

Professionalising the workforce: a study of  
the new reforms and potential impact on  
the CETT *for Inclusive Learning*

May 2008

CETT *for Inclusive Learning*  
School of Health, Community and Education Studies  
Northumbria University  
Coach Lane Campus  
Benton  
Newcastle upon Tyne  
NE7 7XA



## Case Study

### Background Information

This study was commissioned by the Quality Improvement Agency (QIA) for the learning and skills sector in January 2008 and to report by May 2008. All eleven Centres for Excellence in Teacher Training (CETT) were approached and asked if they would like to take part, if so they had to then identify 10 organisations in order to produce ten individual case studies. Each CETT would then produce one overarching case study for submission to QIA.

The Director of the CETT *for Inclusive Learning* identified 10 potential diverse partner organisations that could provide a broad range of data. Key CETT partners were identified, approached and asked if they would like to take part in the project, including one organisation who was not a member of the CETT but who was shortly to join. These partner organisations included higher education, general further education, a vocational training college, specialist further education, adult and community learning, the work based learning community, the voluntary sector and the prison service.

It was expected that the resulting case studies should contribute to the understanding of workforce reform in Initial Teacher Training (ITT) and Continuing Professional Development (CPD). In addition the studies should complement current development work on CPD and the development needs of teacher educators being carried out for Lifelong Learning UK (LLUK). Against this background each CETT would identify its own focus which may be linked to the overall purpose of the CETT.

Cumulatively, a meta-analysis of all the case studies (there may be up to one hundred in total) should clarify the impact of the new workforce reforms on ITT and CPD provision, inform and identify key priorities for development, and inform the QIA's National Improvement Strategy, the Lifelong Learning UK's (LLUK) Workforce Development Strategy, and the Institute for Learning's (IfL) professional development strategy.

### Case Study Context

The intention of the CETT *for Inclusive Learning* is to “...provide a source of expertise for those who teach and support learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities (LDD) and this encompasses Skills for Life.”

The publication in October 2006 by the Learning and Skills Council (LSC), 'Learning for living and work: improving education and training opportunities for people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities', stresses that people with LDD must not be marginalised. All people, with or without impairments, have an equal right to receive high quality education and training as experienced by their peers. The lack of specialist education and qualifications for all staff and a lack of appropriate professional standards severely limit the capacity and capability to deliver.

The focus of this CETT is *inclusive learning* and it arose from a series of discussions held with a wide range of organisations. It was recognised that there is a massive potential not only in initial teacher training but particularly in continuing professional development to support teachers and other professionals who work with disabled learners i.e. those with Learning Difficulties and/or Disabilities (LDD), and this includes Skills for Life (SfL).

'Access for All' (BSA, 2002) was written to support teachers using the adult core curricula in literacy and numeracy who have learners with learning difficulties or disabilities in their classes. The document identified seven groups of difficulty and disability.

1. People who are deaf or partially hearing
2. People who are blind or partially sighted
3. People who have mental health problems
4. People with dyslexia and related specific learning difficulties
5. People with physical difficulties
6. People with learning difficulties
7. People with autistic spectrum disorders and Asperger's syndrome

It is these categories that form the basis of the rationale of the CETT, together with Skills for Life (literacy and numeracy).

In developing the focus of the Case Study the CETT partners were anxious to ensure that data captured would also provide information that would enable the CETT to respond to any needs identified in the partner organisations, particularly in relation to inclusion and inclusive learning.

### **Aims of the study**

The study carried out under the guidance of the CETT for Inclusive Learning, aimed to identify the impact of the new reforms paying particular attention to the first three of the following four further education workforce reforms;

1. new Initial Teacher Training (ITT) pathways and qualifications leading to the award of Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills (QTLS) status including specialist Skills for Life routes and Associate Teacher Learning and Skills (ATLS) status
2. a requirement for all teachers, trainers, trainers and lecturers to fulfil at least 30 hours continuing professional development each year, with reduced amounts for part timers
3. a requirement for all teachers, trainers, tutors and lecturers to be registered with the Institute for Learning, their professional body, the Government will meet the standard membership costs of individual teachers
4. a new leadership qualification (Principals' Qualifying Programme) for all new college principals

### **The key questions / issues the study investigated:**

Within the ten organisations the study sought to ask of the following individuals

- A *Principals, chief executives etc* – systems relating to new and existing teaching staff and their requirements under the new reforms, workforce capacity planning in relation to inclusion and inclusive learning (Appendix 1) The majority of the organisations would complete this schedule. The exception would be those whose structure resulted in the 'Principal' being too remote from the workforce

B *Human resources (HR) and staff development* – HR strategies in relation to the new reforms, implementation of the reforms in relation to inclusion and inclusive learning

(Appendix 2) All organisations would complete this schedule

C *Initial Teacher Training (ITT) providers* – new Lifelong Learning UK (LLUK) awards and continuing professional development (CPD) provision, their views of impact of the new reforms

(Appendix 3) Only those organisations that were teacher training providers would answer this schedule.

D *Teacher Trainers and Educators* – impact of the new reforms on their development and CPD in relation to inclusion and inclusive learning

(Appendix 4) Only those organisations that were teacher training providers would answer this schedule

E *Teachers, trainers, trainers etc* – impact of the new reforms on their development and CPD in relation to inclusion and inclusive learning

(Appendix 5) All organisations with the exception of staff who had answered schedule D would answer this schedule.

F *Trainee Teachers* – impact of the implementation of the reforms and CPD in relation to inclusion and inclusive learning

(Appendix 6) Only those organisations that were teacher training providers would answer this schedule. The exception was those organisations that had staff undergoing teacher training.

A statement covering data protection and ethical issues, information sheets and consent forms were distributed to support the informed completion of evaluation schedules.

### **Managing the study**

The study was managed by the CETT for Inclusive Learning Director with support from a researcher who was part of the 'Research, Monitoring and Evaluation' strand of the CETT. Within each of the ten organisations taking part in the study, the individual partner case study was managed by a named individual from that organisation who acted as the link between the CETT and their organisation.

It was recognised that the organisations were very different and therefore the methodology would need to be adapted for each organisation, although an overarching structure was identified and agreed as follows:

- stage 1 workshop with organisation representatives to discuss the study, the data collection strategies and associated documentation
- stage 2 workshop to refine the data collection strategies, ethical issues and associated documentation. Identify and agree key dates (for stages 3 to 7)
- stage 3 data collection within the individual organisations
- stage 4 progress check on data collection
- stage 5 continue data collection
- stage 6 reduction, analysis and interpretation of data workshop

- stage 7 writing up of case studies

During stage 1 of the study all organisation representatives, who would be carrying out the data collection, were provided with a briefing pack containing a range of documents as background reading, they were:

- Lifelong Learning UK (LLUK) 'Qualification map for teachers, trainers, trainers, lecturers and instructors in the FE sector in England'
- Lifelong Learning UK (LLUK) information pack on the 'Further Education Workforce Reforms'. This pack was instrumental in identifying the roles and the knowledge and processes that should be in place for each role and was used as the basis for the data collection schedules
- Institute for Learning (IfL) 'Guidelines for your continuing professional development'
- Extract from the Institute for Learning (IfL) website on 'membership grades'
- Standards Verification UK (SVUK) 'Tariff of legacy initial teacher training qualifications'
- Lifelong Learning UK leaflet on 'General Professional Recognition Learning and Skills (England)'
- Statutory Instrument for 'The Further Education Teachers' Qualifications (England) Regulations 2007'
- Statutory Instrument for the 'Further Education Teachers' Continuing Professional Development and Registration (England) regulations 2007'
- Statutory Instrument for the 'Further Education (Principals' Qualifications) (England) Regulations 2007'

Carrying out this evaluation has proved locally valuable for the ten CETT *for Inclusive Learning* partner organisations who have taken part. Having the above information as background reading has broadened understanding of the reforms and the relationship between the different national bodies. When evaluators received a response from the member of staff being interviewed that they lacked knowledge of the aspect of the reforms under discussion they could then use the documentation as a discussion tool to facilitate understanding. A number of partners overtly used the opportunity of the case study as part of a staff development process in relation to the reforms. The evaluation has therefore acted as both a data collection exercise and information giving process. For some partners in the CETT it has been their first venture into 'evaluation' and it has been, for them, an enormous learning curve.

This overarching case study has drawn upon the ten individual case studies and the raw data to enable a much wider discussion of the aspects under investigation. Key themes have been identified within each of the aspects leading to recommendations for a range of organisations.

For the CETT *for Inclusive Learning* it has provided us with much more data on what is happening within our partner organisations and will enable us to modify / enhance our range of activities to support the on going professional development of all those involved in the CETT activities whether they be practitioners, researchers or learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities or skills for life.

## Key findings / insights

The data was collected, reduced and then analysed and interpreted. This process involved coding and theme development and was carried out by three members of the team from the University who had not been involved in the data collection. The data revealed the following about the implementation and impact of the reforms within partner organisations in the CETT for Inclusive Learning.

1. *The new initial teacher training pathways and qualifications leading to Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills (QTLS) status and Associate Teacher Learning and Skills (ATLS) status and the subsequent processes of change required to build capacity*

## Setting the scene

The first of the four reforms identified by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in their letter dated 15 June 2007 to the FE / Learning and Skills sector is the

*“...new Initial Teacher Training (ITT) pathways and qualifications leading to the award of Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills (QTLS) status including specialist Skills for Life routes and Associate Teacher Learning and Skills (ATLS) status.”*

In evaluating the impact of the reforms within the ten case study partners we found there were emerging issues related to communication and management structures, the infrastructure that needs to be in place in an organisation to enable all three reforms to be embedded, and confusion as to which sectors the qualifications leading to QTLS and ATLS apply.

## Communication and management structures

How the information relating to the reforms is communicated and disseminated within an organisation appears to be very reliant on the internal communication and management structures within that organisation. Who knows about the reforms (in particular the pathways and awards), how this knowledge is disseminated, to whom and what happens as a result appears largely dependent on who in the organisation becomes the repository for the knowledge and their ability to shape practice in relation to the reforms i.e. their role in the managerial structures of the organisation.

Before any dissemination can happen within an organisation there is a need for consistent messages which are clearly communicated by national partners to providers. The Quality Improvement Agency for the learning and skills sector (2007:7) comments on the many challenges facing the sector,

*“... the roles of the many different national agencies in the further education system are not clear to colleges and providers and stakeholders, and they all have their own strategies and organisational agendas”*

They later build upon this aspect when discussing sharing of practice in relation to national partners (2007: 14)

*“... to ensure that their services are coherent and mutually supportive, their roles are clear and they all add value to the system.”*

Keeping up to date with the reforms is very important but also brought difficulties as noted by one adult community learning manager who identified the need for

*“Consistent messages from national bodies.”*

This was supported by a college manager who noted the need for *“clarity and consistency of information concerning the requirements of staff”* and a staff development manager who stated how he had experienced *“conflicting and unclear information.”* This clarity and consistency of information is very important to an organisation when taking their staff through a period of change and striving to reduce any barriers to the implementation of the reforms.

When management were questioned about what things had to be in place within their organisation to ‘enable’ the reforms to embed, key enablers that emerged were

*“Commitment from the top”*

*“Partnership and joint working within and across departments”*

*“A clear HR and staff development policy”*

This resonates with the findings of the Ofsted report on the inspection of initial teacher training in 2003 and subsequently highlighted by the DfES in their response to the Ofsted findings (DfES, 2003:34) who stated

*“A fundamental systemic weakness identified by Ofsted is the lack of links between human resource management and initial teacher education. Ofsted recommends that FE colleges should ‘integrate ITT with their overall management of human resources, including the professional development of staff.’”*

Caution is needed; within the CETT partnership there are clear links to initial teacher training providers and the CETT can provide a source of general expertise. But, for providers outside of the CETT whether there is a systematic approach to their systems linked to Initial Teacher Training (ITT) providers needs further investigation.

Strategies that had been used to ensure that all teachers in the organisations are aware of the reforms and in particular QTLS and ATLS are wide ranging and included the use of;

- Managers meetings
- Staff briefings
- Training events
- Distributing relevant publications
- Agenda items on team meetings
- Emails outlining the proposals
- Briefing sheets
- Encouraging attendance at consultations and dissemination events

Some partners experienced ‘barriers’ when trying to build capacity, and inevitably ‘time’ emerged as a key factor.

*“Time to review everything, to make sure that everything ‘fits’ and the pace of change”*

In some instances the barriers were not physical but personal due to

*“Some tutors tardy / reluctant to access new qualifications”*

*“Resentment and denial from one individual”*

However there are still sceptics who feel that

*“...it could all change again.”*

The way in which the information is disseminated is vital to whether the reforms are understood and ultimately have an impact. Believing you have disseminated the information and the relevant teachers, trainers etc realising this has happened and that it relates to them is another matter. In one partner it was noted that

*“All three providers claim to have informed staff about the Teachers’ Qualifications framework and its benefits although this is not supported by the comments from teaching staff. 6 out of the 17 who responded were unable to detail which QTLS/ATLS status they were encouraged to achieve.”*

All trainee teachers undergoing initial teacher training stated that they were

*“Encouraged to achieve QTLS and had already registered with IfL. Within their learning programme they had discussed the reforms and their potential impact.”*

### **Infrastructure needed to enable the reforms in general to embed**

The infrastructure the CETT partners put in place to support the implementation of the awards were also found to be very important. Senior management (Principals and HR / staff development), when questioned about the systems they had in place to ensure that all new entrant staff and existing staff were suitably qualified noted that

*“Policies and procedures have been updated and we have developed the systems that need to be in place.”*

One partner stated that

*“All Job Specifications determine the type and level of qualification required. This is used in shortlisting candidates and influences the interview and appointment process.”*

Another partner noted *“We now only employ qualified teachers.”* This could however, be an issue for those who enter the profession through the in-service route.

Many partners had revisited their

*“...recruitment, selection, job description and person specification” and “This has involved departments working together: HR-recruitment, wages, staff development, to act upon the information from the new requirement”*

Almost all CETT partners were clear that on recruitment qualifications are checked and recorded and as a result action planning of staff to achieve QTLS and ATLS was carried out.

For some partners the new requirements had made it necessary for them to carry out an

*“...audit of qualifications has been conducted, recording sight of original certificates, conducting checks – safeguarding and supporting access to further training and qualifications to achieve required professional qualifications and status.”*

In another partner it was noted that

*“Qualifications have been checked by the Head of Learning and Teaching Quality and Professional Development and staff have been required to complete an appropriate teaching qualification when necessary.”*

For some organisations the result of this activity has either resulted in them creating databases or updating databases to keep track of staff and their qualifications and to provide reports to show that

*“We are fully compliant and hitting all targets.”*

*“Database of tutor qualifications and IfL status is maintained.”*

*“A database is held on all staff which reflects their qualifications and subject skills.”*

### **Application of the qualifications**

There does appear to be an application issue. All the partners are aware that changes need to be made and are either working towards these or monitoring the situation; however there appears to be a lack of clarity in relation to who the reforms are actually aimed at and when they have to be actioned by.

*“The term ‘further education system’ refers to the wide range of organisations that make up the learning and skills sector and the national partners responsible for planning, funding and quality improvement.” (QIA, 2007:7)*

This use of the term FE causes some confusion in some providers within the adult and community learning and work based learning sectors perhaps not aware of the QIA definition and as a result of this lack of knowledge they can perceive it only means Further Education colleges. The following example gives an indication of this confusion,

*“The adult and community provider however is not clear whether the new legislation applies to their staff although they are encouraging them all to achieve the appropriate qualification. They have been informed that they need to develop a protocol acceptable to the LSC.”*

One voluntary organisation noted that

*“The new initial teacher training pathways and qualifications leading to Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills (QTLS) status and Associate Teacher Learning and Skills (ATLS) status and the subsequent processes of change required to build capacity will affect the recruitment and retention of adequately trained staff. Whilst, being in the voluntary sector, the regulations are not immediately mandatory; we need to comply if we are to continue to maintain our approved status with funding bodies and contractors. This position is still being debated internally and no policy decisions have yet been made.”*

Another voluntary sector partner stated

*“All our staff have or are working towards QTLS status – in the long term we anticipate a time when all applicants for tutor posts will be in this situation – we have some concerns about the possible time lag between the implementation of the reforms and the numbers of people with the appropriate level of qualifications who are available for work in this area and whether this may lead to recruitment problems.”*

Another aspect of applicability and subsequent confusion is the relationship between QTLS / ATLS and IfL. In a specialist college there was

*“...evidence of uncertainty about the new qualifications and the difference in status between QTLS and ATLS. A common response was to interpret status to grades of membership with the Institute for Learning without linking it to differing levels of qualifications or roles and responsibilities within the workplace.”*

Within the police service

*“There is currently no requirement from the professional governing bodies that regulate the police sector to provide additional training qualification above the minimum set out (Level 3 Learning and Development).”*

As an initial teacher training provider notes *“...we have fully embraced the reforms and have implemented them across the provision.”* However concern was raised by them that *“The route to QTLS has not yet been established”* and *“It does not appear at this stage that there is demand for ATLS.”* There are still concerns surrounding the shelf life of the new standards and if QTLS will ever happen.

In relation to trainee teachers undergoing post compulsory education and training programmes it was suggested that within teacher training

*“...we need accurate statistics regarding the proportion of unqualified staff in post and that further discussions with funding agencies such as the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) should take place to inform need. As there is a requirement to register with the Institute for Learning (IfL) they are probably now in a position of being able to inform Initial Teacher Training providers of those teachers, trainers, etc not yet qualified who are within their geographical area.”*

The only sector that is very clear regarding the non applicability of ATLS is the skills for life sector. Lifelong Learning UK (2007:9) in their Further Education Workforce Reforms clearly indicates that

*“It should be noted that there is no Associate Teacher role in Skills for Life subjects and so QTLS is the only appropriate status for these teachers.”*

This is understood and supported by one adult and community based provider who states that for their staff “...ATLS will not be appropriate.”

Many of the partners had been preparing for change and building capacity by providing information and setting requirements for their staff. However many staff have been experiencing difficulties in “...understanding the training pathways and how to apply them to themselves.” If some employers don't understand the qualifications and pathways and relevance to their staff then they are going to experience difficulties in engaging their staff in the new reforms.

The result of all this confusion could very easily lead to a two tier system. Those providers funded through the Learning and Skills Council and therefore very clear about the status they must achieve and those who are not and therefore not required to work towards QTLS and ATLS. As one partner stated

*“There is also a danger that two parallel systems could grow up i.e. for staff to whom the reforms apply, and for those to whom they do not.”*

Standards Verification UK (SVUK) reviewers are not helping an already confused situation when an ITT provider commented that

*“SVUK are giving the impression that only those working under LSC contracts will be awarded Diploma status.”*

## *2. Teacher's and teacher educators perceptions of the impact of the reforms on their own development*

### **Trainee teachers' perceptions**

Data, although minimal, indicates that the majority of the trainee teachers surveyed had been in a teaching role for less than 4 years and were predominantly in a full time role, these roles in themselves were very diverse. They taught an extremely wide range of subjects; this is an aspect that is worthy of further investigation in order to identify how teacher educators are dealing with the specialist teaching related to occupational / subject areas.

All those interviewed, with the exception of one trainee trainer in the police service, identified that they were encouraged to achieve QTLS status and had registered with the Institute for Learning (IfL). Their understanding of the new awards had developed “Through research using the internet” and had been “Taught about the reforms and awards on their course” and they stated that the QTLS / ATLS requirements would

*“Provide recognition as a good professional qualification” and “It provides a framework to support teachers to progress and professionalise their status within the lifelong learning sector.”*

One CETT partner noted that the trainee teachers in relation to their own development embraced the reforms with statements such as *“They seem to meet my own needs, I think they are a good benchmark”* and *“I feel really encouraged by QTLS”*.

However there was some caution needed in respect of the reforms as some trainee teachers felt that

*“There is a reluctance to engage in the resulting qualifications until they are sure they will not be changed again.”*

The DfES (2003:15) in their consultation document states that

*“All trainees are entitled to a full professional formation that equips them to teach in the learning and skills sector. This formation should consist of initial training, through the completion of an endorsed teaching qualification, and workplace development, where trainees can develop practical teaching skills.”*

This is supported by LLUK (2007b) who note that

*“All teachers must register with IfL and comply with the CPD, regardless of how the ITT regulations apply to them. IfL guidance clarifies where ITT and professional formation can count towards CPD requirement.”*

LLUK (2007a:10) when explaining the new regulatory requirements note that

*“All new teachers are to complete a period of professional formation. This is the process by which a teacher demonstrates through professional practice that they meet the standards and can use effectively the skills and knowledge acquired in teacher training.”*

How ‘professional formation’ will take place is still not clear. We need to know the process through which Initial Teacher Training and the Institute for Learning will identify that a trainee teacher has gone through this ‘right of passage’.

### **Experienced teachers’ perceptions**

Teachers, tutors, trainers etc welcome the professionalisation of the role; however knowledge of the reforms and the impact on their own development appears to be very patchy.

One adult and community learning provider who has been very active in embracing the reforms noted that

*“Teachers welcome the professionalisation of their role. Some experienced staff members were concerned about the need to update their qualifications but this issue has now been resolved.”*

This contrasts however with another adult and community learning organisation in the voluntary sector stating

*“Whilst most (17 out of 18) have some knowledge, the majority (14 out of 18) have little knowledge of the new regulations and the impact on their own development. This correlates with the numbers who have been in the job since before 2000 and are not required to undertake the new qualifications.”*

A work based learning provider who has taken a proactive approach to the reforms notes that

*“Staff generally are very positive about the impact of the reforms – this was expressed through an awareness of the improved professional status and the opportunities for them to reflect upon practice and to develop their own skills.”*

However an offender learning and skills provider described that in carrying out the study

*“A worrying aspect of the research was that 8 of the 17 responses indicated that the respondents were unaware of the reforms or had too little knowledge to enable them to comment. One tutor stated ‘as an informed tutor, I now feel very ill-informed.’”*

There also appears to be disparity between those who have attained a level of professionalisation who then question whether the reforms will have an impact,

*“That it would not make a significant difference.”* and

*“It would have no impact, and was merely jumping through hoops.”*

and those who feel under-valued in terms of their profession and believe the reforms will give them improved status in practice

*“It may improve training and development for some colleagues.”*

*“The workforce reforms will ensure that a greater range of tutors and trainers will have to be formally trained.”*

*“It will hopefully give another dimension to the feedback of teachers and their developmental needs.”*

Lifelong Learning UK (2007b) in their one page summary sheet explain the difference between ‘qualification’ and ‘licensed practitioner status (QTLS, ATLS)’

*“Qualifications are one part of gaining licensed practitioner status (i.e. QTLS or ATLS). You can only be awarded QTLS or ATLS once you have:*

*a) Gained appropriate qualifications, (or alternative recognition), which for teachers of literacy, ESOL or numeracy must also include subject specific qualifications and;*

*b) completed a process of professional formation according to Institute for Learning (IfL) criteria, to demonstrate that you are in good professional*

*standing and can apply the skills learnt in initial teacher training (ITT) to practical teaching.*

*Another distinction is that qualifications, once awarded, cannot be taken away, whereas a licence to practise must be maintained throughout ongoing CPD.”*

This ability to ‘take away the licence to practice’ has raised a concern in one partner who stated

*“There are concerns about IfL policing the workforce and revoking licences.”*

For those experienced teachers who began teaching before 1<sup>st</sup> September 2001 LLUK (2007b) note that

*“You are encouraged to gain licensed practitioner status (QTLS or ATLS) for example through ....gaining recognition of prior experience and qualifications as equivalent to being part or fully qualified i.e. through APL, Tariff database of Legacy Qualification (TLQ), Professional Recognition Schemes.”*

The Tariff of Legacy Initial Teacher Training Qualifications (TLQ or Tariff) as published by Standards Verification UK (SVUK) in 2007 states

*“The tariff is the new value of legacy (pre-September 2007) post-16 teaching and training qualifications in relation to the new teaching and training qualifications that were introduced in September 2007:*

*Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector (PTLLS)*

*Certificate in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (CTLLS)*

*Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector (DTLLS)”*

Once again there is patchy understanding regarding the use of the Tariff of Legacy particularly for those pre 2001 (note, this is the date of the first set of national standards published by the pre-cursor to LLUK the Further Education National Training Organisation or FENTO) teachers. The tariff is a tool that acknowledges legacy qualifications and ensures that people who wish to work towards ATLS or QTLS status start *“...their journey at the appropriate stage.”*

When HR and staff development managers were asked if they were aware of the SVUK Tariff of Legacy Qualification database as a means of reviewing current staff skill sets for formal recognition the overwhelming majority stated that they did know about it. When asked what they had done as a result of this knowledge their answers varied from being used as part of an

*“...audit of staff qualifications against TLQ”* to experiencing

*“...resentment amongst staff that qualifications like for example the 7407 need a further 6 credits”* and that

*“...the process does not take lengthy periods of experience into account.”*

One partner noted that in trying to access the website had *“...found it too difficult to find the information I wanted”* and had given up.

A general impression is that again it appears complicated and partners are as one states trying to

*“...distil the information into something that staff can both understand and retain.”*

Another route to licensed practitioner status is through General Professional Recognition Learning and Skills (GPRLS). This route enables competent and experienced teachers to be recognised as a qualified member of the workforce. It is a process designed for those where undertaking an initial teacher training qualification would be inappropriate. SVUK (2007b) note that

*“Successful applicants are placed on the Recognition register and become eligible to go on to apply for the status of either Qualified Teacher Learning and Skills (QTLS) or Associate Teacher Learning and Skills (ATLS). These are the new licences to practise and are conferred by the Institute for Learning.”*

They illustrate the difference in the roles with the following diagram (SVUK, 2007b:2).

When undertaking the associate teaching role	When undertaking the full teaching role
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• teaching experience with learners</li> <li>• ability to apply strategies which take account of learner need</li> <li>• commitment to continued reflection and evaluation</li> <li>• engagement in CPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• teaching experience with learners on more than one programme</li> <li>• ability to adapt to different learner demands within each session</li> <li>• a knowledge, understanding and application of curriculum development / innovation / delivery strategies</li> <li>• engagement in CPD</li> </ul>

Data drawn from experienced teachers, trainers, etc identified that they held a wide range of roles and 50% had been in a teaching role for less than 4 years. 75% held either a Certificate in Education or a PGCE alongside a wide range of professional, academic and vocational awards. The majority were encouraged by their employers to achieve QTLS status and 85% had registered with the IfL, the majority of whom held ‘member’ status.

When asked if as an experienced teacher they were considering taking advantage of GPRS there was a clear (50%) divide between those who replied ‘yes’ and felt it would,

*“...meet and raise national professional standards...good professional practice.”*

And those who replied ‘no’ citing

*“...decided against it as anecdotal evidence was that the scheme required a lot of work and input from individual teachers, I chose to do the course instead.”*

An earlier Professional Recognition Scheme (PRLS) ran from September 2006 to February 2007 and this might be the basis of ‘anecdotal evidence’.

LLUK in their Executive Summary ([www.lluk.org/nrp/prls\\_index.html](http://www.lluk.org/nrp/prls_index.html)) of the Independent Evaluation report of this earlier scheme note that

*“...many applicants thought that the process was a ‘paper exercise’ to get approval and were frequently shocked when they were unsuccessful. There was a fundamental misunderstanding for many that this was a **professional recognition** scheme, which recognised the applicants as professional teachers with the level 4 skills and knowledge needed to meet the DfES regulations. Many simply thought it was a process to recognise their time served as teachers.”*

One adult community learning provider identified that whilst they were aware of the scope of the GPRS for experienced teachers they had received comments ranging from

*“It would be easier to re-qualify.”*

*“There is a lot of evidence required. There does not appear to be a method of recognising prior learning.”*

*“We have sought guidance from IfL but they do not appear to know.”*

In one large college it was noted that

*“The vice-principal is the champion for this area of work and there is a section of the HR department that deals specifically with this issue.”*

Information relating to the application process for the new scheme has just been released (too late for the data gathering) but as an ITT partner notes

*“The demand for the General Professional Recognition Status route from experienced teachers is too early to gauge and the impact this might have on teacher educators in supporting these individuals needs to be monitored. If applicants, once again, simply think it is a process to recognise their experience rather than it being professional recognition process then there may again be many unsuccessful applicants. “*

### **Teacher educators’ perceptions**

The data was gathered from a small sample of eight teacher/trainer educators from two providers, one teacher educator provider in higher education and the other trainer educator provider in the police service.

The Department for Education and Skills (2004:13) in their document 'Equipping our Teachers for the Future', notes that an important aspect of the reform is to ensure that teacher trainers in HEIs, colleges and other providers are themselves fully skilled in all aspects of learner-centred teaching, and able to model different techniques, including e-learning, that trainee teachers need to master. Part of their strategy was to ask LLUK to set a

*"...professional development framework for teacher trainers, that covers both the qualifications they should hold and the experience they should have of teaching in a range of settings across the sector."*

The Further Education Workforce Reforms as outlined by LLUK (2007a:7) for teacher trainers and educators notes that they should have

*"...appropriate status and qualifications to teach on initial teacher training."*

When all the teacher/trainer educators were asked if they considered themselves to be 'suitably qualified for the role' they all responded in the affirmative.

Those teacher educators in higher education stated that they held at least a Certificate in Education or Post Graduate Certificate in Education in post compulsory education and training and had in some cases also undertaken the level 4 subject specific awards in literacy and numeracy and held higher awards. The majority had entered into their teacher educator role post 2001.

Within the police service, the trainer educators understand the reforms and are aware that although not currently impacting on their role they note they "*...expect it to at some time*", and they say it is "*desirable*" and see it will be a "*...requirement in the future.*" Currently all they are required to hold is the NVQ level 3 in Learning Development as well as, in some cases, assessor awards. However, some have undertaken the Certificate in Education / PGCE as part of their choice to further develop themselves and then progressed onto the BA (Hons) in post compulsory education and training.

Managers in the police training unit are aware of the training pathways leading to QTLS and ATLS. The key stakeholders and driver for change are Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabularies (HMIC) and the National Police Improvement Agency (NPIA). There is currently no requirement for the organisation to embrace the new qualifications for the training provision inside the organisation. The organisation is compliant to quality standards laid out by the stakeholders. Their trainer educators have a good knowledge of the pathways and are actively engaging in the process. This is supported by the management who have encouraged attendance at CPD events to embrace pathway development. Trainer educators see themselves as career trainers and either plan to continue in education outside their current role or develop further within their current position.

For all eight of the teacher/trainer educators, the keeping up to date with the reforms was very important, the strategies predominantly involved attending consultation and dissemination events. When it came to benchmarking against best practice, they utilised strategies such as external examination of work and practice (higher education), reading Ofsted and other inspection reports, appraisal processes, course evaluation etc. Most had been appointed a mentor to support them and observation of teaching practice is, as noted by those in higher education, "*...required as part of their induction and continuing development process.*"

All eight teacher/trainer educators had registered with the Institute for Learning, with six as 'members' and two as 'fellows'. They had registered for a variety of reasons, citing "...requirement for QTLS" in six instances and for five of them "...to support their CPD". All had noted they had done so to "...demonstrate their professionalism".

One police trainer educator noted that

*"Although it is not mandatory for my role at the present time, once membership has been implemented in further education, I am sure that public sector and private industry trainers / teachers will be required to join in order to practice. IfL is an excellent means of professionalising the role of the teacher / trainer in all fields."*

Once again the diverse nature of the sector can also potentially lead to a two tiered approach, this time in relation to teacher educators and trainer educators and the qualifications they hold.

### 3. *Notions of mentoring*

#### **Background to mentoring**

Ofsted (2003:2) in their national survey of initial training of further education teachers noted that

*"While the tuition that trainees receive on the taught elements of their courses is generally good, few opportunities are provided for trainees to learn how to teach their specialist subjects, and there is a lack of systematic mentoring and support in the workplace."*

Unlike their counterparts in compulsory education there is no financial reward and as a result mentoring is predominantly a voluntary activity. There is a real issue surrounding the lack of funding to support the training of mentors and it was felt that this could "...have an impact on the implementation of the reforms."

In addition to this there are concerns as to whether appropriate support and time would be made available for suitably qualified and experienced staff to act as subject specialist mentors for their colleagues. Mentoring in compulsory education is now well established in relation to mentoring in the learning and skills sector. When experienced teachers, tutors etc who acted as mentors were asked how long they had been in the role, the majority had mentored for less than 4 years, indicating the relative newness of the role.

This is an area of keen interest and the majority of the respondents see mentoring as a positive activity even though they don't necessarily currently act as a mentor. For those (thirty four respondents) that do have a mentor role they viewed this as part of the process of "...supporting their new colleagues undertaking teaching qualifications" and to "share and develop good practice". For those who don't currently mentor (forty three respondents) they cited they had "...not been asked but would consider it", and "...lack of time".

### **Definition and a model for mentoring**

Within the health sector there are standards for mentoring, a mentoring qualification framework and a requirement for partners (hospitals etc) to support trainee nurses and other health professionals. In contrast, the current position in the learning and skills sector is one of confusion between the terms 'subject learning coaches' and 'mentors', no standards, no framework and a key partner (the workplace) is not required to take an active part in the development of a trainee teacher with time given to enable this to happen.

There is a need for a clear definition of mentoring and for a national model of mentoring across the learning and skills sector. A national sub group drawn from Centres for Excellence in Teacher Training (CETT) are currently exploring the mentoring issue. This group needs, with some urgency, to identify and disseminate their 'definition' and if there are to be national standards, with an identified credit / level, for mentors then these also need to be agreed so that awarding institutions can take them quickly through the course development and approval processes.

That is not to say that training of mentors doesn't currently take place. It does, and respondents have identified a range of development opportunities from half day "introduction to mentoring" courses to "post graduate certificates in coaching and mentoring"

Partners explored the issue of mentoring and for one of them the results identified that

*"Notions of mentoring within the group surveyed were as varied as the definitions of mentoring. The majority (80%) did not know of our mentoring policy and did not see a value to them."*

Another partner clearly stated that

*"The role of the mentor would need to be defined so that staff can consider the role correctly."*

### **Training and qualifications**

In the absence of any mentor standards and model, the CETT for Inclusive Learning is developing, in response to the need of the partners, a level four, twenty credits continuing professional development module in mentoring for implementation in September 2008. We already have in place a sixty credit, level seven, Postgraduate Certificate in Mentoring, intended for those who have a major role in mentoring. This award was developed originally for the compulsory education sector but is sufficiently generic to accommodate teachers, trainers, etc from the learning and skills sector; the award can form part of the MA in Lifelong Learning.

Experienced teachers, when questioned, could see the value of a mentor qualification as they felt it would identify how it could improve their knowledge, accredit them for what they already do and update and further their skills, including dealing with sensitive issues (part of the feedback process).

The partner organisations are also supportive of this development. However it comes with a health warning,

*“Those who are already acting as mentors’ value the role and would like to consider a mentoring qualification as long as it was nationally recognised and did not demand too great a time commitment.”*

It was highlighted by teacher educators that *“...mentoring is an essential part of the learning process.”*

A clear and consistent definition of mentoring and a framework of mentoring qualifications, depending on role, would be a useful way to identify levels of professionalism. This needs to be backed up by support at a national level via a set of national standards and financial support similar to that made available to the compulsory sector.

Furthermore if there was a requirement for providers to identify a suitably qualified mentor and they were given recognised time for this role to be carried out it would strengthen the tripartite agreement between teacher educator, trainee teacher and workplace subject specialist mentor. This would really have an impact on the reform agenda.

It would also provide an effective response to Ofsted’s (2003:18) findings that

*“Few colleges provide their trainees with sustained support from experienced practitioners who can assist them in developing good teaching skills in their own subject. There is an over-reliance on informal forms of support, and the roles of mentors are often not defined in sufficient detail. Where mentoring support is provided, the standard is extremely varied and, in most cases, not well resourced.”*

#### **4. *Teacher’s perceptions of the impact of the reforms on their learners***

##### **Early days**

The Quality Improvement Agency (2007:5) state that the

*“Three aims of the Improvement Strategy are as follows:*

- 1. all learners in the further education system are equally able to access high quality education and training that equips them with the skills, knowledge and qualifications they need for work and personal fulfilment*
- 2. training provision meets employers business needs and employers can recruit people with the vocational skills needed to increase productivity*
- 3. the further education system continuously improves so that colleges and providers aspire to and achieve excellence, and no provision is unsatisfactory”*

It is still too early to measure the impact of their first aim, as the reforms were only implemented in September 2007. There appears to be in some contexts a general lack of knowledge about the possible impact of the reforms on learners and this requires further investigation.

This view is supported by some partners making comments such as

*“Teachers’ perceptions of the impact of the reforms on their learners were shown to be low” and*

*“The perception of the impact on learners was seen to be minimal.”*

### **Potential**

Interestingly, the potential resulting from access to a range of awards is beginning to emerge. This potential is evidenced through statements such as

*“A better qualified workforce aware of the needs of individual learners” and*

*“Having a stronger and more informed pool of teachers should support a learner centred approach”*

One HR practitioner noted that

*“It is not enough to have the subject or vocational skills without the knowledge of the issues around inclusion and the skills to overcome them.”*

A group of teachers in a vocational training college felt that

*“The reforms would have a positive impact on their learners in that they would drive up professional standards and would improve learning for all.”*

A senior manager of a college recognised that the requirement for a

*“Learner Involvement Policy in the new Instrument and Articles is driving greater involvement of learners. The move to two student governors has had a marked impact on learners’ ability to engage with and influence board discussions. For example our student governors have particularly championed the need for minority voices on the governing body and have done so with increasing confidence.”*

An adult and community learning (ACL) provider states

*Staff felt positive about the impact of the reforms on their learners identifying the improved teaching and learning experience, increased focus on the learner and up to date teachers as key elements in improving learner experience.”*

This was supported by another ACL provider who identified that

*“A wider range of learners should be able to access provision that meets their needs. Those teachers within mainstream provision should have a broader understanding of learners’ needs and may adapt delivery, use a wider range of resources, embed literacy/numeracy support and/or refer learners to specialist providers.”*

A manager in a special needs setting gave an eloquent view of the impact in relation to 'including learners in education'.

*"I do not know the detail of the new reforms. The inclusion of the learner voice in shaping their education and the choices they can make should be a positive thing. For well informed, confident learners this will mean greater choice and flexibility in how and what they wish to study. From my past experience in general FE, I believe that many learners, particularly those who have not achieved at school, will not necessarily have the social skills to make those informed choices. For some learners this may become nothing more than a paper based exercise and they will still end up on programmes that they feel they have not positively opted in to. One of the most common comments learners from the 16 – 19 age groups used to make when asked about "why did you choose this course" was "I did not choose it". Most of those learners did not feel that they had any option. In special needs education, the processes of making informed choices, asking questions and finding more information is promoted well. I believe that this group of learners will benefit from the reforms. It's such a pity that more time is not spent with young people to promote these life skills for everyone – and not make the assumption that they can all make well informed choices."*

For trainee teachers when questioned about the benefit of the reforms to their learners' one key theme that emerged was that

*"Learners can be confident that they are being taught by professional and highly skilled practitioners who are continuing to learn and develop."*

### **Longer term**

An initial teacher training provider noted that in the long term

*"...more suitably qualified teachers should support the inclusion agenda."*

and therefore would result in

*"...better quality teaching, improving learning for all and demonstrating to learners that we are professionally qualified."*

The impact of the reforms on learners and the role they play in their own learning, in influencing policy, contributing to debate and ensuring providers are responsive to their needs requires monitoring and evaluating.

## **5. The requirements for 30 hours continuing professional development (CPD)**

### **Background**

The second of the two reforms identified by the DfES in their June 2007 letter to the FE / Learning and Skills sector is a

*“...requirement for all teachers, trainers, trainers and lecturers to fulfil at least 30 hours continuing professional development each year, with reduced amounts for part timers.”*

The requirement to undertake CPD was welcomed, and for many it is already part of their contract of employment. Some teachers, trainers, etc already spend “...in excess of 30 hours”. For others the requirement was not universally understood stating they spend as little as “...2 hours per annum.”

Maybe it is the lack of recognition of what is CPD that causes teachers, trainers, etc to not recognise what they are naturally undertaking or maybe it is the lack of a formal process of negotiating and recording the CPD which leads to this misunderstanding.

The Institute for Learning (IfL) published in October 2007 ‘Guidelines for your continuing professional development (CPD)’. In this leaflet they recognise LLUK’s definition as complementing their own.

*“CPD, in relation to a teacher, means continuing professional development, which is any activity undertaken for the purposes of updating knowledge of the subject taught and developing teaching skills.”*

They then provide examples of CPD in relation to three broad areas,

- updating your teaching and learning methods and skills
- updating your subject specialism
- activities related to the national policy initiatives and the wider context in which you work

Making something a requirement and then harnessing it to make it meaningful is another thing. One partner commented

*“Whilst there is general understanding of the need to complete 30 hours of CPD there does not appear to be any mention of how that could be constructed into a method of career development.”*

### **Systems to maintain CPD**

LLUK (2007a:4) in their guidance to Principals and Chief Executives clearly state that they need to have

*“Systems in place to ensure that all teaching staff undertake at least 30 hours of CPD per year ...”*

and for those responsible for HR and Staff Development to

*“Have systems in place to support and provide CPD for all teaching staff.”*

For partners the need to maintain and record CPD has for some required the developing of systems. These vary enormously from

*“CPD portfolios that are seen at appraisal”* to

*“We have established via HR self service screens an online CPD log for all staff. We are able to track entries and record how many hours CPD is allocated to each individual.”*

CPD is in many partners linked to appraisal or individual performance review for example

*“Planning of CPD activities is an integral part of our (mandatory) annual appraisal and review. This is unlikely to change.”*

IfL (2007:1) in their guidelines clearly state that it is the individual who has the central role in determining that they undertake CPD as they view CPD as an integral part of achieving and maintaining professional teaching status. When teachers, trainers, etc were asked how they currently track their CPD as a result of this requirement, answers were varied, a large proportion were using partner devised tracking documents or maintaining a log in a diary (paper or electronic). During the data gathering phase IfL released their CD ROM. One partner commented that its release without any written message “...was a *mistake*.” It has since identified for us a training need and we, the CETT for Inclusive Learning, are developing workshops to help teachers, trainers, etc use it.

LLUK (2007a:3) state that

*“All teachers should undertake at least 30 hours of continuing professional development (CPD) per year, with reduced amounts for those on sessional, fractional or part-time contracts, and maintain a record of CPD activities undertaken. For in-service trainees this CPD requirement runs concurrently with their initial teacher training.”*

When interviewed as to who the teachers, trainers, etc send their CPD records to, the majority identified “...*their line manager*.” At that stage, of the data gathering for the case study, it was too early for there to be recognition that they would go to IfL.

LLUK in its Further Education Workforce Reforms document frequently states the need to

*“...undertake at least 30 hours of continuing professional development (CPD) per year...”*

But they make no explicit statement that the records should be sent to IfL other than to be

*“...registered with IfL and to maintain that membership in accordance with membership conditions”*

It is only when you explore the later section (LLUK, 2007a:12) relating to the CPD regulations that they state that

*“...FE teachers to maintain a record of CPD undertaken, make that record available to their employers and have available a record of the CPD undertaken to the Institute for Learning (IfL) each year.”*

More than one partner commented that for sessional staff working for a range of providers there may be an issue, in relation to who co-ordinates, tracks and pays for their CPD. The Further Education Teachers' Continuing Professional Development and Registration (England) Regulations (2007:4), note that

*"...part time teachers to undertake pro-rata amounts of CPD with a minimum of 6 hours per year and for those working for more than one Further Education Institute (FEI) to apportion this CPD requirement accordingly."*

This still doesn't get over the difficulty of a lack of funding to support sessional teachers, trainers, etc some of whom only work for a matter of weeks then move onto other work. This needs careful monitoring to ensure that these people are not penalised.

Given the diverse nature of the sector and the range of subjects / professions held by its teachers, trainers, etc it became clear that teachers, trainers, etc could belong to more than one professional body. For example, the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) and the Chartered Management Institute (CMI) both of whom have requirements for maintaining CPD. DfES (2007) note in their letter that they require all teachers to

*"...maintain an IfL record of their CPD activities and make it available to the Institute for Learning (IfL) and their employer or, where they have more than one, each of their employers, for inspection."*

For some people the dual nature of the teaching profession places a double professional requirement, they need one system that would meet the requirements of both professions and the requirements of the DfES.

### **Nature and level of CPD**

The Institute for Learning (2007:1) state that

*"...as a professional body, we stress that it is the quality of the CPD that is undertaken that is crucially important to the notion of professional development."*

So what is it that determines the quality? IfL then explore this concept of quality, for example

*"Awareness-raising events are useful for absorbing information and updating knowledge but are not likely to lead to skills development. Therefore, when deciding on your priorities for CPD, it is important to consider what kinds of CPD will be most effective for developing your practice as a teacher."*

And summarise (IfL 2007:2) by stating that

*"Continuing professional development means maintaining, improving and broadening relevant knowledge and skills in your subject specialism and in your teaching so that it has a positive impact on practice and learner experience."*

Evidence from this evaluation suggests that there is confusion over what constitutes appropriate CPD. One manager noted that

*“The absence of firm information concerning the level of CPD to maintain IfL registration is a cause for concern and needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency. There is a danger that the level required will put added pressure on staff already overburdened with contractual change.”*

Many questions were raised on this issue. They included

- How will individuals know that the recording of their CPD is not a tokenistic gesture? Will this fall upon providers utilising their appraisal systems to make judgement on the quality and appropriateness of the CPD? Or do IfL members wait in anticipation to be randomly ‘selected’ to submit their CPD record to them.
- Have IfL got the resources to police the CPD system?
- What will they do if the individual’s CPD record doesn’t meet their (IfL) expectations?

In the Chartered Institute for Personnel and Development, members maintain their CPD and it is only if they are applying for a change of level of membership that the CPD record plays an important role when it then comes under scrutiny. The inherent danger of this strategy is that you can coast along and not reflect on your practice.

### **The reflection process**

It is very obvious that IfL have provided guidance through their website and the distribution of the CD ROM. However, perhaps further consideration should be given by IfL to how the quality of CPD arising from the reflective process can be supported, for example as they state

*“So CPD comprises more than just courses, workshops or formal study; it is the critical reflection on different learning experiences and resulting action planning that demonstrates development as a teacher.” (IfL, 2007:1)*

This requisite for ‘reflection’ was noted by one partner

*“The need for reflection on activities was a major change that would need to be implemented but this was felt in general terms to be a positive development. College recording systems have been modified to take this into account. It had been felt that it would be divisive to operate two different systems, i.e. for teaching and for other staff. Consequently the College’s amended system had been designed to standardise recording and auditing procedures.”*

The way the CPD processes that the partners and the individuals have implemented and how they can be effectively integrated to support the development of the individual, together with the 30 hours CPD requirements of the reforms should be monitored to identify good practice. More importantly however is how we provide the support that turns that CPD activity, through meaningful reflection, into a change of

practice. How do we also enable our teacher, trainers etc to become critical thinkers and their colleagues to become critical friends?

As IfL note (2007) professional conversations about CPD are vitally important for your development as a teacher.

*“We would recommend therefore that from the outset you share our on-going development work with a colleague who will also be able to act as a critical friend, supported of activity and peer reviewer of your planning and reflection on CPD.”*

## 6. *Impact of the requirement for CPD on inclusion and inclusive learning*

### **Introduction to inclusion and inclusive learning**

Given the focus of the CETT *for* inclusive learning it seemed appropriate to explore how much of the requirements for continuing professional development was focussed on inclusion, inclusive learning and inclusive practice. As a CETT we have not defined these terms, waiting to see what emerges as a result of our activities.

The 1996 Tomlinson Report focused on inclusive education, its proposals were aimed at improving further education’s response to learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities, and at matching provision to a wider range of individual learning needs. At that time Tomlinson (FEFC, 1996:4) stated that

*“...the burden of a disability and/or learning difficulty placed on individuals was socially constructed, the results of attitudes and attributions of those who deem themselves without disability or able to learn normally.”*

Since then there has been considerable development in the area of education for disabled people. Today the emphasis is not on the disability but on how that person can be helped to learn more effectively by taking into account the requirements of the individual.

The Learning and Skills Council outline their vision for provision for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities and how the further education system should respond to meet that vision. It notes (LSC, 2006:3) that

*“People with learning difficulties and/or disabilities must not be marginalised and we must strive harder to deliver access to, and experience of, post-16 learning whether in schools, in Apprenticeships, in ‘independent living skills’ programmes or through Train to Gain, that is equal to that experienced by their peers without learning difficulties and/or disabilities.”*

The concept of learning for living and work drives the LSC vision and they state that part of this vision is

*“...person centred learning, based on the principles of Inclusive Learning, whereby learning has purpose, positive outcomes and meets learner aspiration, and in which the environment matches learners’ requirements.”* (LSC, 2006: 9).

### **Nature of the organisation in relation to inclusion and inclusive learning**

Within the CETT *for* Inclusive Learning there are those partners whose whole ethos is based on inclusion, inclusive learning and inclusive practice. In our first year we carried out a needs analysis of the range of in house non accredited learning opportunities being accessed by the teachers, trainers etc. The response was astonishing. There was an enormous amount of specialised continuing professional development taking place that went unrecognised beyond the individual organisation. The CETT *for* Inclusive Learning now intends to work towards making this 'transparent' in order to share practice across the CETT partners.

This case study enabled us, through a questionnaire, to ask of teachers, trainers etc to identify the types of inclusive practice CPD they were undertaking. Once again, over eighty types were identified. This needs further exploration to separate out the more general CPD from the specific 'inclusion' CPD.

From both activities, the needs analysis and the case study questionnaire, there is evidence that there is taking place not only a broadening of individuals subject specialism but also their pedagogical skills, and the need for them to constantly keep up to date with policy drivers. All of this activity sits very comfortably with IfL's notions of CPD.

One voluntary sector provider they stated that

*"The nature of the organisation focuses the majority of CPD on the area of inclusion and inclusive practice, the role of CPD in improving practice in this organisation will improve our ability to meet the needs of all our learners and to include them in the process of teaching and learning."*

An adult and community learning provider they commented upon the fact that

*"...all teachers will have the opportunity to keep up to date with inclusion issues and hopefully work collaboratively. Skills for Life tutors have often received discrete training. Within some organisations, historically, inclusion has been seen to be the responsibility of Skills for Life; now there is the chance to share CPD and address issues together."*

Within the police service in key areas of business, training is delivered

*"...on inclusion for example; safer detention for custody officers and mental health training for firearms officers, all training delivery is delivered with diversity as a golden thread through it. All trainers are required to attend diversity training and complete modular learning on the subject."*

Within the prison service

*"All 3 providers thought that the reforms would have a positive impact on inclusive learning although one raised concerns that the requirement for a relevant teaching qualification may adversely impact in the prison setting where there may be instructors who know their subject inside out, but who would find it difficult to achieve or would not be self motivated enough to do so."*

A college partner noted that any impact of a requirement for CPD on inclusion and inclusive learning.

*“It is unclear for the majority of staff although there is the perception amongst some that the organisation will be better able to cater for all types of learners.”*

There is the need however to make transparent not only what constitutes inclusive learning CPD from general CPD but also the links between the IfL CPD requirements and all the inclusive learning activity that is taking place.

Not all CPD needs to be formally accredited as long as it is recognised. Guidance needs to be produced by the CETT and disseminated to partners.

### **Specialist Qualifications**

The LSC Learning for Living and Work document (2006:19) recognises that

*“Insufficient specialist qualifications for all staff and a lack of appropriate professional standards severely limit the capacity and capability to deliver. Significant work has already been undertaken by DfES, LLUK, CEL and other partners to develop the workforce of the FE system.*

*New professional standards for teachers, trainers and trainers in the lifelong learning sector have been developed and new standards for learning support staff are being developed over the coming months by LLUK.*

*Qualifications frameworks are also under development for teachers and learning support staff.*

*In this development, LLUK is seeking to ensure that all teachers and learning support staff are prepared to teach inclusively and have appropriate knowledge and skills. This includes working with learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities.”*

The Quality Improvement Agency in their Pursuing Excellence (2007:9) document when discussing its aims, objectives and priority actions (and its aim for learners in the further education system to be equally able to access high quality education and training) note that the current position indicates that there is evidence of significant variation in success rates between learners from different backgrounds. In particular

*“...success rates for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities (LLDD) show no significant differences but current trends indicate that the numbers of learners with LDD in the sector is likely to increase.”*

Shewell and Penn (2008) were commissioned by MENCAP National College at Dilston and funded by the regional Learning and Skills Council to consider the need for a virtual sixth form for learners with learning difficulties in the Tynedale area of Northumberland. They identified that there might arise from this potential initiative,

that would bring together high schools, local college, Dilston College, work based learning and other providers, a need to “...*develop staff and to pioneer new approaches.*” (2008:45) Discussions have been held with the CETT for Inclusive Learning to identify what the CPD needs would be of the virtual sixth form’s staff and how possibly to address them. One possible outcome is to draw upon the new Level 4 Certificate in teaching learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities, developed by CETT partners. Another is to accredit activity through negotiated work based learning.

So far the focus has been on the teachers, trainers etc and their needs. We ignore at our peril the increasing influence of the ‘learner voice’ (QIA, 2007:12). With the range of partners and current contacts we need to also further engage with disabled people to recognise their potential role as teachers and educators. There has been little recognition to date of the abilities of learners with LDD to also be active in the role of teacher/educator and appropriate pathways for development in this area are lacking. The CETT for Inclusive Learning and in particular Northumbria University recognises the need to develop the potential of participants in learning as educators and as researchers to inform the activities of the CETT.

## 7. *The requirement for registration with the Institute for Learning (IfL)*

### **Knowledge of IfL**

The third of the four reforms identified by the DfES in their June 2007 letter to the FE / Learning and Skills sector is “...*a requirement for all teachers, trainers, tutors and lecturers to be registered with the Institute for Learning, their professional body*”

The Institute for Learning is the professional body for teachers and trainers in the learning and skills sector with responsibility for the registration and regulation of licensed practitioners within the sector through QTLS. All those registered with the IfL will be obliged to comply with its Code of Professional Practice.

### **Management and organisation support**

There is a clear commitment from management to support this workforce reform requirement.

One specialist college has such a strong commitment to ensure that all members are registered, with the HR department recording registration numbers and grade of membership, that a college manager has been assigned the role of “*IfL Champion*” to keep the staff team abreast of developments.

Another college partner paid their fees. This is an issue as those who registered early were not able to take advantage of the government’s commitment as noted in their June 2007 letter that “...*the Government will meet the standard membership costs of individual teachers*”. It still rankles with some individuals that they have not been reimbursed as one noted “...*had to pay the £25 registration fee when others registered free.*”

Another partner supported the requirement by “...*giving staff access to IT facilities and time off to register*”. As this was within the prison service, where access to IT is strictly restricted this use of IT would not normally be an everyday occurrence as it would in other organisations.

An adult and community learning manager noted that they had *“Badgered every member of staff until it was done and supported them with their web entries.”*

An outcome of this requirement is that one College had decided that it would only *“...appoint qualified candidates registered with the IfL to vacant teaching posts. In the short-term this could impact on the range of candidates available.”*

A manager within the police service noted that

*“Trainers are not being supported to become professionally registered at this time. The situation is being closely monitored, with the force in regular consultation with the National Police Improvement Agency and Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary. The training department is monitoring the need for IfL registration.”*

They did recognise that the trainer educators

*“...have been registered as part of their own professional development”*

### **Individual responsibility**

In this survey of ninety five teachers, trainers etc, eighty five of them had registered with IfL, with the majority noting that this was a *“Requirement of employment / government directive.”*

Of the ten who hadn’t registered they were either in the process of doing so or thought that they had longer to carry it out. IfL state that for

*“Existing college teachers they need to register by 31 March 2008”* whereas

*“Existing teachers for other LSC-funded providers will also be required to register, although this will be managed on a slightly longer timescale”*

More confusion as this timescale has not been identified.

Of those who disclosed their grade, there was one affiliate, three associates, sixty two members and three fellows.

Trainee teachers when surveyed had all registered with IfL. This time however their responses were more varied, including to

*“...become a registered teacher”*

*“...hope to gain parity with compulsory education”*

*“...to comply with government regulations”*

Together with the ever hopeful

*“I will get a raise in salary.”*

## Recommendations: Local

### Recommendations for the CETT for Inclusive Learning partners in relation to workforce development

Continue to be responsive and proactive to the national strategies through attendance at consultations and dissemination events in order to remain up to date and well informed. Ensure there is a strategic plan for the dissemination of knowledge to the workforce that informs your management processes and is shared with your CETT partners.

Consider further research into the impact the reforms are having on the integration of your overall management of human resources, staff development and initial and continuing professional development of staff. Identify any implications arising from the reforms linked to the recruitment and retention of staff including sessional tutors.

Work with the CETT for Inclusive Learning to develop a strategy to create a more effective 'reach' into your organisation, thus enabling more staff to access the learning opportunities on offer and involvement in the new Network for Inclusive Practice.

Continue to share effective practice and encourage the development of innovative practice through attendance on working groups, offering placements and subject specific mentors and by opening up opportunities for visits to your organisation.

Monitor the impact of the reforms on your learners paying particular attention to how a greater awareness of inclusive learning is resulting in better access to quality provision that more effectively meets their needs.

Consider the role learners play in the development of practice and identify clear pathways for that process to take place.

### Recommendations for the CETT for Inclusive Learning in relation to CPD

Continue to act as a central point of reference and provide on a regular basis general help and advice on the reforms, as it has proved to have been invaluable in providing a stable and informative source of information in an otherwise confused environment. Further marketing is required to ensure that the support, advice and learning opportunities the CETT for Inclusive Learning can provide is more widely recognised and disseminated.

Continue to act as central point and conduit for a range of advice and support in relation to teaching and learning for those who teach and support learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities (LLDD). However, the CETT for Inclusive Learning needs to ensure that it does not concentrate on particular disabilities but rather broadens its remit across the full range of LLDD, for example the needs of those who work with learners with hearing and/or vision impairment.

Design a rolling programme of accredited and non-accredited learning opportunities in relation to an active understanding of inclusive practice and to ensure that teachers, trainers, etc are aware of these opportunities. Draw upon the diverse membership of the CETT for Inclusive Learning to provide specific and specialist

insights and training. Publish an overview of continuing professional development opportunities with progression routes.

Provide guidance on what constitutes inclusive learning continuing professional development and identifying the links between the IfL CPD requirements and the inclusive learning activity.

Embrace the anticipated QIA definition of mentoring and until such time as a common model of mentoring or standards emerges the CETT *for* Inclusive Learning should continue to provide support and training for mentors, including an accredited route for those who request it.

Further develop the participation of teachers, trainers, etc and others in supported Action Research as it has generated significant interest for its potential to identify, develop and disseminate good practice and for the professional satisfaction that participation is felt to offer.

Build upon current contacts and engage with learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities as educators and evaluators to inform the activities of the CETT *for* Inclusive Learning.

Support organisations and individuals with the requirements of the Institute for Learning by identifying and training CETT *for* Inclusive Learning champions to support the use of 'Reflect' and provide guidance on the appropriateness of the 30 hours of continuing professional development.

### **Recommendations: National**

#### **Recommendation for QIA's National Improvement Strategy**

Provide a clear vision and strategy that will take us beyond 2010 that also identifies how the QIA National Improvement Strategy links with other national body requirements.

Consider whether a greater emphasis in the current reforms on inclusion and inclusive learning for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities would be appropriate if the QIA wishes to further this agenda. Ensure that inclusive practice is embedded within all Centres for Excellence.

Clarify and disseminate more widely the term FE in order to ensure that the current reforms don't result in a two tier learning and skills sector artificially delineated by LSC funding.

Extend the Workforce Reforms to include non-LSC funded provision, i.e Jobcentre Plus.

#### **Recommendation for LLUK's workforce development strategy**

Publish a clear statement that the new standards / qualifications are here to stay or there will continue to be a reluctance in some quarters to engage in the new

programmes as there appears to be issues surrounding employer knowledge of the qualifications.

Clarify whether adult and community providers who are not skills for life providers are subject to the reforms. The suggestion that they reach an agreement with their local LSC will need to be reviewed prior to the demise of the LSC in 2010.

Consider how Priority 4 of the workforce strategy, which is to ensure that equality and diversity is at the heart of the strategy, could feature as a compulsory part of the 30 hour continuing professional development.

Develop mandatory standards that awarding bodies can access in order to develop qualifications for teachers working with learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities. However, the constant review of the application of standards provided by LLUK made developing the current programmes very frustrating and any future standards development needs to take this into account.

Carry out an evaluation and make public its findings of how the £30 million distributed to the LSC financed sector in relation to all four reforms has had an impact.

### **Recommendations for the IfL's professional development strategy**

Provide a position statement outlining their strategy which should result in clear consistent guidelines. It would appear that changes are being implemented before plans have been thought through and finalised e.g. Identify how QTLS and ATLS will be conferred. There is a distinction between 'qualifications' and licence to practice' and this should be outlined more clearly.

Improve communication with members' e.g. the recent distribution of the 'Reflect' CD ROM without any written explanation has caused some concern to teachers, trainers, etc. Further guidance would be of benefit or a redistribution of earlier guidance.

Consider identifying and funding appropriately trained regional advisers in relation to using 'Reflect' when recording the 30 hours mandatory CPD. Advisors could support organisations and individuals through appropriate workshops and guidance sessions.

Bespoke support for organisations would be of great benefit to all members or to have a local liaison officer to answer queries and spread good practice. This level of support could be integral to CETT activities and would allow advice, guidance and training to be delivered in one service.

Reach out to the work based learning community as knowledge of IfL remains unclear outside of the learning and skills council funded sector.

## References

Basic Skills Agency (2002) *Access for All: Guidance on making the adult literacy and numeracy curricula more accessible*. London: BSA

DfES (2003) *The future of Initial Teacher Education for the Learning and Skills Sector: An Agenda for Reform. A Consultative Paper*. Sheffield: DfES

DfES (2004) *Equipping our Teachers for the Future: Reforming Initial Teacher Training for the Learning and Skills Sector*. Sheffield: DfES

DfES (2007) *Workforce Reforms across the FE / Learning and Skills sector in England – Essential preparations for September 2007 onwards. (Letter to providers)* Sheffield: DfES

Further Education Funding Council (1996) *Inclusive Learning. The Tomlinson report* London: HMSO

Institute for Learning (2007) *Guidelines for your continuing professional development (CPD)*. London: IfL

Learning and Skills Council (2006) *Learning for Living and Work: Improving Education and Training Opportunities for People with Learning Difficulties and/or Disabilities*. Coventry: LSC

Lifelong Learning UK (2007a) *Further Education Workforce Reforms. Explaining Initial Teacher Training, Continuing Professional Development and Principals' Qualifications in England*. London: LLUK

Lifelong Learning UK (2007b) *Qualifications for teachers, trainers, lecturers and instructors in the FE sector in England. (Summary sheet of routes)* London: LLUK

Office for Standards in Education (2003) *The initial training of further education teachers. A survey. HMI 1762* Ofsted Publications Centre

Quality Improvement Agency (2007) *Pursuing Excellence: The National Improvement Strategy for the further education system*. Coventry: QIA

Shewell and Penn Consulting Ltd (2008) *Virtual sixth form: a strategy for Tynedale's learners aged 16 to 18 with learning disabilities*. Dilston: Shewell and Penn Consulting Ltd

Standards Verification UK (2007a) *The Tariff of Legacy Initial Teacher Training Qualifications (TLQ or Tariff)*. London: SVUK

Standards Verification UK (2007b) *General Professional Recognition Learning and Skills (England)* London: SVUK

CD Rom

Institute for Learning (2008) *Reflect*.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1

*Schedule A Principals, chief executives etc*

Impact on systems relating to new and existing teaching staff and their requirements under the new reforms, workforce capacity planning in relation to inclusion and inclusive learning

### Appendix 2

*Schedule B Human resources (HR) and staff development*

Impact on HR strategies in relation to the new reforms, implementation of the reforms in relation to inclusion and inclusive learning

### Appendix 3

*Schedule C Initial Teacher Training (ITT) providers*

New Lifelong Learning UK (LLUK) awards and continuing professional development (CPD) provision, their views of impact of the new reforms

### Appendix 4

*Schedule D Teacher Trainers and Educators*

Impact of the new reforms on their development and CPD in relation to inclusion and inclusive learning

### Appendix 5

*Schedule E Teachers, trainers, trainers etc*

Impact of the new reforms on their development and CPD in relation to inclusion and inclusive learning

### Appendix 6

*Schedule F Trainee Teachers*

Impact of the implementation of the reforms and CPD in relation to inclusion and inclusive learning