a professional development record, providing this is created in a format that is easily accessible to staff in the sector, secure and confidential for individuals, and not unduly onerous in its requirements for maintenance and updating.

QUESTION SEVEN:

If so, what form should the professional development record take?

Comments:

The PDR should be an exclusively electronic document, available via the internet through a secure download and storage facility. It should be hyper-linked to an on-line credit transcript with secure access to awarding bodies to record formal recognition of achievement through the award of credit.

QUESTION EIGHT (PAGE 22):

Do you agree that teacher education qualifications should be strengthened in the area of observation of teaching practice?

Agree

Disagree

Unsure

Comments:

While NIACE supports the principle that observation of practice in the workplace should be a key element of both assessment and continuing professional development for new teachers, we would be concerned if a single formula for this observation 'at appropriate intervals' was established. Effective and manageable arrangements for observation are crucial to the development of new staff and NIACE would wish to see this observation take place in the field in which a new teacher propose to teach. The potential costs of managing such a system of observation in a service with small numbers of full-time staff and large numbers of part-time teachers need to be recognised. Again, NIACE would like to see flexible arrangements for observation of practice built in to the individualised programmes agreed with new staff prior to beginning their progression to a qualification.

QUESTION NINE (PAGE 25):

Do you support the idea of introducing a formalised mentoring system (pages 23-25)?

Yes

No

Unsure

Comments:

We would have similar concerns about a formalised entitlement to mentoring. Although NIACE would support the principle of workplace mentors as a useful structure within which to support professional formation, we are not sure that the investment in capacity building to create effective and professional mentors will be worthwhile in areas of the L&S sector where most staff are on part-time and short-term contracts of employment. NIACE would not support the development of a mentoring scheme for professional formation without a fully-developed and good quality training and development programme for mentors to underpin it.

QUESTION TEN (PAGE 26):

Do you agree with the introduction of a national framework for the training and development of teacher educators?

Agree

Disagree

Unsure

Comments:

While NIACE supports the principle of a national framework for the training and development of teacher educators, we would need to know more detail about such a framework before giving it our support. In particular we would wish to be assured that the framework did not exclude from involvement in teacher education the large numbers of committed individuals who have considerable and valuable experience of practical work in supporting the professional development of teachers and other staff in their organisations, but who may not have the formal educational background or qualifications that teacher educators in the school sector possess.

QUESTION ELEVEN (PAGE 30):

How can we build on the achievements in adult literacy, numeracy and ESOL teaching for the rest of the learning and skills sector workforce?

Comments:

We have not yet been able to identify the achievements/success of the new qualifications framework for teachers of LLN but we do know that an infrastructure is growing which offers a welcome raft of different and differentiated workforce development opportunities. These range from short, non-accredited curriculum familiarisation programmes to full level 4 qualifications. This is providing a continuum of opportunity, backed by the gradual creation of regional Professional Development Centres (or Units) and Professional Development Teams (PDTs). This must be welcomed - identifiable centres of knowledge, development, resources, research etc should grow in stature, credibility and quality for individuals and the whole sector. The L&S sector, which like LLN, has large numbers of under-qualified staff, could learn from this. The need for rigour and specialism at all levels has been demonstrated - a core with specialist units could provide consistency as well as differentiation.

We must learn from the necessity for coherence and clarity about the range of opportunities - clear communication about how things will develop is necessary for potential participants as well as providers. The order in which things are rolled out is crucial - demand has been stimulated in LLN training but the supply side is trailing well behind. Issues of capacity of the field to respond to the demand must be addressed whether that's for new or existing staff. Overlap of old quals with new ones is recommended if disillusion and disenchantment are to be avoided.

QUESTION TWELVE:

Do you agree with the proposal to cover the FENTO standards during both parts of professional formation (initial training and workplace development)?

Agree

Disagree

Unsure

Comments:

If the intention is to develop qualifications appropriate to all staff working in teaching roles in the Learning and Skills sector, then it must be recognised that the FENTO standards are not fit for this purpose. (Though we recognise that some elements of the FENTO standards will be relevant to staff working outside FE Colleges) We would wish to see a wholesale review of existing standards taking place before any requirements for achieving qualified teacher status are introduced for staff in the L&S sector. In addition to the need to revise the content of the FENTO standards, the scope of these standards also needs to be reviewed. NIACE would also be wary of any future qualification that sought to cover 'all' of any revised set of standards, as this would seem to be potentially at odds with the vision of a diverse sector with many different needs, supported by individualised programmes geared to an initial assessment of appropriate routes to professional formation. The flexibility and responsiveness envisaged in this approach would be undermined if all teachers in the sector had to achieve the same (large) qualification covering all identified standards.

The LSDA/NIACE project on Workforce Development for Adult and Community Learning Staff is proposing a credit-based qualifications structure based on a wide range of standards as the appropriate future model for qualifications across the L&S sector. We would wish to see this proposed model informing the development of standards and qualifications for ITE.

QUESTION THIRTEEN:

What should be included in the wider review of standards?

Comments:

In their work in this area LSDA and NIACE have identified a range of existing sets of occupational standards that are relevant to the work of staff in the L&S sector. The FENTO T&L standards are just one of over 20 sets of standards that are relevant to staff in the sector, with several of these being directly relevant to teaching staff. NIACE would like to see the scope of any standards review include all these relevant standards, and the report of the LSDA/NIACE ACL Workforce Development project will include a detailed mapping of this range of standards to the roles and responsibilities of staff in the sector.

Any review of standards must encompass all the roles and responsibilities of staff in the L&S sector, not just those for teaching staff. For example, standards for management, leadership, learner support, advice and guidance, technical support and other roles must be included within any review. In the future NIACE would wish to see a set of qualifications designed to support initial professional formation as an integral part of a range of qualifications designed to support continuing professional development for all staff in all roles across the L&S sector. Such qualifications should be built on principles of credit accumulation and transfer, and should facilitate the transfer of credit to and from related sets of qualifications in 'neighbouring' sectors (eg Health and Social Care, Retail etc.)

QUESTION FOURTEEN (PAGE 32):

Do you agree with the proposals for strengthening the endorsement and inspection processes for initial teacher education courses?

Agree

Disagree

Unsure

Comments:

Following from the above, although NIACE would support many of the proposals for improving quality contained in Section 11 of the consultation document, we would not support an extension of the endorsement of programmes based on the FENTO standards, for the reasons outlined above. Any endorsement process that was fit for the purpose outlined in the vision for the L&S workforce in Section 3 would need to be based on a revised set of standards and a revised set of endorsement procedures established by the Lifelong Learning SSC, which may need to be different in several regards from the existing processes of FENTO endorsement.

NIACE would also wish to see the involvement of ALI as well as Ofsted in developing revised inspection criteria appropriate to any new arrangements for professional formation.

QUESTION FIFTEEN:

What checks should be included in the endorsement process?

Comments:

This should be a matter to be developed through the LLSSC once the structure and content of standards and qualifications for professional formation have been determined.

QUESTION SIXTEEN (PAGE 33):

What arrangements should be made for funding and assuring the quality of initial teacher education in the learning and skills sector?

Comments:

In any assessment of the funding and quality assurance needs of ITE in the sector, NIACE would wish to see the needs of part-time staff considered at each stage of development. We are sceptical of the ability of the L&S workforce to renew and update the needs of all its staff involved in teaching through a programme of initial professional formation alone, rather than through an integrated approach to initial and continuing professional development that is flexible enough to meet the needs of all staff working in the sector.

There is a real need to secure adequate funding to support the development of a workforce able to support the future development of community-based adult learning. In particular the workforce needs serious investment to support the process of quality improvement within the Success for All agenda, and to develop distance and e-learning support skills for adults learning in their community.

QUESTION SEVENTEEN (PAGE 34):

Should new and existing teachers and trainers be required to register with the Institute for Learning?

Yes

no

Unsure

Comments:

As the consultation document confirms, membership of the IfL is open to those with an FE teaching qualification or an NVQ assessor/verifier award. It is therefore restricted in its access to membership to only a part of the L&S workforce involved in teaching. As currently constituted the IfL would not be an appropriate body to hold required registrations for all teachers across the sector. Again NIACE would wish to see the issue of registration considered by the LLSSC in the context of an inclusive opportunity for all staff in the sector to become registered, if this was a practical option.

QUESTION EIGHTEEN (PAGE 35):

How can providers improve their integration of initial teacher education and human resource management?

Comments:

NIACE accepts the recommendations of the Ofsted report in this respect. Providers need to create a higher level of integration between human resource management and ITT. In fact NIACE would wish to see this integration of HR functions not just with ITT but with all training and development activities supported by a provider.

QUESTION NINETEEN (PAGE 36):

How should we fund initial teacher education in the future to ensure high quality and value for money?

Comments:

In the same way that ITE for staff in schools is funded.

QUESTION TWENTY (PAGE 37):

What legislation do you think is needed to implement the proposals for reform?

Comments:

The current regulations covering the employment and qualification of teachers in the post-school sector relate explicitly to further education institutions. Clearly this is not an adequate framework within which to develop any legislative arrangements to underpin employment practices across the whole of the L&S sector. NIACE is not suggesting however that the existing FE regulations should simply be extended to cover all staff in the L&S sector. A thorough review of the current legislative arrangements is required in order to establish an appropriate regulatory basis for employment in the L&S sector. One possible outcome of this review is that it would not be practical or beneficial to underpin the proposed reforms of ITE across the L&S sector through changes in legislation.

QUESTION TWENTY-ONE (PAGE 39):

What regional support would you like from the Standards Unit?

Comments:

A mixed economy of support through regions, with part-time staff having the same rights of access to this support with full-time staff.

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply

Here at the Department for Education and Skills we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be alright if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

Yes

No

Code of Practice on written consultation

All UK national public consultations are required to conform to the following standards:

1. Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left at each stage.
2. It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.
3. A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.
4. Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.
5. Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.
6. Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and the reasons for decisions finally taken.
7. Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation co-ordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this consultation.

Completed questionnaires and other responses, should be sent to the address shown below by **29/02/2004**

Send by post to: **Jane Cunliffe, Standards Unit, Department for Education and Skills, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ**

Send by e-mail: Once you have completed the questionnaire, save it on your hard drive and then open an e-mail to: Sqd.team@dfes.gsi.gov.uk, attach the completed questionnaire file and send the e-mail.